OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIRST SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

---

9 EDWARD VII., 1909

VOL. XC

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FIFTH DAY OF MARCH TO THE FIFTH DAY OF APRIL, INCLUSIVE.



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

House of Commons Debates

FIRST SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 5, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved:

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

Mr. MONK. I suppose this will apply to Wednesday next and I thought I had understood from the right hon. the Prime Minister that the motion standing in my name on the Order Paper might be gone on with on Wednesday next, Monday being allotted to the motion of my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), I would ask that the order take effect only after next Wednesday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is not reached on Monday next, it will no doubt be reached the following Monday and that ought to be satisfactory.

Motion agreed to.

STEAMSHIP SERVICE WITH FRANCE.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg to move for the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries: that on Tuesday next the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution. I beg to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor General assents to the resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to enter into a contract or contracts for a term not exceeding ten years with any individual or company, for the performance of a steamship service between a port or ports in Canada and a French port or ports, on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council deems expedient, and to grant therefor a subsidy not exceeding two hundred thousand dollars a year, based upon a minimum service of fifteen round voyages a year, and a subsidy therefor not exceeding one hundred thousand dollars, and so in proportion for a more frequent service.

Motion agreed to.

JURISDICTION OVER THE FISHERIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whether any and what progress has been made in the negotiations which at one time were being carried on between the government of Canada and the provincial governments with regard to the respective jurisdictions of this government and the provincial governments over the fisheries. The Prime Minister will recollect that we had an intimation from the government last session that a certain officer was named to us as having been commissioned for the purpose of visiting the various provinces and consulting with the Ministers so as to arrange, if possible, some effective plan by which the work would be carried on by the several provincial governments or the federal government without let or hindrance and without any doubt as to jurisdiction. I made inquiry early in the session in regard to it and did not receive much information. If the Prime Minister is not able to answer to-day would he be good enough to communicate with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and let me know as soon as possible?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am afraid I cannot give as full information as the Minister would be able to give were he present. I understand that Mr. Bastedo was appointed last year to confer with the provincial governments with a view of obtaining, if possible, a basis for a settlement. Mr. Bastedo was engaged in that work when he was called upon to serve in the Trade and Commerce Department in connection with the annuities law. Some few weeks ago several of the provincial governments were represented in Ottawa on a matter which was not directly concerned with this question, but I understand that at the conference it was to some extent discussed. It is the intention of the minister to resume the discussion, but further than this I cannot say.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I notice that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has now entered the House; would he be good enough to look in 'Hansard' at the question I have put to-day so that he may be able to answer it on Monday?

WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any information available as to when the waterways treaty will be laid upon the table of the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have just received a despatch on this subject which I will be glad to lay on the table of the House on Monday or Tuesday next.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 91) an Act to incorporate the Prudential Trust Company, Limited—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 92) an Act respecting patents of the Hart Otis Car Company, Limited—Mr. Geoffrion.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE moved the adoption of the first report of the select standing committee on standing orders, as follows:

Your committee have considered that portion of the petition of the Kettle River Valley Railway Company which asks for an extension of time for the completion of their authorized lines of railway, reported by the examiner of petitions for private Bills as not being covered by the notice. Your committee, in view of the fact that proof having been received to the effect that the required notice is now being published and will have sufficiently matured before the Bill can be considered by the Railway Committee, they therefore recommend that the same be deemed sufficient.

All of which is rspectfully submitted.

A. H. CLARKE,
Chairman.

He said: I have been asked to move this report in the absence of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What precaution will be taken to assure the House or some committee that the required notice shall have been given at the time mentioned. This motion is based on the expectation that something will be done, but what guarantee is there that that particular thing will be done. Who will take cognizance of it to see that it is done before the Bill goes on?

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I am scarcely able to answer the question. The chairman of the committee is not here and the report was placed in my hands as a matter of form.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If some assurance could be given for example, that the chairman of the Railway Committee would take cognizance of the matter and exact proof that the provisions of the rules had been complied with before the Bill came under the consideration of the committee it would be satisfactory, but in the absence of that assurance the motion does not seem to me to be satisfactory.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The motion had better stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

SUPPLY—FRENCH TRANSLATION OF LAWS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee of supply.

Mr. E. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the French edition of our statutes. In perusing the series of volumes from 1867 to 1903 inclusively, that is up to the time of the retirement of the late Mr. Coursolles, the then chief French translator, one cannot help noticing that the designations of railway companies and others, even of those outside of the province of Quebec are, except in a very few cases, given in French.

It will be noticed on the other hand, that in the French edition of the statutes for 1904 and the years following, the English designations are seldom translated. Moreover, in the French edition of statutes relating to the amalgamation of two companies of two lines of railway, the contract entered into by the two corporations, and included as a schedule to the Amalgamation Act used to be translated into French, so that we had a French edition that was complete, a homogeneous work. Why has this rational system which remained in force during so many years been abandoned?

Let me point out a few striking discrepancies. In the first place we have Bill (No. 8), session of 1908, the French version of which refers to 'The Tobique Manufacturing Company ;' that company was incorporated in 1898, 61 Vict., chap. 116, under the name of 'La compagnie manufacturière de Tobique.' Here then is a company designated in the French edition of our statutes, at times under an English name, and at times under a French name.

In the second place we have Bill (No. 13) for 1908 the French copy of which relates to 'The British Columbia Southern Railway Company ;' while in the statute-book for 1899, the company is designated as 'La ccmpagnie du chemin de fer du Sud de la Colombie Britannique.' That is, we have the same discrepancy as in the previous instance.

In the third place, we have Bill (No. 15) for 1908, the French version of which refers to 'The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company ;' while in the statute-books, for 1886, chap. 15, 1888, chap. 89, in 1905, chap. 90 and 1906, chap. 92, the company is designated as: 'La compagnie du chemin de fer

d'Esquimalt à Nanaimo.' Even as far back as 1884 section 3, chap. 6, in the French edition of the statutes, the name of the company is given in French. So that in the statutes for five years we have the designation of a company given in French and then in 1908, after a lapse of 24 years from the date of the first mention of the name of the company in 1884, the English designation is substituted for the French in the French edition of the statutes.

Then again, let us take Bill (No. 16) for 1908, an Act concerning 'The South Ontario Pacific Company;' in the statutes for the four years, 1887, 1891, 1896 and 1906, the designation of the company is given in French in the French edition. Bill (No. 19) for 1908, an Act incorporating 'The Bank of Winnipeg;' in all acts previous to 1903 the designation of the bank was given in French in the French edition of the Act. Bill (No. 21) for 1908, an Act concerning 'The British Yukon Railway Company;' in the French edition of the statutes for 1897, incorporating the company, it is designated as 'La compagnie de mines, de commerce et de transport du Yukon britannique.' In the French edition of the statutes for 1900, 63-64 Vict., chap 55, the name is changed to that of 'Compagnie du chemin de fer du Yukon britannique.' The same designation is to be found in the French edition of the statutes for 1901.

Bill (No. 20) for 1908, the French version refers to 'The Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company;' in the French edition of the statutes for 1899, chap. 95, the designation is given thus: 'La compagnie du pont de Belleville-Prince-Edouard.' Bill (No. 24), the French version refers to 'The West Ontario Pacific Railway Company;' but in the French edition of the statutes for 1885 chap. 87, for 1886, chap. 70, for 1887, chap. 62, for 1906 chap. 178 the designation is in every case, 'La compagnie du chemin de fer du Pacific de l'Ouest d'Ontario.'

Here then are several companies whose designations are given in the French edition of the statutes, at times in English and at times in French. It will be found that in Bills (Nos 25, 28 and 30) introduced at this session and having contracts attached, no translation has been made of such contracts, the original English text having been merely inserted in the French edition, against all reason. The hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay has introduced a Bill (No. 42) incorporating 'The Canadian Liverpool and Western Railway Company.' It deals with the building of a railway in the province of Quebec; nevertheless, the designation in the French edition of the Bill is given in English.

What reason is there for such irrelevancies in the French edition of the statutes? I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that in the fulfilment of your high duties, it would be proper on your part to take measures towards preventing the turning of the French edition of our laws into a perfect muddle.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the matter brought up by the hon. member who has just taken his seat, is not one under the control of the government, the translation of the laws being effected by officers of the House appointed by the House, and therefore outside the control of the government. However, the House has a perfect right to discuss this question, and I am not objecting in any way to my hon. friend having thought fit to bring up the matter.

I understand that formerly not only the text of any act incorporating a company was translated into French, but the name of the company as well. For instance the English edition referred to the 'Bank of Montreal,' and the French edition to the 'banque de Montreal.' So that the same institution was known under two different names. The same rule applied in the case of the 'banque Nationale de Québec,' which in the English version was designated as the 'National Bank of Quebec.'

At the time of Mr. Frechette's appointment as chief translator, he, I think, effected the change referred to by the hon. member, which consists in designating companies under the name given by the petitioners themselves in the petition addressed to parliament. I remember perfectly well that when the 'Banque Provinciale' came up for incorporation, the designation that was given was purely and simply 'La Banque Provinciale.'

To my mind, a great deal may be said in support of the change effected by Mr. Fréchette. I for one am not ready to say it was a mistake on his part. As the hon. member is aware, the designation of a company is in fact the name of a person in the moral sense, and that being the case, should a company be known under two different names?

Mr. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) If the hon. member will allow me, I have shown a moment ago, that in the French edition, at times, English designations were translated and at others were not. What I am anxious to obtain is uniformity.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) The whole question comes to this: is it desirable, as my hon. friend seems to think, that the designations of companies be put in both languages, that is to say that they should appear in French in the French edition, and in English in the English edition? There may be some well-founded objection to this practice. For instance a company might be sued before the courts under two different designations, although constituting a single person in the moral sense. Is it not better that each company should be

known under one designation only? I never had occasion to discuss the matter with Mr. Fréchette, but I think that is what he had in mind.

I have pointed out the case of the 'Banque Provinciale.' If my hon. friend will peruse the statute-books, he will find that in the English edition, that bank is designated as the 'Banque Provinciale.' However, my hon. friend has referred to a rather serious case, that of a company having obtained its charter under a name which has been translated in the French edition of the Act granting the charter, and which subsequently causes its charter to be amended, while its original designation is not translated in the French edition of the Amending Act, in such a way that the company, in so far as the French edition is concerned, appears to have a double designation. Mr. Fréchette may come to the conclusion, after looking into this debate, that it would be better to retain the same designation throughout the French edition, as long as the company exists.

As to the general principle governing the translation of such designations, I am not of opinion as before stated, that Mr. Fréchette is wrong.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques-Cartier). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the general principle laid down by the hon. minister is fraught with great danger. If I understood him aright, he contends that in the translation of our statutes, English designations of companies should not be translated for the French edition. And why? Because petitions having for their object the incorporation of a company are, as a rule, written out in English, and accordingly the designation is given in that same language. He bases himself on a ruling made by the chief translator, Mr. Fréchette, a good many years ago. Does the hon. minister know as a fact that such is the interpretation Mr. Fréchette puts on his duties as translator? It would be a matter of surprise to me. I have known Mr. Fréchette for some time, and it does not seem likely to me that he would endorse such a proposal.

Whenever we adopt a Bill incorporating a bank or any other kind of company, that Bill is supposed to have been passed in French as well as in English. The firm which we are incorporating receives its designation in both languages. If we were to dispense with translating such designations, where would that lead us to? If the principle laid down by the hon. minister were to prevail, as most petitions seeking incorporation are sent to parliament in one language only, all expressions of a sacramentl nature—if I may be allowed to use the expression—used in these petitions, might be considered untranslatable for legal purposes. That is a dangerous principle to lay down, and I doubt that a man of Mr. Fréchette's ability has ever dreamt of establishing it.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) To say the truth, I mentioned Mr. Fréchette's name, for the reason that the member for L'Islet had stated that this change in the way of effecting the translation became noticeable only after Mr. Coursolles' retirement; I inferred that the change had been effected by Mr. Fréchette but I am not positive about it.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) It dates back to 1903, inclusive.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) That does not appear to me very likely, for the rule has not always been adhered to, as stated by the member for L'Islet. If Mr. Fréchette had laid down such a rule, I think he would have adhered invariably to it.

I insist that this is a dangerous principle, for if it were to prevail in the end, its effect would be to render illusory our right to have all legal enactments expressed in both languages.

As regards the work of translation, true the House has control over it to a certain extent; but, as we are aware, the translators are paid by the government, and accordingly are under their control. To contend, as the hon. minister has done, that the government have nothing to do with the question because these officers are not under their control, does not seem to me to be a reasonable excuse.

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not see any difficulty in a corporation having both a French and an English name. With regard to La Banque Provinciale having been incorporated originally under the French name, and having only the one name, I do not know that it is very material; but I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that by an amendment to the Act incorporating La Banque Provinciale, passed if my memory serves me rightly, about three years ago, it was specially enacted that the bank should be known as La Banque Provinciale du Canada and not the Provincial Bank of Canada. So that in that particular instance at least, parliament seems to have considered that there was not any difficulty involved in the corporation having a name in each of the languages.

WORK OF THE COMMITTEES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to inquire of the Prime Minister whether it would not be advisable to make a reference of the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to the new committee which has been constituted. I observe that a portion of the report was referred to the committee upon the motion of the chairman on the 3rd inst., namely, that portion

relating to the lobster and the oyster fishery. It seems to me to be rather an unusual procedure. If the committee is to do any service, the whole report should be referred to the committee, in order that the members of the committee could take into consideration what inquiries they might desire to make or in what way they could be of assistance to the minister and the department. I would regard it as singularly inexpedient to require a motion every two or three days in this House that some portion of the report be picked out and referred to the committee. The committee was appointed for the purpose of dealing generally with the subject of the fisheries, and I would be inclined to think that the whole report of the department ought to be referred to it. I do not know how it is with the Committee on Agriculture. Is the report of the Minister of Agriculture referred to that committee?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The position is this: When a committee is constituted, that committee can only deal with matters referred to it by the House. In the case of the Public Accounts Committee there is a reference to it of the public accounts for the year; that is the basis of its jurisdiction. In the case of the Committee on Agriculture, I understood that there was a reference of the report of the Minister of Agriculture, and that that was the basis of its jurisdiction; if it is not, I do not see where it finds any basis at all. It cannot deal with matters that are not referred to it by the House. And so the Committee on Fisheries is but a name; it has no power whatever until something has been referred to it with respect to which it can take action. I would suggest to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the whole report of the department had better be referred to the committee. It seems to me that there should be consideration also as to whether all reports of any department relative to the mines and minerals, waterways and water-powers, should not be referred to the committees dealing with those subjects, in order that they may have some basis on which they can commence their work.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say that the reason why this particular part of the report has been referred to the committee is that the other day there was a meeting of the committee, at which the consensus of opinion was that we should inquire into the subject of lobsters and oysters; and in order that the committee might have some jurisdiction over the matter, it was decided to refer to the committee that part of the report. With regard to the Committee on Agriculture, I fully agree with the hon. leader of the opposition that the proceedings of that committee must have been more or less irregular, because the committees of the House have no power to deal with anything that has not been referred to them by the House. I think that point was dealt with by the Prime Minister when the motion of my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, was discussed, and I think that principle is embodied in the resolution which is passed immediately after the committees are formed at the opening of the session.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. minister is astray, except in the case of the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. BRODEUR. In the case of the Public Accounts Committee the report of the Auditor General is referred, and that is the matter for investigation by the committee. In the case of the Department of Agriculture, I do not know exactly what has been the practice in the past, but I am under the impression, having looked into the question when it was discussed some time ago, that no formal reference has been made to that committee. However, the practice of that committee for perhaps twenty years has been to take evidence from officers of the Department of Agriculture on the administration of the department. We have a Committee on Railways and Canals, but the report of the Department of Railways and Canals has never been referred to that committee.

Mr. FOSTER. The House is constantly referring matters to the committees.

Mr. BRODEUR. We refer Bills to them.

Mr. FOSTER. Not to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I think no Bill has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what puzzles me in the discussion. The Committee on Agriculture is at work. But what is its basis? Can it take up an astronomical question and pursue that? Is the basis to be found in resolutions, or in daily or occasional references from this House?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think that most of the procedure of the Committee of Agriculture is entirely irregular, because it is not upon any reference from this House. The House has never referred the report of the Department of Railways to Committee on Railways, nor has it referred the report of the Department of Finance to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, why make the reference in this case?

Mr. BRODEUR. We desire to have these matters taken up by the Committee on Ma-

rine and Fisheries. We have some Bills now before the House dealing with the question of marine. It is natural to expect that these Bills will be referred to this committee. I repeat, the committees have no jurisdiction except upon matters formally referred to them by the House. That is the reason why we propose this resolution—because we wish to investigate in Committee on Marine and Fisheries the whole question of lobsters and oysters, and so we wish the House to refer to the committee that part of the report of the department relating to the subject, so that the committee may have authority to deal with the question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What would be the objection to referring the whole report?

Mr BRODEUR. I do not see any objection, except that it might lead to dealnig with all the matters mentioned in the report.

Mr. FOSTER. But that is what the committee is for.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) is hardly correct in what he says concerning the Committee on Agriculture. The present procedure had its origin in the work of the Committee on Colonization, appointed many years ago, to which were referred questions on agriculture, with the authority to send for persons, papers and records and to report to the House. This they did. On that basis, the committee was afterwards known as the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, and the order of reference instructs that committee to send for persons, papers and records, and to take evidence on any of the subjects in which the committee is charged with the duty of inquiry. I think the report of the Minister of Agriculture is submitted to the committee by the House. Whether rightly or wrongly, this is the procedure followed by the committee. But all the committees except the Public Accounts Committee, if I understand aright, can do the same thing. Of course, the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report are referred to that committee every year. The Committee on Agriculture, by virture of their order of reference, inquire into everything relating to the subject matter over which they have jurisdiction and report their observations to the House. I think these are nearly the words of the order of reference.

Mr. BRODEUR. Perhaps I may be permitted to read the motion to which I have referred. It is the motion usually made immediately after the committees are formed:—

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, it was resolved, That the Select Standing Committees of this House shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon; with power to send for persons, papers and records, with the exception of the Committee on Debates and that on the Library of Parliament.

That is the source of the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. That is in accordance with what I said in the first place, when I asked whether the whole report might not be referred to the committee. The committee will have control of it when it gets there, and, of course, they cannot investigate everything at once.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. They will have to take up one matter at a time. This motion is in accordance with the view expressed in the committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. All I suggest is that, instead of making it necessary to come here fifteen or twenty times with applications, it might be more expedient to refer the whole report to the committee. Of course, the committee will not embark upon any investigation if it is not desirable to do so. As a matter of organization, it would seem advisable to refer the whole report. I think the minister should take the matter into his consideration.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not done in the case of the other committees. I do not say whether it would have been advisable to adopt that plan or not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as the Committee on Agriculture is concerned, I think that, if this practice is not followed, the committee has proceeded as though that had been the case. In order to keep matters strictly regular in the future, I think this reference will have to be made, for the Committee on Agriculture is appointed under the same procedure as the others, and no special reference is made to it. It is true that, as my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has pointed out, each committee has authority to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses on oath. But that power is only ancillary to the jurisdiction of the committee, and an inquiry must be founded upon a reference to the committee of some matter by this House. It may be that the long practice of the Committee on Agriculture will be considered as authority to the committee, for it has reported for many years upon matters that do not seem to have been strictly referred to. Therefore, it may be held that a practice has grown up which will justify the committee in continuing as in the past.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Carillon and Grenville canals—completing repairs to gap in Carillon dam, $40,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. I move that that item be reduced by $25,000. The reason of that is that we are going through with the work more rapidly than we anticipated when this estimate was made. When this estimate was made I did not expect to be able to do as much work as we have done. I am asking in the supplementaries, a few days hence, for $25,000 for the year we are now in.

Motion agreed to.

Macadamizing public road along old canal, $7,500.

Mr. WRIGHT. What is the length of that road?

Mr. GRAHAM. Between a mile and a half and two miles. It runs parallel with the canal, and we are obliged to keep it up.

St. Anne's lock — renewing old wooden bridges over road slips, $2,500.

Mr. WRIGHT. Are you still making wooden bridges?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are putting in steel bridges. The work is done by our own staff.

Cornwall canal—to repair washout, $55,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the unfortunate washout that occurred last season. The work altogether will cost $162,000, and this amount will finish it. We had some expensive temporary work. The work was let by contract, except the rush part we had in order to get ready for navigation in a few weeks. A good deal of it was done by our own engineers, and by day's work. But the permanent work is done by contract.

To repair north bank between locks 18 and 19, $5,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. For a distance of some 3,000 feet the bank was not up to grade, was not properly protected, and the water is eating into the bank. We are trying to build the bank up by rip-rap; it is done by our own staff.

Galops canal — to build concrete superstructure and bridges for piers at upper entrance, $40,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. I move that that item be reduced by $20,000. We will not be able to expend more than $20,000 this year, but it will eventually cost $40,000.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. What is the necessity for these bridges? How is it they were not in the original design of the canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. In the olden time the policy was to build wooden bridges and wooden piers. Now the piers at lock 27 are decaying, and we propose to renew the bridges with concrete. It is a concrete superstructure.

Rideau canal—rebuilding bridge at locks—Jones' Falls and Washburn, $3,000; to rebuild long bridge at Kingston Mills, $7,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. The two bridges at Jones' Falls and Washburn are rotten and unsafe. They are wooden bridges, and we are rebuilding with our own staff. The bridge at Kingston Mills is 220 feet long. It is proposed to do away with the old wooden superstructure and replace it with a steel span on concrete piers.

Trent canal—improvements, $50,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for dredging improvements. I have the details here, and I will read them to the committee, so that they may understand what we want to do:

Dredging Otonabee river below Peterborough	$ 3,000
" entrance to Bobcaygeon	2,500
" entrance to Fenelon Falls lock and Cameron lake.	3,000
" Balsam lake—Lake Simcoe division	2,000
" Lindsay river	2,000
" Lakefield — Peterborough division	1,500
Cleaning drowned lands, lake Simcoe —Balsam lake division	5,000
Rip-rapping Balsam lake division	2,500
Two new dump scows	5,000
To complete new dredge	5,000
New dams on Cull river, Burnt river and Eel's creek	6,500
Landing piers	2,000
Duplicate lock gates	10,000
	$50,000

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Why do you take this vote separate from the vote for the Trent canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. These are repairs out of income, the others we were discussing come under capital account for building the Trent canal. These repairs we are doing by our regular staff on income.

Welland canal—chargeable to income—to renew entrance piers—Port Maitland, $65,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister explain this?

Mr. GRAHAM. This item is required for the purpose of renewing the west pier at Port Maitland. Last year there was an appropriation for it, but by a mistake there was a supplementary vote for the work on the east pier amounting to $22,000 which was included in the main estimates. The work is under contract, the contract having been awarded to Mr. Hogan on September 29, 1908. There were seven tenders received. The amount expended up to January is $903.25. We are practically just starting the work.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the total cost of these piers?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contract price is $60,600, approximately. It is done on schedule rates. It is expected that it will cost about $65,000.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. That will finish the whole work?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is supposed to finish the whole entrance at Port Maitland.

Mr. WRIGHT. I understand that the department have under consideration the digging of a new canal to parallel the Welland canal. Have the department come to any decision in regard to that? It seems to me that this is a lot of money to be putting into the old canal. If we are going to dig a new canal I think as little as possible ought to be spent on the old canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. This really has nothing to do with the question to which my hon. friend refers. This is in connection with the old feeder up at Port Maitland. We have always had charge of this work. We will have to do this whether we dig a new canal or not. It is really for the protection of the harbour. Similar work was done on the east side of the harbour. It has been reported for several years very strongly that in a heavy storm this work is necessary for the protection of the town.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Why should the government do this work when it is not used for the canal? The new canal gets its water directly from Lake Erie and this feeder is of no use at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is right in a way. It may be that this is a work properly for the Department of Public Works but it has always been ours, the work must be done and there seems to be no other department to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is really a harbour upon the canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is on Lake Erie at the entrance of what is known as the old feeder near the mouth of the Grand river.

Mr. WRIGHT. If this is not now used as a feeder why do you need a dock or any improvement at its mouth? It does not seem to serve any useful purpose at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have always had charge of that work.

Mr. WRIGHT. Where is the necessity for the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is strictly speaking a harbour work for Port Maitland. Personally, I think it should be carried on by the Department of Public Works, but it has been ours ever since it was the entrance to the old feeder and therefore we think that we must do it.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is Port Maitland a port of sufficient importance and possessing sufficient business to warrant the government spending this large amount of money? There is no business worth speaking about at Port Maitland.

Mr. LALOR. This happens to be in my constituency and I know something about it. I can easily understand any one not familiar with the circumstances saying that it should be abandoned and that no more money should be spent upon it. The Welland canal formerly was fed from the Grand river and this was a most useful and necessary part of the canal system. There have been very large amounts of money spent on the Welland canal and on the feeder between Dunnville, Port Maitland and Port Colborne and it is pretty hard for the government to abandon that work although the value to the country is not now so great as it formerly was. But, if anything went wrong with the feeder of the canal from Lake Erie this old feeder could be used for a certain length of time. As to Port Maitland harbour, it is the best harbour on the whole of Lake Erie. It is the safest harbour of refuge for boats coming down the lake. In case of a storm they make into Port Maitland harbour and they go on up the river and into the Welland canal feeder which affords them safe refuge. The adoption of Port Maitland as the entrance of the Welland canal has been advocated in this House by several hon. members representing my part of the country and particularly by the late Senator McCallum who was at one time a member of this House. There is not the slightest doubt that Port Maitland should be the entrance to the Welland canal and not Port Colborne. You can go on spending money on Port Colborne as long as you like. This and other governments have spent millions of dollars but you will never have a satisfactory harbour at Port Colborne. The harbour entrance to the Welland canal should be Port Maitland without the slightest doubt. You are talking about building a new canal; you can get a route by way of Port Maitland without encountering any rock whatever. You can go down eighty feet and you can build your canal with a much less expenditure of money than if you continue to spend millions of money, as you have been spending money every year, on the old Welland canal system. A proper survey for the new canal would begin with Port Maitland as the Lake Erie port and not Port Colborne.

Mr. WRIGHT. How far apart are Port Maitland and Port Colborne?

Mr. LALOR. They are about fifteen miles apart. To build the canal from Port Maitland would not lengthen it to any great extent. It would make it a little longer but there would be great compensating advantages. We can go on spending just as much money as we like and just as long as we

like, as has been done ever since the canal was first built on the present route from Port Colborne, but if we do we will never have a canal that can compete with the waterways through New York state to the sea-board. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) reminds me that even the imperial authorities have reported that Port Maitland and not Port Colborne is the proper port for Lake Erie.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that a few years ago the commissioners recommended Port Colborne, but however that may be I shall call the attention of the engineer in charge to what my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) has said. When the time comes, as I think it will come, for enlarging the Welland canal or for building a new one, whoever is Minister of Railways then will want to have the fullest information as to the best possible route.

Mr. LALOR. I appreciate the reply of the minister and all I ask is that the matter be looked into from the standpoint of what is best for the country. If that is done I have no doubt it will be the route accepted by the government.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose a change should be made what will become of the heavy expenditures we have made for a number of years past in improving Port Colborne and building large elevators. It seems to me this question should have been considered years ago and that it is too late to talk about making a change now.

Mr. GRAHAM. If we are going to undertake a very vast improvement, I suppose we may be like the railway people who, when they want to reduce grades and lessen curves, sometimes deem it wise to abandon the old route altogether notwithstanding that it may have cost millions. I do not say that the old route will be abandoned; all I say is that the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) make it necessary that the engineer should take the matter into consideration.

Mr. J. HAGGART. There is no doubt a good deal in what has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor). The imperial authorities adopted Port Maitland as the depot for armed vessels on Lake Erie. Time and again it has been advocated in this House that Port Maitland would be more advantageous than Port Colborne. It is a natural harbour and there need be no money spent on it as is the case at Port Colborne. Of course when Port Colborne was adopted as the terminus of the Welland canal it was not contemplated that that canal would ever be deepened to the extent now contemplated. They find a great deal of difficulty on the Welland canal in getting over what is called the height of land section, which is liable to sink and which requires to be excavated now and again. There is probably as great a depth there now as can be maintained. If it becomes necessary to deepen the Welland canal to 21½ feet it would be a question for the consideration of the government whether it would not be cheaper and better to adopt a new route.

Welland canal—heavy repairs, $10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister carefully compared this estimate with the pronunciamento of the Liberal candidate in Welland who set out in his pre-election address what he had done for the county of Welland, all that he had got, all that was promised, and all that he hoped to get. Has the minister carefully gone over that statement of the member for Welland and is he sure he has it all in this item?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not seen that compilation yet.

Mr. LENNOX. I can show it to you printed alongside of Mr. German's photograph.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister wish me to read him that statement to refresh his memory?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether it ought to be put on Hansard or not.

Mr. GRAHAM. You can't put the photograph on Hansard.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably the Prime Minister remembers it; I think he was there at the time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What was that?

Mr. FOSTER. That was the celebrated statement of what had been got in the shape of money by the member for Welland; all that he had been promised, and all that he hoped in the course of five years if he were given the suffrages of the independent electors to get from the government. I think he read it at the same meeting that my right hon. friend made his statement to the people.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My memory is not equal to all that.

Mr. FOSTER. Very likely the Prime Minister revised and authorized it as he did the $347,000 extra to the Civil Servants in Ottawa for the benefit of himself and his junior colleague.

Mr. J. HAGGART. We should have a statement from the government in reference to their policy on the transportation question re the Welland canal. The Prime Minister, speaking at Welland, is said to have favoured both the deepening of the Welland canal and the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. The Minister of Railways has said that he preferred deepening of the

Welland canal to the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. Then we have the authoritative statement of the Minister of Railways through the report of his department that it is necessary to deepen the Welland canal. I would be glad to have an authoritative statement of the policy the government intend to pursue in this matter.

Mr. GRAHAM. I made a statement on a similar request the other night, but I admit it was not very elaborate. I said then and I have said many times and I now repeat, that I believe Canada could compete for the carrying trade not only of our own products but of a portion of the products of the United States from the west to the sea-board, if the Welland canal were deepened or a new Welland canal were constructed giving a depth of 22 feet, probably 25 feet. I have never expressed an opinion adverse to the Georgian Bay canal scheme. There are a great many conflicting opinions concerning it, but it strikes me, from the natural contour of the country, its geographical and physical conditions that the time will come when the great carrying trade of the west will have an artery of outlet through the Georgian Bay canal. The Welland canal, of course, is of the cheaper construction and I have faith enough in Canada to believe that with the Welland canal enlarged or a new Welland canal, a great impetus will be given to our carrying trade; but that the trade of Canada will be sufficient in the years to come to require both the Georgian bay and the St Lawrence routes. For the present the policy of the government, owing to temporary conditions which exist, is to undertake no works which would demand very large expenditures of money. When conditions change, I will be prepared, if I occupy the position I do now, to take a more aggressive stand as to the water routes of Canada.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. Is it correct that the surveying party who have been examining the route for the Hudson Bay Railway have reported that the Nelson river could be made navigable up nearly to Winnipeg?

Mr. GRAHAM. I laid the report referred to on the table yesterday. Its contents would imply that the navigation of the Nelson river is perhaps more practicable than I myself have hitherto thought it was, and suggestions are made which almost stagger one, for they would lead one to believe that large ocean vessels could be brought from the Hudson bay clear through to Winnipeg. It is a large proposition, but I believe the engineer in his progress report has in one paragraph intimated that this is the case.

To renew foundations of junction locks, $8,000.

Mr. J. G. HAGGART. The foundations of the locks are leaking badly; we do this work with our own staff.

To build new steel gate-lifter, $12,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This new lifter is required to take the various gates out for repairs.

Mr. FOSTER. Where do you procure that?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a new work, we ask for tenders for it. I think Polson's got the contract for the last gate some years ago, but we ask Canadian builders for tenders and award the work to the lowest tenderer.

To renew three feeder bridges, $3,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. That work will be done by our own staff; there are three old wooden swing bridges.

Before leaving this canal, I wish to furnish some information asked for the other night. The first question was with reference to the price paid by the Cataract Power Company to the government for their water-power. The information is as follows:

	Per year.
First lease dated December 6, 1902, for 700 cubic feet per second at $30 per cubic ft.	$21,000
Supplemental agreement of March 31, 1906, provided for 300 cubic feet per second additional at $30..	9,000
Or in all per year, 1,000 cubic ft. per second..	$30,000

Mr. J. HAGGART. What is that per horse-power?

Mr. GRAHAM. My deputy informs me that it is difficult to give this information on the basis of horse-power. The company have constructed a pond and do not use the flow of water steadily. It is easier to check it by the cubic foot than by the horse-power.

Mr. J. HAGGART. With the cubic feet per second and the amount of fall the department should be able to calculate that in five minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. It will be about 30,000 horse-power, or about a dollar per horse-power.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the contract perpetual or what length of time has it to run, and must you absolutely supply the company with at least that amount of power?

Mr. GRAHAM. The lease terminates in 1923. This is the surplus water of the canal. We make the navigation paramount, as in all these contracts. We can close down their supply at any time it is necessary in the interests of navigation

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Is it true that the works of the Power Company cause such a current that it interferes seriously with the operation of the canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are informed by the engineer-in-charge that that is not the case.

Mr. WRIGHT. When was this lease entered into?

Mr. GRAHAM. In 1902.

Mr. J. HAGGART. That is a renewal of the contract.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the time they gave me, the lease will expire in 1923.

Mr. SPROULE. Was this contract let by tender or by private agreement?

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall have to look up the files of the department to find that out. The last renewal was made seven years ago, but the first contract was made many years ago. The contracts are for twenty-one year terms, renewable, and at the end of each term the rates are subject to revision. My hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) asked for certain information in regard to the cost of electric power on the Welland canal. For light and power on the canal itself, the Lincoln Electric Light and Power Company, Limited, agrees to supply electric current for the needs of the canal, dated June 27, 1903, to August 31, 1913, at $14 per horse-power per annum.

Cost of power for year 1906....	$9,826 59
Cost of power for the year ending December 31, 1907..	8,996 44
Cost of power for the year ending December, 31, 1908..	8,713 20

During the year 1907 the current was used for lighting purposes only; during the year 1908, for light and operating gate mechanism. The reduction in cost is due to improvements made by the electrical engineer of the department installing a synchronous condenser.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the department a record of all the water-powers it has leased, the dates of the contracts and the reasons for them?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think I can find that for my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. To-day a great deal of interest is taken in the conservation of water-powers, and we have along our canals a large amount of surplus power. We have gone to all the initial expense of constructing canals and making the water-powers available, and the question that occurred to me was whether we were getting our fair share out of them or not. Here is a concrete instance where you are letting thirty thousand horse-power for a dollar per horse-power, while throughout the province of Ontario this water-power ultimately sells for $25 or $30 per horse-power when converted. When you deduct the cost of the original plant for converting the power and the cost of the up-keep, you have the whole margin over that between one dollar and $25 or $30 per horse-power. The people who have contracts of that kind must be making money hand over fist. If they are, does the minister believe that the country is getting its fair share? From the canals you are getting nothing, while you have to bear the cost of capital repairs and current account repairs. Under these circumstances, what justification is there for allowing corporations or individuals to make such immense amounts of money out of the people? In old times these things were winked at, they were not thought much of; but people are getting awake nowadays. Is the department getting awake? Is it attempting to establish a proper basis for the revision when the time for revision comes? I think we ought to be alive to that sort of thing. If a man were a trustee of an estate, and were as much asleep as the department seems to be, he ought to be hauled over. It seems to me that the government is in that position with regard to the people's franchises. It would be instructive if in the book of Railway and Canal statistics you made a tabulated statement of all the water-powers which are utilized and the rates which are paid for them.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that is a good idea. As the hon. gentleman says, a few years ago the question of water-powers was not considered of as much importance as it is at the present time. But recently, just before my time, a commission was appointed to go over all the leases we have on the Welland and Lachine canals, particularly on the Lachine canal, and they brought in a report as to the proper rentals for these, and we are carrying out the recommendations of that commission as far as possible. Wherever we have had a lease that was not for a stated term, we have cancelled it, and asked the lessee for the increased rental recommended by the commission. In some cases the rentals have been doubled, in some quadrupled, in the last year and a half.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are these leases perpetually renewable?

Mr. GRAHAM. Some of the old ones are, I think; but the general form is for twenty-one years, renewable for two other terms of twenty-one years each, subject at each renewal to a revision of the rental paid.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How is the revision accomplished?

Mr. GRAHAM. By the Governor in Council. My idea would be to have it done by the Board of Railway Commissioners; I have not worked that out. But in new

leases along the Trent canal, I am wherever possible giving the board power to control the rates the leesees shall charge the public.

Mr. FOSTER. How about the rates they are to pay to the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are a variety of conditions.

Mr. CONMEE. I think that the explanation of the management of these water-powers and the value that should accrue to the government for the use of them, has been hardly fully stated. The government leases the right to take the water from the canal channel. The parties who obtain the lease, as stated by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), expend further moneys in making the development. But that is not all the expenditure, in fact it is not half. They must not only make the entrance channel, the tail-race, and all the developments necessary to put the wheels in motion, including the installation of machinery, plant, buildings and every thing necessary for such work, but they must find a market for the power. To do this, they must either establish works in the immediate vicinity of the power, or convert the power into electrical energy and transmit it to points where it can be used for commercial purposes. All this expenditure will exceed considerably that of the actual water-power development, and, I assume, would have to be considered in determining what the value of the rental will be.

Mr. FOSTER. The establishment of power at a place draws manufactures, does it not ?

Mr. CONMEE. That will depend on conditions. If there are transportation facilities, or if the point is one where raw materials can be advantageously assembled for manufacturing purposes, no doubt it has a tendency to draw manufactures. But this particular water-power is not so fortunately situated; a market has to be found thirty or forty miles distant from the point of development.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the government the power to fix the rate for the rental after twenty-one years ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the usual lease—the terms to be fixed by agreement subject to the Governor in Council.

Mr. SPROULE. The information given suggests how improvident was the contract made with Mr. M. P. Davis for the power on the Beauharnois canal. If I remember well, that was renewable for eighty-four years, and I am not very sure that provision was made for readjusting the rentals—

I do not speak positively, for it is some time since I looked into the matter. It seemed to me that there must have been either absolute carelessness of the public interest or something much worse in making this bargain, because the whole power was sold for $1,000 a year, and then the government bought back the power at $63 per horse-power. It was about the most extravagant bargain of that nature that I ever knew, and, not content with making it for twenty-one years, the government made it for eighty-four years.

There is another question that I brought up some years ago, and I would like to know if the minister has looked into it: What authority have we for taking water from streams that are under provincial control and that might be utilized by the province, running it into a canal, and selling the power so created to individuals ? We are taking over more and more of these streams. I asked this question some years ago. Has the minister had any report upon it, or any conference with the provincial representatives ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed that the Justice Department did make a report on that matter so far as the Trent navigation is concerned. So far as I know, no question has ever been raised by the provincial government. The principle is, I believe, that navigation and navigable streams come under the jurisdiction of the Dominion government.

Mr. SPROULE. These streams are not navigable.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Trent, part river and part canal, is navigable. I understand that the Ontario government turned over to the Dominion government certain wharfs and other works and property that they had in connection with this system. This was done, I think, under order in council.

Mr. SPROULE. That may apply to the Trent, but certainly not to all the streams that are feeders of the canal. It would seem to me, in view of the policy of the provincial government in the power scheme, that it would be unwise to take any other of these streams under federal control, or to make unlimited grafts on the streams of the province to build up power in the canals and then sell that power to individuals.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will find that the order in council included all the streams tributary to the system that would help in the development of navigation. The up-keep of these various works on the Trent canal was a source of expense to the provincial government, and I think they were not averse to getting rid of them. We have taken over these works and spent large sums of money

in dams and others constructions which expenditures would have had to be undertaken by the provincial government to develop the waterways. As to the question of the water-powers along the Trent, they are largely developed by the work done by the federal authority in the construction of these dams and creation of reservoirs. And the provincial government, whatever might otherwise be their claims in law, have handed over to us their rights in the present canal.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON. What does the minister consider a 'navigable stream'?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a large question, and I would refer it to my hon. friend from the Sault, who is a legal man. It is a question that might be discussed in connection with certain treaties. I would not care to express an opinion.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON. The reason I ask is because at the present time, in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, there is a very small stream known as the Veuve river, which is not navigable in the proper sense of the word, that is, no boats can go up there of any capacity at all. It is said to come within the meaning of the Act. Just now a party wants to build a small bridge over it; it seems he has got to get permission from the department to build that bridge.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course, if it be considered a navigable stream they could not construct a bridge over it except by consent and approval of the Department of Public Works. If it is navigable up to a certain distance, I suppose it is a navigable stream; but I would not like to express an opinion.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON. It is navigable for canoes, or small boats drawing three or four feet of water.

Mr. CONMEE. Certain streams have been held by our courts to be navigable. For instance, the Winnipeg river is one, though it has a great many rapids and falls. But the river is navigable in certain sections. In an action that arose, the courts held that though certain portions of the river were composed of rapids and falls, it was nevertheless a navigable stream. A question arose in connection with the diversion of certain waters in the State of Minnesota. The waterway of Birch lake is entirely within the state of Minnesota, but the waters discharge into the Rainy river, which is a boundary stream. It was held by the Waterways Commission, both by the American and Canadian sections, and confirmed by the Secretary of War at Washington, who is charged with navigable waters in the United States, that their ruling was correct, that it was a navigable water, though navigable only for floating timber, ties or logs. Certain portions of it, such as Maline lake, Basswood and Birch lakes, are swells of the river, so to speak, though the water channel is comparatively shallow outside the lakes. There were some tugs on these lakes. Any stream of that character, it would appear from these decisions, would be regarded, and perhaps properly, as a navigable water, although not entirely navigable in a state of nature.

Remuneration to A. Brunet, government director, Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know what Mr. Brunet's duties are.

Mr. GRAHAM. As I understand, he has to represent the government on this board

Mr. FOSTER. That is so many English words, but what does he do?

Mr. GRAHAM. He has a place on the board, as any other man; he has a voice, and attends meetings. I asked him this year to make me a report concerning his work. He has given me such a report, and I will be glad to lay it on the table.

Mr. FOSTER. How long has he been commissioner?

Mr. GRAHAM. He was appointed in July, 1906.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the government given him any instructions at all as to what he has to do? Is he a restraining force, and in what way? Does he follow his own sweet will and do as he likes, or has he any instructions given him by the government, or does he go whichever way the tide runs, or does he simply look after his salary? All these are pertinent inquiries when a man is getting $2,000 a year of the people's money. He may earn it, he may earn a good deal more; but we want to know what the man is doing.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will remember that last year when this item was up some questions were asked, and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) made some extended remarks, very eulogistic, of Mr. Brunet. I had several conversations with him during the past year. I really had not met him last year. I discussed with him unofficially his duties on the board at various meetings, and asked him to give us a report as to his work on that board, and he did so. I have that report, and I will lay it on the table early next week.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Is he still in the employ of the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, in this capacity, a director of the Grand Trunk Pacific representing the government.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. When will it end?

Mr. GRAHAM. I suppose the government will be represented by some person on that board until the Grand Trunk Pacific is completed. I do not know whether his functions extend to the operation or not.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. This gentleman was on that board as director or commissioner. Is this the commissioner who resigned?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the same gentleman that resigned from the Transcontinental Commission. Section 43 of the National Transcontinental Act provides that during the term of said lease, and so long as the government remains liable for any portion of the bonds issued, the government shall have the right to appoint one director, and shall pay him a salary not to exceed $2,000 per annum. That is the clause of the Act by which he was appointed.

Mr. FOSTER. The Act is plain enough. It would seem as though the government felt that when it was guaranteeing the bonds it ought to have a man on the spot. I do not know why that should have been done because I think in the final analysis the whole thing comes before the Finance Minister, who has got to be satisfied that there is sufficient ground for issuing bonds, and afterwards for payment over of the proceeds of those bonds. Has Mr. Brunet anything to do with that? Is he the government director who keeps the Finance Minister informed?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think not. His report is made to the Department of Railways and Canals. The Auditing Department audits the entire expenditure of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. We had a return brought down showing that the whole amount of the government guarantee for the construction of the work from Winnipeg to Edmonton had been paid out to the Grand Trunk Pacific although the road has not been accepted and passed by the government. I suppose Mr. Brunet is looking after that.

Mr. GRAHAM. That matter will come up a little later in the discussion upon the Transcontinental Railway. I am not prepared to go into it just now. Our department audits all these accounts and I think that on our certificate the money is paid.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand it, Mr. Brunet has no instructions from the government or the Minister of Railways and Canals as to what particular stand he is to take or what particular function he is to perform on the board of directors. None such have been issued to him?

Mr. GRAHAM. I understand not.

Mr. J. G. HAGGART.

Mr. FOSTER. It would seem, as he had been appointed by the government and for prudential reasons, that there should be an understanding as to what line he is to take on the board of directors. He would not seem to be of any use there at all, unless he were assigned to some particular oversight or duty. How often do these directors meet?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think they meet on the second Tuesday in the month.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. Brunet's time all devoted to that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think not.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. You have laid his report on the table, have you?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I will lay it on the table the first of the week.

Maintenance and operation of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, $107,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How is that distributed?

Mr. GRAHAM. Here are the items which are not covered by statute, the items covered by statute being the salaries:

Chief engineer, 2 assistants, electrician and clerk	$ 15,000
Traffic officer and staff	16,000
Law clerk	2,500
Registrar and accountant	2,500
Inspectors and staff	12,000
Assistant to secretary and staff	7,000
Private secretary to chief commissioner	1,600
Stenographers	3,400
Messengers	2,500
Official reporting	9,000
Official car	3,000
Printing	2,000
Stationery	5,000
Board's and staff's travelling expenses	12,000
Telephone company, telegrams, postage	1,500
Outside service	1,800
Contingencies	10,200
	$107,000

Then there are authorized by statute salaries as follows:

Chief commissioner, Hon. J. P. Mabee.	$10,000
Assistant chief commissioner, D'Arcy Scott	9,000
Commissioner, Hon. M. E. Bernier	8,000
Commissioner, James Mills	8,000
Commissioner, S. McLean	8,000
Commissioner (vacant)	8,000
Secretary, A. D. Cartwright	3,500
	$54,500

That makes $54,500, and the total vote is $55,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How many commissioners are there now ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Five and one vacancy.

Mr. MARSHALL. How many inspectors?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will get that for the hon. gentleman in a minute.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this commission find plenty of work to do ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. It is over burdened with work ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not say that it is overburdened. I would like to say a word as to the selection of Mr. Justice Mabee as the head of the commission. I think the public will bear me out in saying that this is as happy a selection as has been made in several years.

Mr. FOSTER. You do not limit that to the selections made by this government ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like to extend to all governments the same courtesy. He is a man who is fitted for the position possibly better than any other who could have been chosen.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, let us hear the minister's opinion of the next one ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Of the whole board ?

Mr. FOSTER. No, of the next one.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am speaking of the chairman. I think they are all efficient. The board is doing excellent work. One portion is in the west and the other is in the city of Ottawa. The decisions during the past year have been democratic, to say the least, but they have been approved by the public very largely. I expect the chief commissioner here in a few days to discuss with him the filling of the vacancy.

Mr. FOSTER. How long has that position been vacant ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Since the death of Mr. Greenway.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the work of this commission is always ahead of it ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, the commissioners have all plenty to do, but the chief commissioner is a man who cleans up his work with a rapidity unknown to many people. He is an inveterate worker and he often decides cases that under other circumstances it might take months to dispose of. He decides them before the parties have left the room. I expect him in the city in a few days, and I want to consult him with regard to the new appointment to be made. If the vacancy is to be filled my own opinion is that it should be filled by a competent western man who knows the conditions there, and, the chief commissioner, having been through the west and having dealt with many cases there, may possibly have in his mind some one who will fit into the niche.

Mr. FOSTER. I judge that the minister will depend mainly on the recommendation of the chief commissioner as to who shall fill the vacancy.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not like to nominate a man to the commission who would not be satisfactory to the chairman. I would feel that I ought to consult with him in a matter of that kind. He will have some information as to western conditions, and I will postpone making the appointment until I consult with him.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister ever thought of adopting the principle, which was adopted by the old Romans in filling a vacancy, of allowing the members of the commission at the time to select the man to fill a vacancy that happened by death or otherwise?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am afraid that might perhaps be something like the system followed in selecting municipal councillors under which the man having the next highest vote may get the situation. We want some one who will be worthy of a seat on the board. My hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) asked me a question as to the number of inspectors. There is an inspector and three assistant inspectors of accidents and an inspector of equipment.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am told that the commissioners are handicapped by having only one special car. The effect of what I am saying is to advise the government to provide such facilities as are necessary to the proper carrying on of the business of the board. I am told that when some of the commissioners were going through Ontario lately they were handicapped by not having a car in which to carry their equipment, their clerks, stenographers and so on, as the other branch of the board were out in the west and they had the only official car belonging by the commission to carry their equipment and staff. They have to have engineers, stenographers and other officials to help them, and one can readily understand that when they are travelling they can save a lot of time if they have their own car and are able to do work, which they cannot do if they have to travel in the ordinary trains and in the ordinary way. I think it would be a saving to the country if this official car were supplied, and it is perhaps right that I on this side of the House should say that it would be a reasonable expenditure in the interest of the speedy transaction of the public business. If they had this car they could carry their officials and have the work done while they were travelling which would be a very good thing for the country. Does the min-

ister contemplate making provision for a car for the other branch of the commission? The question as to whether another official car should be provided for them is worthy of consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was going to say I am surprised, but I shall not, because my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) has good sense, however, it amuses me a little to hear some person suggesting that we should have any more official cars.

Mr. LANCASTER. But this is in the interest of the public service.

Mr. SPROULE. You have an army of them now.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was criticised pretty strongly last year for giving the commission a car at all, but I may say that I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) that it would save a great deal of time and the commissioners would be able to do more work if they had a car on which the staff could be accommodated when travelling. However, it did not suggest itself to me and they themselves have not asked for it in their estimates this year. When the work increases it will be worthy of serious consideration that they should be fully equipped so that they can do their work with the least possible loss of time.

Mr. LANCASTER. We have the chief commissioner presiding over a branch of the board which is in the west with an official car and we have a co-ordinate branch presided over by the assistant chief commissioner which has not an official car when it is travelling on the public business. It seems to me it is consistent that if you give a car to one branch of the commission you should give a car to the other. I think it is a reasonable proposition and that the furnishing of this facility will enable the work to be done more expeditiously and the public served better.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose no haulage is charged for the Railway Commission car?

Mr. LANCASTER. The railways have to haul it free.

Mr. FOSTER. On what principle are the officials of the Railway Commission appointed?

Mr. GRAHAM. The secretary is appointed by the Governor in Council direct, and the other officials upon the recommendation of the chairman—perhaps I should say on the recommendation of the board—approved by the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it on the request of the board that appointments are made?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes; they make a recommendation that such assistance is necessary.

Mr. LANCASTER.

Mr. FOSTER. As a matter of fact their recommendation is carried out?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, I think it has never been varied that I know of.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the vacancy on the board; I have been informed that this is a hard work commission and that its work is ahead of it. There does not seem to have been any excuse given for so long delay in filling the vacancy on the board. If so many commissioners are necessary to do the work they should all be there. Why this interregnum; is there any trouble within the Cabinet itself?

Mr. GRAHAM. If there were a man to be appointed from this vicinity I think I have my eyes on the one I want. We did not make the appointment right away after the death of Mr. Greenway, and some few months elapsed during which we were engaged in other matters and finding recently that the chief commissioner was going to the west himself I suggested we should not make any appointment until at least he would come back and give us his views. As I have said, if the selection were to be made from Ontario where I know most of the men, I would not have hesitated so long, but I want to consult the chief commissioner before the appointment is made and that is my reason for waiting.

Inspection—Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, $28,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We guarantee a certain percentage of the cost of the mountain section and of the prairie section, and Mr. Collingwood Schreiber has a staff under him all the time inspecting this work.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Have you a report from Mr. Schreiber?

Mr. GRAHAM. His report was placed on the table. In a few days I will include his interim report in the statement I shall make to the House before we take up the large item for the Transcontinental railway.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I would like to have that report before you make your statement.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will get a copy.

Mr. FOSTER. Months ago a statement was made that about 600 miles of the Grand Trunk Pacific west of Winnipeg had been finished and was in operation. Does that mean that the Grand Trunk Pacific is now in full possession of that 600 miles and is operating it?

Mr. GRAHAM. I believe it is still running as a construction road; we have not taken it over yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it being operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific or by the contractors?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think probably there is an arrangement between the company and the contractors.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of a service is being given on it?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed there has been a time table issued for this 660 miles but I have not seen it.

Mr. J. HAGGART. How is it that you have paid the whole amount of the government guarantee if you have not taken over the road?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have not done that.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Your report placed on the table says so.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think my hon. friend will find that is an error.

Mr. SPROULE. Has not that portion of the road been carrying grain during the winter? I saw a report that they were prepared to handle grain and freight.

Mr. GRAHAM. They have been carrying grain as all these roads carry anything that is given them. They have also carried passengers. But they are not under our control or that of the Railway Commission. There is a little work, ballasting, etc., yet to be done before it is taken over. In the meantime they are accommodating the public by carrying freight and passengers.

Mr. SPROULE. Who authorized any tariff being put in operation?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am told the Board of Railway Commissioners have given them permissive authority to run as they are now doing, and has approved of a certain tariff they are charging the people.

Mr. SPROULE. Have they been carrying much grain?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed they have carried quite a large quantity, but I have only newspaper information, we have no report.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The minister says the full amount has not been paid out on the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to Edmonton? Who pays them for what they do? There is an issue of a certified quantity of stock or securities to some one and the money received from that I think goes into the treasury, and is moneyed out in some way to the railway as they earn it. Is that done by the railway or the Finance Department?

Mr. GRAHAM. On a certificate from my department the Finance Department releases a certain amount of money on this guarantee. I believe that about $10,000,000 has been released on the prairie section, the 660 miles.

Mr. J. HAGGART. How much more is there still to release?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot tell that offhand. That is more a question for the Finance Department than for mine.

Mr. SPROULE. Do the inspectors have to pass upon that portion of the road to be built by the government or only that portion to be built by the Grand Trunk Pacific themselves ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That applies only to the western division, the Grand Trunk Pacific, to see that they live up to their contract with us because we guarantee a certain amount of bonds.

Mr. SPROULE. On the result of that inspection and the reports I presume you pay out your money?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

To provide for expenses, preparing plans for the reconstruction of the Quebec bridge, $150,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. As the committee are aware we selected three of the most prominent engineers we could find in the world to take charge of this work. They were appointed by order in council and given authority not only to prepare adequate plans but to examine all former plans and to pronounce upon the possibility or advisability of using any material already prepared under former plans. After they make their own plans they are to be responsible for the construction of a bridge upon those plans that will stand up. Mr. H. E. Vautelet is chief engineer and chairman of the board. He receives $1,000 a month. I asked Sir Thomas Shaughnessy as to his ability and Sir Thomas told me that he believed Mr. Vautelet had the ability and if he were building the bridge he would feel safe in giving to Mr. Vautelet the entire work that we are giving to these three engineers, he had such confidence in his ability.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Is he a Canadian?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that he was originally from France, but he is now a naturalized citizen of Canada. He was educated in France, and is a very prominent engineer. With the Canadian Pacific Railway he has done splendidly.

Mr. FOSTER. Is all his time devoted to this work?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, since he was engaged. Mr. Maurice Fitzmaurice, C.M.G., is the chief engineer of the London County Council. He is the English representative on this board. We pay him $1,000 a month.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he devote all his time to this?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, not all his time.

Mr. LANCASTER. How many months is this supposed to spread over?

Mr. GRAHAM. The present idea is that after the plans are completed we will probably retain only Mr. Vautelet at full salary, but the preparation of these plans will take a year at least. For consultation purposes after the plans are completed the arrangement is to retain Mr. Fitzmaurice and Mr. Modjeski at half the salary they now receive. Mr. Mojeski is the American member on the board. He receives the same salary on the same terms.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he give all his time to the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, he is in the same position as Mr. Fitzmaurice. Mr. Modjeski has been here a great deal. These men are really to my mind making this a question of reputation as much as of salary. They are taking an interest in their work that is really gratifying to the department and the government and they have no doubt but they will make it a success, although it will take some time. We want them to be successful in the building of the bridge even if it takes a little longer and costs more.

Mr. LANCASTER. Should not their reputations have been made before they got that remuneration?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the largest undertaking of the kind that has been attempted, and to be connected with the successful construction of a bridge of this size means a great deal even to an engineer of eminence. They have a staff of 16.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they employees of any of the departments here?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, and the commissioners are not hampered in the least in the employment of their staff. I laid down this principle to them when we engaged them: you are a board and I shall not even recommend a man to you, I want you on your own responsibility, if you need assistants, to select men irrespective of who they are or where they are, or anything except their ability, as we hold you responsible for everything. The staff are appointed by order in council on the recommendation of this board. We do not interfere with them.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister please give their salaries?

Mr. GRAHAM. The staff is as follows:

	Per month.
Joseph Mayer, principal assistant.. ..	$500 00
John D. Wilkins, asst. engineer, draughting room..	333 33
Geo. F. Porter, chief draughtsman.. ..	250 00
A. P. S. Glasco, asst. calculator and draughtsman..	150 00
Hans Grether, calculator..	150 00
A. J. Mayers, asst. calculator..	$150 00
Paul Guillimard, draughtsman	125 00
Ove Hein, draughtsman..	100 00
J. A. Brunet, clerk..	75 00
P. E. Coté, stenographer..	75 00
Olaf Evanson, asst. calculator..	75 00
H. E. Bates, tracer..	75 00
T. P. Borden, asst. engineer and secretary..	225 00

That is the position as I left it. If we were allowed any interference I would ask for some explanation; but these men take the responsibility of saying that they are needed and that they are all technical men. My chief engineer says that for designing and carrying on the tests and experiments for this work it is a small staff.

Mr. FOSTER. Is their responsibility measured by a guarantee company or not?

Mr. GRAHAM. Their responsibility is not a financial one, of course, but a professional responsibility, and from what I hear, I think we have got three of the best men in the world.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the minister does not expect to have this matter in a position to be really considered by council for a year or two?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am told that they hope to have the plans ready next autumn. For the real construction work of the bridge there cannot be a vote asked for until next session. The present vote is to cover all their other expenses.

Mr. SAM SHARPE. Have any overtures been made by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company with regard to the building of this bridge

Mr. GRAHAM. None whatever.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Have any been made to the company?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does not the minister think that he would get these plans at an earlier date if he paid these men a good honorarium or fee instead of by the month?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. The terms have to be acceptable to them, or we could not get their services. In view of past experience, I want to be careful to give the men whom we have practically selected their own way as far as the preparation of the plans is concerned. They are proceeding with all possible speed; I do not think they are wasting a moment. They are proceeding to make their tests and experiments separately, and when they get together, they will compare them and decide on the plans, and I think the country may feel confident that it will be secure.

Mr. HAGGART. Next year the rails will be laid on the Grand Trunk Pacific from

Levis to Moncton. How is the minister going to utilize that part of the railway in view of the fact that the bridge will not be completed for seven or eight years? Does he intend to use ferry boats?

Mr. GRAHAM. That matter has been taken up with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company within the last few weeks, and we are considering what ought to be done. I am not prepared to give any further information at present.

Mr. CROSBY. The people of the maritime provinces are much interested in this work, and I wish to ask the minister if it would not be possible to have these plans completed earlier.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was told that they could not be hurried, and that it would not be safe to hurry them. I feel like keeping my hands off these men. I simply told them that I wanted the plans as soon as they could be given.

Mr. HUGHES. Is there a Canadian engineer in the lot?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Vautelet is a Canadian.

Mr. HUGHES. Is he an experienced engineer?

Mr. GRAHAM. I believe one of the best in the world, if not the best.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not understand how paying these gentlemen a large sum per month is going to hurry up these plans. I cannot help thinking that if they were paid a certain sum for the plans, they would complete them more quickly, as they would have an incentive to hurry them up.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I believe that the way the minister has taken is the proper way. He wants the best men available, and in order to get them he must pay them as they wish to be paid. I believe that is the proper and businesslike way of dealing with them.

Mr. HUGHES. Were any of these engineers pretty well paid?

Mr. GRAHAM. The pay will not make a bad engineer a good one, if it is a question of pay.

Mr. HUGHES. Were not the last engineers any good?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not saying anything about that. Our bridge is in the river; something was wrong, but I am not saying who was wrong. The main thing now is to get a bridge. After a great deal of care, I have got the three men who I believe are the most competent men in the world.

Mr. HUGHES. Were any of these men on the Forth bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Maurice Fitzmaurice was assistant on the Forth bridge.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any investigation been made as to whether the material that lies in the river is utilizable in any way?

Mr. GRAHAM. The engineers have decided that they cannot use any part of the material prepared for the former bridge.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any use that can be made of it?

Mr. GRAHAM. Nothing but scrap.

Mr. FOSTER. Has there been any consideration of the idea of making a tubular construction through the water near the surface?

Mr. GRAHAM. The water at that point is about two hundred feet deep. I saw something of that suggestion in the newspapers, but I would think it would be utterly impracticable. The engineers think so. The current is very rapid there.

Miscellaneous works not provided for, $5,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a vote that is asked for every year. Sometimes some of the money is used, and sometimes none of it is used. For the current year, we did not use any of it.

Mr. FOSTER. You never use it on works.

Mr. GRAHAM. On faith, perhaps.

Mr. WRIGHT. Why is this money asked for when you have not spent that already voted?

Mr. GRAHAM. The vote lapses at the end of the year.

Mr. WRIGHT. Then, this should appear as a re-vote.

Mr. GRAHAM. We could hardly enter it that way. Suppose that, after these estimates were made up, we used some of this year's appropriation. We cannot tell in advance how much of the money will be spent.

Arbitration and awards, $4,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to provide for law costs in connection with arbitrations. We have not spent any of this money for the current year.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the nature of these arbitrations?

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, we had an arbitration last year on the claim of a contractor, but, in that case, we made the contractor pay all the costs. In such cases we might have to pay an arbitrator.

Mr. LANCASTER. These are not land owners' arbitrations?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. FOSTER. There was an arbitration between the government on behalf of the Intercolonial with the Grand Trunk in reference to matters in and around Montreal, and in connection with the lease made some years ago. Has that ever been finished ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Why has this dragged along ? You have arbitrators appointed, have you not ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine that, if the late Judge Killam had lived, he probably would have had the matter cleared up by this time. We shall have to appoint another arbitrator to take his place.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there more than one arbitrator ?

Mr. GRAHAM. One for each side, and a third.

Surveys and inspections—canals, $3,000.
" " —railways, $28,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are constantly making surveys along our canals in order to exactly locate our own properties, when we wish to make improvements and that sort of thing. The inspection of railways is largely in connection with lines to which we grant subsidies. Before the payment of the subsidy there must be a certificate that the line has been constructed according to the terms of the subsidy contract. Up to January 31, 1909, the expenditure under this head for the current year was $15,809.04.

Costs of litigation in connection with railways and canals, $6,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of this vote has been spent for the current year ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Up to January 31, last, $2,733.67.

Mr. FOSTER. One large item of last year's expense under this head is noted in the Auditor General's Report as follows :

Quebec Southern Railway—Perron, J. L. & A. Geoffrion, legal services re Beique, $1,684.78.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed that that road was in litigation, that it owed us a certain amount, and that we interposed—if that is the legal term—to protect our own interest.

Mr. FOSTER. Did you get the money they owed ?

Mr. GRAHAM. A portion of it, not all.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you still carrying on the litigation ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think it is still before the court. I know of a bank which was interested in the suit, and, unless I am mistaken, the question is now before the Supreme Court.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this Mr. Perron the same who was engaged in the Cassels' Commission ? And is J. L. and A. Geoffrion the name of the firm ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think so. There is only one lawyer of that name known to me.

To pay expenses in connection with cases before the Railway Commission, $10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How does that come up ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The case we had last year was this: There was a provision in the Lord's Day Act which implied that the Railway Department was interested to the extent that it ought to be represented in any case under that Act before the Railway Commission. That view was pressed very strongly on the department, and after consulting with the Department of Justice, it seemed to me that, to carry out the intentions of the Act, we would have to appear to see that the interest of the public at large was protected. We were not there to advocate the Lord's Day side of the question or to combat it, but as being interested in transportation, to see that the public interest was protected.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was your representative ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. W. Buell, of Buell and Botsford. That cost some thing over $220. He was engaged some time before that in connection with the investigation of the express companies' charges, and that is how we came to engage him in this other work. In connection with the express case, he was paid $867.74 up to last December. That was all the expenditure we had out of this item last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you ask for so much ?

Mr. GRAHAM. My deputy says that the opinion has been expressed in the House at times that we ought to be prepared to appear before the Railway Commission.

Mr. LANCASTER. On behalf of whom?

Mr. GRAHAM. On behalf of the public.

Mr. LANCASTER. It would be well if the shippers by these express companies knew that, because they are employing counsel, in these cases.

Mr. GRAHAM. We do not take the part of any particular man, we do not go there as an applicant.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does this man appear in the interest of the shippers? We see that the questions that arise before the commission are generally questions of

shippers against railways. If this gentleman was appearing in the interest of the shippers and arguing against the railways, I would not object, but if he is not appearing in that capacity, I think it is a waste of public money. The shippers have always to employ counsel to contend with the most eminent counsel the railways can procure, and to argue before the commissioners for the rights of the shippers. If this is going to develop into the government paying for counsel in the interest of the shippers as against the railways, of the people as distinguished from the corporations, then I would be in favour of it. But I am pointing out that the public does not so understand it. It seems as if the people were paying out of their own pockets to the shippers to get protection before the commission, and at the same time paying some other counsel to go there who may not be directly looking after their interest.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Why not provide counsel as part of the machinery of the commission on behalf of the public, something in the nature of a Crown Attorney to look after the public interest? As I understand the purpose of the Railway Commission, it is to protect the interests and adjust the grievances of the public as between the railways on the one hand, and individuals, municipalities and the public generally on the other. Now, why not make trained counsel part of the machinery of the Railway Commission, and pay him a substantial salary, to take up the people's end of the disputes? It would save expense to the country, because the commission would not have to lose so much time in listening to inexperienced solicitors, the cases would be better presented by trained council on behalf of the public. I think this item should not be allowed to go through until the minister has considered that question.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have never gone so far as to employ counsel for diversified individual interests. The government cannot take the position of appearing before the commission by counsel as against the railway companies.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then why should this man appear at all?

Mr. GRAHAM. This man appeared, not for the Lord's Day Alliance or against the Lord's Day Alliance. This is our own Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman said that the same gentleman, before that, had been employed in regard to express rates. I cannot understand why, if he was not there in the interest of the people against the railways.

Mr. GRAHAM. He was there assisting the commission in investigating the conditions and the rates of the express companies. He was not there as soliictor before the Board of Railway Commissioners, combatting the express companies.

Mr. LANCASTER. But he was appointed and paid by the government. Was he not doing that in the interest of the people?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend does not draw the distinction. As to the matter which the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) has mentioned, I have discussed with the chairman of the commission the advisability of having standing counsel. But we have already given protection to the people by appointing as chairman of the board an ex-judge, and his assistant is a lawyer as well. For my part, I want to keep this board from becoming a real court; I want to keep it as a body before whom I may go myself without any lawyer, and say to the chairman, This is my case, I want a judgment upon it. If we were to engage counsel to appear against the counsel of the railways, then we would simply have to sit back and listen to them as we do in any court.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CANADIAN, LIVERPOOL AND WESTERN RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 44) to incorporate the Canadian, Liverpool and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

On section 2:

Mr. S. SHARPE. Mr. Chairman, as a young member I listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion on this Bill when it was before the Railway Committee and also to the discussions that have taken place in this House. It involves important interests and very contentious matters. The interests of the province as distinguished from the interests, powers and rights of the Dominion are certainly very important. My short experience in this House has shown me that promoters of Bills frequently insert two objects; one is an important object, it is the main object and it is properly within the purview of the province and then, they insert a minor or subsidiary object that is properly within the jurisdiction of the Dominion. The whole purpose and intent of doing that is to oust the jurisdiction of the various provinces. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), when this Bill was being discussed in the Railway Committee, stated that one reason why he wanted the charter granted by this parliament was because the rates of this company could be regulated by the Railway Commission, practically ignoring the fact that the provinces have the right to regu-

late a railway company having a provincial charter and practically ignoring the fact that most of the provinces have machinery for the regulation of railway companies incorporated by themselves. I do not know if the province of Quebec has a railway commission, but it has a tribunal that regulates railway companies analogous to the commission appointed by the Dominion government. Consequently, the reason which was given by the hon. member for Westmoreland, why a Dominion charter should be granted to this company, was certainly not a strong one, because, if it were only to give the Railway Commission of the Dominion jurisdiction to regulate its rates, that is not a sufficient reason why it should come to this House for its charter.

The question of provincial rights has been raised many times during this session. The absurd lengths to which this House has gone in declaring railways to be for the general advantage of Canada is instanced by the fact that in the county of Ontario it has declared an electric railway, only two miles in length, running from Oshawa to the lake shore, to connect the town with the steam railway company's road, to be for the general advantage of Canada. That shows to us the absurd lengths to which this House has gone in declaring railways that are purely provincial to be for the general advantage of Canada.

I think it is only right that great deference should be paid to the representations made by the representatives of the province of Quebec. Before the Railway Committee a representative from the province of Quebec appeared and made strong representations that the Dominion should not grant this charter. I think this House should pay great deference to those representations and as a young member of the House I was struck very much by the spectacle of most of the hon. gentlemen representing Quebec constituencies ignoring the representations of the Quebec representative and voting in favour of granting the charter. My own opinion is that when a province protests great deference should be paid to that protest and when there is a contention between the Dominion and the province with reference to their respective jurisdictions, that a reference should be made of the Bill to the law department of the government for an opinion. I think that what the House should do with a contentious Bill of this nature is to refer it to the law department in order to get an opinion as to whether the province has sufficient powers to grant this company a charter. Wherever a company can have its rights and privileges granted by a provincial charter we should not encroach upon the jurisdiction of the provinces and grant Dominion charters. One argument alone is sufficient 'to show' the wisdom of adopting that course and that is that the provincial control is closer, more intense, and would tend to a cessation of the friction that exists between the province and the Dominion. Under these circumstances, while I am not speaking as to the merits of the Bill or as to whether it should receive a provincial or Dominion charter, I say that where there is contention, and there certainly is contention in reference to this Bill, it should be referred to the law department for an opinion as to whether the power of the province is sufficient to grant a charter adequate to the purposes of this company. If the province has sufficient power to grant all necessary rights and privileges to this company then the law department's opinion should prevail and we should refuse to grant that charter and let them go to the province and get the rights that they desire.

Mr. E. ROY. I will not dispute the reasons that have been given by the hon. member, but when we look at the constitution I think there is no question but that we have jurisdiction to deal with this Bill. I am for provincial rights, but when I look at section 91 of the British North America Act I see that the powers of this parliament 'extend to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated.' When we come to section 92 we see that it says:

> In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated, that is to say:

Then follows the enumeration. By paragraph 10 we see that there is included in this list,

> Local works and undertakings, other than such as are of the following classes,—
> (a) Lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs, and other works and undertakings connecting the province with any other or others of the provinces, or extending beyond the limits of the province.

Those are excepted. Then we come to paragraph (c):

> Such works as, although wholly situate within the province, are before or after their execution declared by the parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more of the provinces.

That is to say that the parliament of Canada has the right to declare immediately that the works to be undertaken under this Bill are for the general advantage of Canada. Therefore, I think we have the jurisdiction. Whether the work to be done under this Bill is for the general advantage of Canada is another question. The argument has been presented before the

Railway Committee that clause 10, to give to the company the right to construct, acquire and navigate steam and other vessels, docks, wharfs, &c., is for the general advantage of Canada. We must not lose sight of the fact that the St. Lawrence river runs through the province of Quebec and that there are many good harbours on that river awaiting development to become the seaports of the future. Every hon. gentleman who has looked at the map in the railway committee room knows that this railway starts at a point on the Grand Trunk Pacific and goes to a point near Tadousac, which, without the least doubt will sooner or later become a winter seaport. It is therefore undoubtedly for the general advantage of Canada to have these seaports on the St. Lawrence developed into ocean-going ports whence the products of Canada may be sent to the markets of Europe. It is quite plain that the intention of this company is to develop seaports on the St. Lawrence, and as the parliament of Canada has power under section 92 of the British North America Act to declare such a work for the general advantage of Canada I do not see how it becomes necessary to refer this Bill to the Department of Justice to know whether or not we have such jurisdiction.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. It was not my contention that this Bill should be referred to the law department to ascertain whether this parliament had power to grant the necessary incorporation, but on the contrary to ascertain whether the province has that power, and if it properly comes within the purview of the province this charter should not be granted here.

Mr. ERNEST ROY. It is my opinion that the province of Quebec has jurisdiction in the matter. I do not approve of the Bill as it is drafted at present, but I do certainly say that this parliament has jurisdiction also.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. ERNEST ROY. And the province of Quebec also has jurisdiction.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Then let them get a charter from the province.

Mr. GIRARD. With the consent of the committee I will ask that the Quebec and Montmorency Railway which runs from Quebec to Ste. Anne de Baupré be added to this clause. I received a petition to that effect to-day.

Mr. GRAHAM. That gives power to amalgamate with the Quebec and Montmorency railway?

Mr. GIRARD. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no objection to that.

Mr. LENNOX. It seems to me that is rather an important amendment to offer here without consideration.

Mr. W. B. NANTEL (Terrebonne). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I move in amendment to add the following clause :

14. The company will be obliged to print its bills of lading in the two languages, English and French.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment has reference to the printing of the Bills of lading and time tables in the two languages. I am afraid the importance of the amendment would make it impossible to deal with it without notice.

Mr. MONK. The amendment is in order, is it not ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Amendments of importance on the third reading of a private Bill must have notice.

Mr. J. GIRARD (Chicoutimi and Saguenay). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment if the House wishes to adopt it. I must say that this is already done on all railways, such as the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern, the Lake St. John Railway and others.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) Then, let us have it on the statute.

Mr. MONK. The amendment does not affect the substance of the Bill, the route, the capital or anything of that kind. What is the rule of the House relating to it ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Rule 111 :

No important amendment may be proposed to any private Bill in the Committee of the Whole House or at the third reading of the Bill unless one day's notice of the same has been given.

Mr. MONK. I would submit that this is not an amendment such as is contemplated by the rule you have just quoted. It does not alter in any respect the powers of the company or the route or any of the essentials of the law incorporating the company. It merely places on the company the obligation to conform to the needs of the company, inasmuch as the road is intended to be operated entirely in a district where they do not understand the English language.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Would not the company do that any way ?

Mr. MONK. I understand the promoter has no objection to the amendment. If in your judgment you consider it of sufficient importance to require notice I would ask to have the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. GIRARD. (Translation.) I have no objection to the amendment and the Min-

ister of Railways says that he does not object either, provided it is not contrary to the rules of the House.

Mr. LENNOX. I would support the suggestion that the committee rise and report progress. A good many members would regard it as an important amendment and it could stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the amendment proposed is of so much importance that I would not be justified in accepting it without notice. It will not interfere with the progress of the Bill to have it stand over.

Progress reported.

TORONTO, NIAGARA AND WESTERN RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 42) respecting the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

On section 1,

Mr. LENNOX. I wish for a minute or two to urge again the unwisdom of this kind of legislation. This is one of several Bills we have had before us this session with respect to companies which have allowed the time fixed in their Bills for the expenditure of a certain proportion of their capital to elapse. These companies have come here and have secured better terms than they got on the last renewal. I do not think this point was brought to the attention of the Railway Committee when the Bill was before them. We renewed this charter in 1906 and it is to be noted that when we renewed it the last time we inserted the ordinary clause that the company should within two years after renewal expend fifteen per cent of the capital stock and complete the undertaking within five years after the date of the renewal. If the minister will really consider this matter he will see that we are going very far wrong in these renewals. When we passed this Act on July 13, 1906, we provided that the company should within two years after the passing of the Act commence the construction of the railways it had been authorized to construct and expend fifteen per cent of the amount of the capital stock thereon, and should within three years thereafter, complete the undertaking. They have not done anything. Our condition two years ago was fifteen per cent or you cannot have a renewal. Nothing has been done since and they come to us and to-day, and without any explanaion or any reason, we reverse the policy of two years ago and say that they can go on and construct without any condition as to the fifteen per cent. That is the first point I want to impress on the minister. They are given five years for completion, and in that five years were not required to turn a sod. Two years ago we said that fifteen per cent had to be expended within two years; they have done nothing since; and now they come and ask us to relieve them from that obligation. The objections I have to this Bill are twofold. The first is that we impose no necessity on this company to do anything whatever for five years.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The railway must be completed within five years.

Mr. LENNOX. But we do not know whether they will complete it or not. We make no provision for beginning the work, and whereas under the terms of two years ago they would have to expend 85 per cent within the next three years, we say by this Bill that they need not do a tap for five years. I submit that the only sound principle on which we can go in renewing these charters is this, that whenever a company calls for a renewal, we will give it five years within which to complete the work, and will require it within the first two of those years to expend at least 15 per cent. We would be renewing the charter on as good terms as we gave it before. We say, we want you to do as well within the two years from the renewal as you were to do within two years from the incorporation; therefore you must spend 15 per cent of the capital within two years of the renewal, and must complete the railway within five years. I argued this point in the Railway Committee, but was not then fortified with the Act. When I look at the Act, it appears to me that it would be an absolute absurdity to renew this charter upon the terms set forth in this Bill. Consider how inconsistent we would be in other respects. Turn to the next Bill on the Order Paper, Bill (No. 47). In that we have not the 15 per cent clause, but we have the other about commencing within two years and completing in five. In the next Bill after that we have the same thing. What I submit is that in every instance in which a company comes to us for a renewal of its charter, we should say: Dating from the time of the renewal you must expend 15 per cent of your capital within the next two years and complete the railway within five years. If the answer is, we have already expended 15 per cent, I say that is no answer at all; it does not matter what you have expended; you may have expended 40 per cent, but if you want five years from this time for the work, you must expend at the same rate as you were required to do from the first incorporation.

Mr. TURRIFF. I agree entirely with the hon. member who has just taken his seat. What I would prefer would be the insertion of a clause in the general Railway Act that would cover all cases of renewal, whether 15 per cent had been expended or not. If the company has not

expended 15 per cent, there is no reason why, if it gets another extension of time, it should not expend another 15 per cent within two years. Until the general Act is amended in this direction, I think that a clause to this effect should be put in all these Acts.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is difficult to lay down any hard and fast rule, particularly in a country where we are so anxious to get railway construction. In some instances it is perfectly proper to impose cast-iron conditions, but cases have arisen in the Railway Committee in thirty minutes in which conditions had to be put in one Bill and not in another, owing to the differences in the conditions of construction. I am surprised at what I find in this Bill. I understood in the committee, and the Bill was allowed to go through on the assurance, that they had expended 15 per cent since the last extension of the charter. But I find that this Act was passed in 1906, changing the name of this road, extending the time, and containing the two years and 15 per cent clause, and since that Act was passed no circumstance could have arisen to justify us in relieving the company of the conditions imposed by that Act. The only reason the 15 per cent clause was left out of this Act was that the committee understood that since the last extension the company had expended 15 per cent, and the same condition would not be imposed in the renewal; but they would be required to complete in the five years. I agree with the hon. member from South Simcoe that in this Bill we ought to insert the two years and 15 per cent clause.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no information whether any money has been expended on this road since the time of the last renewal in 1906. I have no information that no money has been expended. For anything I know, there may have been considerable. We had the assurance in the Railway Committee that about $250,000, if I remember rightly, had been expended, and we were told where this money was spent. A portion of the road has been constructed at Mimico, abutments for a bridge over Twelve Mile creek at Bronte have been built, and I think other works have been constructed. At any rate, we had the assurance that, so far as the 15 per cent was concerned, that had been expended on the road. I do not think the promoter of the Bill made the statement that this work had been done since the last renewal was given.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know that he did.

Mr. HENDERSON. If a blunder has been made, I think it was made when the last renewal was given. There was no reason then for putting in the provision respecting 15 per cent, because that had been spent. All that they should have asked for and obtained was the extension for five years to build the road. It seems to me it was an oversight to put in the regular clause instead of a special clause. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) smiles, but I know that in the Railway Committee it is not unusual for the chairman to say: 'Shall we insert the usual clause?' and it is immediately agreed to, the committee losing sight of the fact, perhaps, that the case is a special one and the usual clause is not called for. The blunder, if there was one, is unfortunate, because it may have an undesirable effect on this charter. This is an important road, commencing at Toronto, passing through York, Peel and Halton counties, and so on around to Niagara. I am disposed to regard the legislation of three years ago as something done in error, and the 15 per cent as an expenditure made prior to that time. All we have to do now is to extend the time for the completion of the road. Parliament has the power to do that—it has the power to do almost anything in these matters. I admit that there is a point in what is said by the hon. member for South Simcoe, if he is right in his allegation that no money has been spent since the last renewal was obtained. On that point I am not informed. I realize that there is a difficulty, but I hope the Minister of Railways will find a way out of it. If necessary I would ask that the Bill be not disposed of now, unless he sees fit to allow the clause to go through as passed in the Railway Committee. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) asks: What is the objection? It is that nothing has been done since the last renewal was granted. Certainly I have no evidence—I do not say that the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has no evidence—that such is the case. I think that, in the absence of evidence, we must presume that the Railway Committee understood that the necessary 15 per cent had been expended since the last renewal, though I do not know that as a matter of fact.

Mr. LENNOX. I will say for the benefit of my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) that I do not profess to have evidence on the matter; I only argue on the facts as they appear in the documents before us. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows much more about the facts than I do. I understood the hon. member to say that he knew there was a very considerable expenditure at one time.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am simply following the statement made in the Railway Committee by the solicitor representing the promoter, who mentioned the work that had been done near Mimico, and especially the abutments built at the village of Bronte. There was also the right of way that had

been secured all through. My recollection is that it was said that $250,000 had been spent—an hon. member near me says $280,000. I do not see that any harm will be done to any body by this extension, while we may do harm by any action of ours that will cause the charter to lapse. The country wants the road built. I believe we should take the risk and put the Bill through in the ordinary way.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

WINNIPEG AND NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 29) respecting the Winnipeg and Northwestern Railway Company.

On section 1,

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would ask you to let that Bill stand over, as the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) wishes to speak upon it. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HUDSON BAY AND PACIFIC RAILWAY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 43) respecting the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company.

On the preamble,

Mr. HERRON. There appears to be no definite route selected or laid out for the road proposed from British Columbia to the Hudson bay. I think we should have some assurance from the Minister of Railways that, before he will accept the plans of this railway chartered for construction purposes, the people in the different localities should be heard. The charter probably extends for a thousand miles, and we cannot tell what part of the country it is going to traverse.

Mr. CASH. I think the hon. gentleman has got this road mixed up with another. This road has been laid out, and extends from Grand Rapids almost in a direct line to Prince Albert, and from Prince Albert almost in a direct line to Calgary.

Mr. HERRON. I agree with the hon. member for Saskatchewan. I think I am mistaken, I had reference to another Bill.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Wilbert McIntyre.

Bill (No. 47) respecting the Guelph and Goderich Railway Company.—Mr. Lewis.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—Mr. Donnelly.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

To pay expenses in connection with cases before the Railway Commission, $10,000.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Before six o'clock I was suggesting to the minister that he should appoint permanent counsel as part of the machinery of the Railway Commission. We all admit that the Railway Commission is performing a great work. We are told that the Railway Commission is composed of capable men; yet, the interests of the general public are not safeguarded as well as they would be if there were a regular counsel connected with the machinery of the board. The minister stated that he wanted to make it a layman's court, but any person who has been present at the sittings of the Railway Commission knows that it cannot possibly be a layman's court because the railway companies have skilled lawyers there. A timid layman would not go in there to present his own case and even if he did it could not be presented with the ability with which it should be presented in order to ensure success. I am speaking on behalf of the poor men, of the agriculturists, the shippers, the manufacturers, the men who are not accustomed to present their cases before the courts. You cannot get away from the fact that this is a court and that a layman cannot present his case against the skilled counsel who are there on behalf of the railway companies. There are thousands of dollars paid out every year by the public to counsel to attend before the Railway Commission and present their cases. That is a big expense that the individual has to bear. If the minister would appoint counsel to take up that work, become a part of the machinery of the board and present the cases of the public before the Railway Commission he would adopt a measure that would meet with general acceptance and one by which the country in the long run could be benefited. The time of the board would be economized and they would be able to dispose of ten cases where they can now dispose of but one. The evidence would be sent to counsel in advance and he would have the case prepared. A layman cannot prepare his case. Any person who has seen the Railway Commission at work must commend the minister for the appointment of the gentlemen who compose this board because they have been exceptionally good appointments. Generally they discard all the formality and procedure of a court but even the Chairman of the Railway Commission cannot possibly protect the interests of a poor layman because he has not studied the case. He

knows nothing about it until it is presented by the applicant who seeks to redress a grievance. I have given this matter some attention and I purpose bringing it up in another way, but it was interjected into the discussion by my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) and I thought it might very well be taken up in connection with the item which was up for discussion this afternoon. Even though the layman employs a skilful lawyer he cannot possibly contend with the lawyers who make a specialty of railway cases. It would be in the interests of the country generally and of applicants particularly to have a counsel appointed as part of the machinery of the Railway Commission to appear on behalf of the agriculturist, the shipper, the manufacturer, paid out of the funds of the country and to be known as the public council. Not only could he appear on behalf of shippers, manufacturers, and agriculturists, but he could also represent the municipalities. A lot of the rural municipalties have no solicitors. The large cities have their counsel and solicitors and they are protected. The appointment of a public prosecutor would not preclude the right of a man to employ his own counsel if he saw fit. He could still have his own council to assist the public counsel, but I think it would not only be in the interests of the country but in the interests of the commission to have a public counsel who would be skilled and learned in the work of the court and who would protect the interests of the public generally. I therefore make an appeal to the minister to consider that question and I think he would earn the gratitude of the people from the Atlantic to the Pacific if he would agree to the appointment of a public counsel.

Mr. MARSHALL. I cannot agree with my hon. friend (Mr. S. Sharpe) who has just taken his seat. I think we would have too much machinery attached at the court. The practical man, the man who understands his business, is the man to meet the commission. I have had some little experience as a manufacturer in meeting with this commission. While I do not profess to know every thing, still I think that I put my case quite as well as a lawyer for the reason that I was familiar with it. I think that applies also to the farmer. It strikes me that there is no person who can put his case as well as the practical man. I have met the commission at different times. We have not got all we asked, but we have had no trouble in putting our cases in such a way as to make the commission understand it. I think we have all the machinery we want and that the practical man is in a better position to put his case than the man who is not acquainted with business.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I heartily endorse the remarks of my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) and I do so as a business man. I think that instead of putting more counsel on that commission there ought to be an amendment to the Act precluding counsel from appearing at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. That would keep the railway specialists out.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Yes. The Manufacturers Association have matters to submit to the Railway Commission as they have matters to submit to other courts. They did not select counsel at $10,000 a year to do their business for them. They took a man out of the Customs Department, one of the ablest men possibly in the service, and he knows every thing practically about their business. The great struggle in the Railway Commission has been to prevent it from becoming a court of record hedged in with so many rules of evidence that the ordinary individual cannot get his evidence in sideways. It should be open like a coroner's court and the less red tape there is in connection with it the better. It is said that the public do not get a fair show unless they are represented by counsel. From what I can understand the man who has the least to say, who is the most ignorant and the least qualified to present his case, has his case taken in hand by the chairman and as a general rule he gets what he wants much easier than if he were armed with a $10,000 counsel.

Mr. LANCASTER. And much cheaper.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Yes, and much cheaper. Small shippers, lumbermen, merchants and manufacturers cannot afford to go to great expense or to pay large counsel fees. All they want is a plain, ordinary everyday layman's court where they can go in, tell their tale of woe, and be sure that there is no rule or technicality in connection with the court that is going to bowl them out and prevent them from stating their case whether it is in accordance with the rules of evidence or not. The Minister of Railways and Canals should very seriously consider whether any person should be allowed to be represented by counsel before the Railway Commission.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think that my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has the right idea, but he is in error in supposing that that is the idea that is being carried out. Personally, I think this should be absolutely the layman's court, but the difficulty is that the railways—and I do not see that you can prevent them—employ the ablest, most expert railway lawyers, and any man, lawyer or layman, who goes there is up against the most astute and able counsel who are ready to resort to every technicality of the four

hundred sections of the Railway Act against him. If we could so arrange it that it would be nothing but a layman's court that would be the ideal condition. Although that is the ideal condition that is not the condition to-day, for no man can get his case properly presented unless he employs a lawyer who understands the Railway Act. I do not think that ought to be so. I suppose any party to a case can be deprived of the right to engage counsel, and as the railways will certainly employ skilled advocates the difficulty is that the other party must have counsel to contend against them:—

Contribution of the government railways to the faculty of McGill University towards the foundation of a school of railway engineering and transportation in general in connection with the faculty of applied science, $2,500.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is the minister not afraid he is breaking his heart in giving such a huge contribution to a small organization like McGill University?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Canadian Pacific Railway gives $3,000, the Grand Trunk $3,000, the Canadian Northern $2,000, and we give $2,500.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Do they not test your oils and materials free of charge?

Mr. GRAHAM. We pay extra for that.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the college course a training in the running of trains and the handling of engines and so on?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a course of general instruction in railway matters.

Mr. HUGHES. The building of roads and the operating of trains?

Mr. GRAHAM. It deals with the general theory of railroading.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is McGill the only university which gives this course?

Mr. GRAHAM. I understand so.

Mr. DANIEL. I suppose the students have to pay their regular fees?

Canal staff and repairs, $1,081,254.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have a lengthy detailed statement, but perhaps it will be sufficient to give the totals for the various canals.

Lachine	$143,760
Soulanges	78,975
Beauharnois	.....
Cornwall	125,000
Williamsburg	51,000
Welland	220,000
Sault Ste. Marie	44,057
Trent	80,000
Rideau	123,700
Carillon and Grenville	36,607
Ste. Anne	5,985
Chambly	51,300
St. Ours	5,845
Murray	9,000
St. Peter's	$ 4,700
Dredge vessels—Lachine	8,000
" Rideau	10,500
Miscellaneous	11,000
General	15,000
Quebec canals, salaries	20,625
Trent canal, salaries, grant	4,700

We have $31,000 for operating the canals on Sunday. Last year when the break in the Cornwall canal was repaired the canals were open on Sunday and we had to pay the men extra for that.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it allowable to go through the locks on Sundays if the boat owner mans the lock himself?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. HUGHES. Why not?

Mr. GRAHAM. They cannot run through the canals on Sundays without first getting permission from the department, and in cases of emergency it has been found necessary to give that permission.

Mr. HUGHES. It is all right for the government boats to run through on Sundays?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is all wrong if they do not get permission.

Mr. HUGHES. They do it though.

Mr. GRAHAM. In one case in a thousand.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Without being in any way irreligiously inclined, I should think it is a serious thing to stop the canal traffic of the country on Sundays. The American canals, our competitors, are open on Sundays, and it is only a matter of a few years when they will have a better canal system than we have. The present system simply cuts off one-seventh of our traffic, and that is a serious matter. Considering the time that is taken to lock a ship through on Sunday and the conditions under which it is done I do not think any law of the Bible would be broken. All the lock-tender has to do is to touch a button and the machinery does the rest. I certainly would not advocate anything that would be irreligious, but it is pure hypocrisy to let street cars run on Sundays and close down the canals.

Mr. HARTY. And allow railways to run.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. It simply adds one-seventh to the equipment of those engaged in the transportation business. No one can pretend for one minute that the canal gates are open by any servile labour, for the man has simply to sit in his chair and touch a button and if he likes he can read his Bible all the time he is doing it.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a matter about which there is a divergence of opinion, and it is the law and not a regulation of the

department. In the autumn, when the season is drawing to a close and the produce of the country has to be forwarded to its destination, we give some leniency in allowing the canals to open on Sunday.

Mr. HUGHES. How does the Railway Department control that?

Mr. GRAHAM. They ask for permission and we give it.

Mr. HUGHES. If that is so why can't you give permission all the year round.

Mr. GRAHAM. The law is that there shall not be any traffic on the canals on Sunday as a general thing, but in an extreme emergency, such as the break in the Cornwall canal last year, we allowed the canals to be open on Sunday in order to get the traffic through.

Mr. LANCASTER. And you allow it for three weeks in the autumn?

Mr. GRAHAM. When the Cornwall canal was broken last year there was great congestion of traffic, and as soon as the repairs were finished we allowed the canals to be opened to get rid of the congestion.

Mr. LANCASTER. You allow the Welland canal to be open on Sunday from October to the end of navigation, and if you can do it then why can't you do it from April to October? If it is right in October, why should it not be right from April to October?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Under the present regulations for closing the canals on Sunday it simply means that the sailors never get on shore for a minute on Sunday. They load up and on Saturday night, a few minutes before 12 o'clock they get ready and clear and the men have to work all day Sunday on the lakes. If that law was not on the statute-book the vessel owners would endeavour to have the men on shore on Sunday and the men would have a chance to go to church. I do not believe in such a distortion of the law by reason of the agitation of people who do not understand the facts. There is not one sailor in a thousand who has a chance to put his foot on shore on Sunday. There is a Sabbath law providing that a boat shall not start out on Sunday.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it the intention of the minister to have the Sabbath Observance Act amended?

Mr. LANCASTER. So that he will not have to break it every fall.

Mr. MILLER. He does not have to break it every fall because the Sabbath law has a provision for that fall traffic.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would ask the assistant Minister of Railway if that law does not permit him to do it at any time in the year.

Mr. MILLER. I would tell the would-be Minister of Railways and Canals that it applies every fall.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is there a limitation in the statute to the fall?

Mr. MILLER. The Act makes a special provision for the fall when the grain is coming down.

Trent canal construction, $1,000,000.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The correspondence relating to this matter has just been brought down and we are not prepared to discuss it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. It would take a good sized man to carry the correspondence which came down yesterday, let alone read it and it would be an advantage to have it stand over.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not want to be unreasonable as I realize that hon. gentlemen are reasonable in dealing with my estimates. This is the third time the item has been called, and I would be glad to know when they would be ready to discuss it; if they would be ready the next day we go into Supply, I would ask to have it stand again.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I do not wish in any way to dictate to the minister but I would be glad to have the discussion postponed until Thursday.

Mr. GRAHAM. I wish to have it borne in mind that the part of my supply that has gone through is a very small part of what has to go through for my department, but I am anxious to meet hon. gentlemen half way and we will allow it to stand.

Mr. HUGHES. In the meantime I would ask the minister to consider, since he is going on with the branch canals, an extension of the canal from Balsam lake to the lakes in Haliburton county by the construction of two or three dams. The matter is most important. For one-fifth of the expenditure the minister is wasting on the Newmarket ditch he would open up fifty miles of country with twenty times the population that would be served by the Newmarket ditch.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to remind the minister that the people in the neighbourhood of Barrie and between there and Collingwood are depending upon coming to interview the minister before he determines upon the question whether he shall connect with the Georgian bay by the Severn river or by a direct canal from the head of Kempenfeldt bay through to the Georgian bay. That is whether the canal will follow the earlier survey or the recent survey. I have had some correspondence with the department in reference to it.

Mr. GRAHAM. The arrangement made with the hon. gentleman has not been forgotten. Before anything is done, and as soon as we have the plans completed so that we are in a position to discuss it thoroughly, we will notify him in order that he may bring his deputation down.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. When the discussion opened I asked the minister if a report had been made of the survey on the Nottawasaga and Barrie route. He stated that the survey had been made but that the notes had not been extended and that a full report had not been made. It is nearly two months since that question was asked, and if there are any data available I would like to have a chance to examine them before the deputation comes down.

Mr. GRAHAM. What we have is not intelligible without the plan to follow it along. It will take some weeks to complete the plan and my hon. friend will be advised when the plan is completed.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Would it be possible to see the diary and field books of the engineer?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is at liberty to come over and see the report if he desires.

Dominion buildings—rents, &c., $200,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I promised to give some particulars with regard to the rent of the Canadian building. It was stated that the building was assessed at a certain figure, and that the amount of the rental paid was a very large return upon its value.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister allow me to mention that the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), who brought up that question the other night, is not here to-night. I do not like to ask the minister to let it stand, but I know that the hon. member for Peel would be glad if he would do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am quite willing under the circumstances to let it stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Public buildings, British Columbia — renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the usual vote.

Mr. BURRELL. In connection with the grant for public buildings in British Columbia, I would like to quote from Hansard, at page 1407, where the minister gave a list of those works for which tenders had been asked and which it was not proposed to proceed with this year. They were in the whole of Canada eleven in number, and were all wharfs, with the exception of one public building, that of Vernon in the province of British Columbia. On page 1347 of 'Hansard,' I find that the minister said :

Mr. LENNOX.

I decided to recommend to my colleagues in the first place to drop those public works for which tenders had not been called irrespective of their necessity. That rule was followed possibly with one or two exceptions. Then that left to be considered all those works in regard to which we had called for tenders. We went through the list again, applied the pruning knife and considered as to whether or not there might not be a few of these which we might drop. We also considered as to whether they were really of such urgent public necessity that they could not stand over for another year.

So that in that pruning process the public building of Vernon in British Columbia is the only one in the whole of Canada which has been placed in that position; and I assume, from the statement of the minister that he felt a solemn obligation—I think that was his phrase—in regard to fulfilling these contracts later on, that he will have no objection to assuring me that this building will be proceeded with next year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that when the appropriation for the Vernon building was put in the estimates, it was put there in good faith, because I and my colleagues were satisfied that it would very soon be required to be constructed in the public interest. But we thought that it might be allowed to stand over for another year, along with a number of other public works. I think I gave a list of eight or ten works in the various portions of the Dominion which, although tenders had been called for them, we arrived at a decision to postpone. I may say to my hon. friend that the land has already been purchased for the building at Vernon, and that just as soon as we are able to take up the other works for which appropriations were made last session, the building at Vernon will be proceeded with.

Mr. BURRELL. I would like to run over a few things in connection with this matter of public buildings. In the various discussions which have taken place the minister has laid down certain principles as those which have guided him in the construction of public buildings throughout Canada. On page 1333 of Hansard, he said:

No rule has been laid down as to the exact number of people required in a place in order to justify the erection therein of a public building. Population does not always govern. Something may depend upon the trade that is done in a place, upon the customs receipts, upon the post office building, upon the possibility or otherwise of renting suitable buildings.

Then, on page 1347, in answer to a question as to what principle guided him in this matter, the minister said: 'the public necessities.' I think all of us are perfectly willing to grant that these are the two principles that should guide any government in

the construction of public buildings. I propose to give, as a basis for comparison, a couple of references in the east and two or three in the west. I have a definite object in quoting these figures, and I do it on the principle laid down by the minister. In the province of Quebec, at Knowlton, we have an estimated population of 800; a postal revenue of $2,156.83; money orders issued, $5,857.93; money orders paid, $6,427.27; postal notes paid, $1,026.81. Knowlton is not a customs port so there is no way of judging what the trade is in that respect. Yet this place has been given a post office costing $26,806, according to the statement of the minister.

Another case is that of Shelburne, N. S., which may be regarded as typical. The following are the figures in relation to this place: Shelburne has a population of 1,500; its postal revenue is $1,969.78; money orders issued, $29,439.81; money orders paid, $19,768.63; postal notes, $671.21. Shelburne is a port of entry, with three subports. The total duty collected was $1,471,67, or, in Shelburne itself, $1,245.61. The exports for the year ending March 31, 1908, were $33,177. Shelburne has a post office building which, according to the minister's estimate, cost, with the site $35,158.77.

These are two examples from the eastern part of Canada. Now, take two cities in my own constituency. The first of these is the city of Vernon, for which the figures are as follows:

Vernon, B.C.

Population	3,500
Postal revenue	$ 8,222 96
Money orders issued	67,543 41
Money orders paid	32,941 50
Postal notes	5,813 46

Vernon is an outport of the port of Revelstoke, and the actual duty collected at Vernon was $35,879.23. We have not only no post office building, but we have very poor postal accommodation for this growing community. My second example is the city of Grand Forks, in which I live. The following are the figures for Grand Forks:

Population	2,500
Postal revenue	$ 4,695 32
Money orders issued	89,802 84
Money orders paid	21,802 54
Postal notes paid	1,495 39

Grand Forks is a port of entry with eight sub-ports. The total duty collected was $51,794.61; the amount collected in Grand Forks City, $25,712.42. The total exports from this place amount to $2,981,688, a bigger export than that of any port in Nova Scotia, except Halifax, and bigger than any port in New Brunswick except St. John. Yet, so far, we have no post office building, though we have a site which, I have to tell the minister—he probably knows it already—was purchased six days before my election. Let me give a few figures concerning also the city of Greenwood, which is in my constituency, and in which my late opponent resides:

Greenwood, B.C.

Population	2,000
Postal revenue	$ 4,254 48
Custome duty collected in Greenwood	25,162 31
Customs duty collected in Greenwood and sub-ports	45,454 69

Several sites have been looked at for a public building, but none has been purchased.

I wish to briefly contrast these cases, for the whole country, apart from politics is interested in this matter. The Department of Public Works, as we know, is the great spending department of our government, and I think there should be some basis of comparison to show how the money should be expended. Let me give the figures to show the comparison between Shelburne and Grand Forks:

	Shelburne.		Grand Forks.
Population	1,500		a 2,500
Postal revenue	$ 1,969	b $	4,695
Money order business	48,879	b	113,100
Customs duties collected	1,471	c	51,794
Exports	33,177	d	2,981,688

a Nearly twice. b More than twice. c 35 times as much. d 90 times as much.

Yet we find that Shelburne has a post office costing $35,000, and the Grand Forks post office is carried on in a rented building.

Now, let me take the case of Vernon. I speak of this because it is one of those for which the tenders were called as late as October 20, to be opened as late as November 20—that is, eight days after my own election. If the money stringency, or decrease in the revenue, have anything to do with it, it must have been known some time before that. Let me compare the case of Vernon with that of Knowlton:

	Knowlton.		Vernon.
Population	800		3,500
Total postal revenue	$ 2,156	a $	8,222
Total money order business	13,312	b	106,298
Customs revenue	c		35,879
Public building	26,866		d

a 4 times as much. b 8 times as much. Not a custom port. d Pruned out of existence.

Now, a word or two about these figures which I have brought forward for purposes of illustration. I trust I may be allowed to emphasize this contrast before the Minister of Public Works, because it is I who am called upon to explain to my constituency the tremendous disparity in the distribution of the public moneys of this country, and, in spite of the assistance the minister has given, and the explanations he has made, I am afraid I have not been helped very much toward the explanations

I shall be called upon to make. The people in the west will want to know what principle is followed in these matters. The minister has told us that he has drawn the line sharply between those for which tenders had been called and those for which tenders had not been called. But, in the case of Vernon, he departed from that position. In my humble opinion—and I suppose I should speak with some diffidence as a new member—this part of our public affairs seems to be in great confusion. I must say I sympathize with the Minister of Public Works. It seems to me that, in a case of post office construction the Postmaster General should accept the responsibility, and the Minister of Public Works should not be constantly badgered and criticised and asked for information which he is not always in a position to give. The same is true in relation to the Minister of Militia. A short time ago a question came up concerning the construction of a public building, which, in the ordinary course of procedure was referred to the Minister of Public Works. But that hon. gentleman was not able to answer many of the questions, because the matter related to the Militia Department. It seems to me that, while the book-keeping could be arranged between the departments, the responsible minister of the department for which the building is to be constructed should answer the objections and meet the criticism arising in connection with the matter. The minister, when he was meeting the objections raised about enormous sums being expended in small constituencies, made the remark that sometimes a member representing that constituency would come up and urge very vigorously that this public work should be given, and so he got it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend pardon me? I think he is mistaken. When I used that expression it was in reference to some of the plans being prepared at an earlier stage than others, and sometimes the minister urged that those plans should be prepared somewhat more speedily.

Mr. BURRELL. I am glad to accept the minister's assurance. At all events, we know as a matter of fact that these things are very often done under our present political system. We know that the urgency of a member who has the ear of the government bears direct results by the construction of certain works in his constituency that he would not get otherwise. I submit that that principle is fundamentally vicious. If other things are equal, or nearly so, we can understand that under our present political system a government is naturally inclined to favour its political friends, I presume all governments would do that. But the indiscriminate—because there is no other word to be used—the indiscriminate expenditure for public buildings in small towns simply amounts to a waste of money, it is certainly a subversion of the public interest, it is a deplorable extravagance and absolutely destructive of good government. I think I appreciate as well as any one else the position of the minister, that is, I appreciate the fact that we have a stringency in our finances at the present time. I am aware that in the whole of the debate that took place a week or two ago there was a lot of thrust and parry, and sometimes the minister came out on top, and sometimes he came out second best. But what the people of this country want, I think, is that their legitimate needs should be attended to, whether in respect of the Post Office Department or of any other department, They want the legitimate needs of the country attended to. They want post offices where they are necessary, and then they chiefly want better mail facilities all over the scattered portions of the country, where, although the people are isolated, they are engaged in adding to the prosperity of the country. In my own riding there are districts where the people actually only get a mail four times a year, and they are pleading hard with the government to get at least a monthly mail. I think when these things can be said, when these things exist, there should be a recognition of legitimate needs before there is such a tremendous expenditure of money in places where the needs are very much less. Now take the case of my own town. I am making no clamour for a post office, because I am willing to admit this, that if the country is in straightened financial circumstances, the fact should be recognized, and I think Canadians as a whole are willing to recognize it. They may disagree as to the causes thereof, but they are willing to recognize the fact, and at all events are not disposed to urge upon the government the expenditure of money unnecessarily, we ought all to agree with that. But we do feel this, and feel it very strongly, I know the people feel it throughout my own constituency, they will feel a just resentment when they find that these large sums of money are spent in small places absolutely without necessity, and they have the mortification of seeing their own crying needs utterly neglected. I want to give an illustration. How can I explain to my constituents that their legitimate needs are turned down when I have at the same time to tell them that the government has spent $7,000 on each one of a number of houses at Kingston for drill instructors and gunners, while the servants are getting about $460 a year; and when I find that a million dollars is being expended on a canal which, if I am to believe some of my hon. friends, has not sufficient water to operate it. We had a little while ago a resolution proposed by the hon. member for Lincoln

(Mr. Lancaster) for the abolition of that ancient body, the Senate, and in the course of his address I noticed he said that the Senate cost this country $318,000 a year. Now whether we would be justified in abolishing the Senate or not, how can we satisfy the people who are crying out for a recognition of their just needs, when we have to point out to them that the senators are taken care of to the tune of $6,000 worth of rubber tiling, for their chamber and are robed in purple and fine linen, while at the same time places which afford very considerable revenues to the government are not given the consideration which they deserve. I would like to suggest to the minister that if this sort of thing goes on to any great extent, and much longer, the people will be disposed to agree with that biting cynicism of Max Nordau, when writing of the non-success of democracy, particularly in the larger sense of that word when he said:

The cabinet not only rules the country but the parliament as well. Instead of their following a policy prescribed to them, they dictate the policy of parliament and nation. They manage all the powers and resources of the nation according to their own discretion, bestow favours and presents, support innumerable hangers on in luxury at the expense of the community, and never hear a word of reproof if they but remember to send to the majority in parliament occasional tit-bits from the royal feast spread for them by the state.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I may say that it would be a horrible thing if it had to be said in our country that that language was absolutely true. That it is partly true, we have got to admit, right in this country of ours, of which we are all so proud. I want to say to the Minister of Public Works and to other ministers who are here, that they will get a generous recognition of any efforts they may put forth to try and wipe out this system, and make at least some attempt, before they spread out this tremendous distribution of money in needless ways, to attend to the legitimate needs of the country, whether it be a post office or anything else.

Prince Rupert quarantine station, $25,000.

Mr. BARNARD. I would like some explanation of this item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is well known that a good many people are now going to Prince Rupert, and in the coming summer a large number, probably many thousands, will be going to that city. We have felt that it would be very desirable, in fact absolutely essential to the public health, to have a quarantine station established there. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture made a very strong appeal to me to have an amount for that purpose put in the estimates.

Mr. HUGHES. Will tenders be called for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders will be called for just as soon as possible, and it is hoped that a suitable building will be erected for the purpose of taking care of sick persons who may go there during the coming season.

Mr. HUGHES. Will Canadians have a chance to work on that building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BARNARD. Have the government provided for any other expenditures in connection with the city of Prince Rupert?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BARNARD. Any post office or public building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BARNARD. Has it occurred to the minister that there will possibly be something a good deal more necessary than a quarantine station?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A quarantine station is essential to the public health.

Vancouver public buildings, $60,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is to complete the public building at Vancouver.

Mr. HUGHES. What building is that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The new post office—a very fine building.

Mr. HUGHES. From whom was the site purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was purchased from Mr. Robertson.

Mr. HUGHES. And the adjoining property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We purchased that for an examining warehouse.

Mr. HUGHES. From whom was that purchased and at what price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From Mr. Robertson also, I think, at about $80,000.

Mr. HUGHES. Are you sure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Victoria immigration building, $43,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is to finish the building.

Mr. BARNARD. Could the minister tell us what the immigration into Victoria was last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I have not the figures. That would be in the Interior Department.

Mr. BARNARD. Could the minister give us an idea of what this building is intended for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is an immigration building of the ordinary character. The building is two-stories, fireproof, built of brick with stone foundation, and the object is to prove facilities for medical inspection, hospital accommodation and for the other services connected with the handling of immigrants. There are a good many people coming to Victoria. They come from the Orient, they come from the cities along the United States coast and they require care.

Mr. BARR. I thought the Orientals were all shut out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are always some coming, and in the future there will be some coming, but there are a good many people coming from the coast cities. The information we had before this building was undertaken was that there was a necessity in Victoria for an immigration building.

Mr. BARNARD. Who made the request for this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Department of Immigration.

Mr. BARNARD. Cannot the minister state what the necessity is in view of the fact that the government tells us that Oriental immigration is shut off?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As I have said, there are a good many in addition to oriental immigration, which has undoubtedly fallen now to small proportions, but which was larger when this building was undertaken. There is a very considerable immigration from United States ports.

Mr. BARNARD. Can the minister give us any idea as to the number of those during the past year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry to say I cannot, because this is not a new work. It was undertaken and a vote was given last parliament for it.

Mr. BARNARD. Could the minister tell us what volume of immigration this building is to cover?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The most I can do is to give my hon. friend the size of the building. It has a frontage of 98 feet on Ontario street by a depth of 35 feet, and it extends along Dallas street 91 feet with a depth of 45 feet. It is a two-story building with basement, and there are in the building a waiting room, large dining room, detention room, two rooms for guards, two rooms for medical officers, two rooms for United States officers, two rooms for clerks and also some other rooms such as closets, lavatories, &c. There are a surgery and six hospital wards in the building.

Mr. HUGHES. Where were the plans drawn?

Mr. BARNARD.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were prepared by the department.

Mr. HUGHES. As skilfully as the plans for the extension of this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume so.

Mr. HUGHES. They could not be any worse.

Mr. BARNARD. I must confess to a certain amount of ignorance as to what a building of that kind is designed to cover, and, if possible, I should like to know where my hon. friend expects his immigrants from who are to use this building apart from Asiatic immigration, and what number of immigrants he is erecting the building to accommodate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend must see that it would be quite impossible to tell how many immigrants are coming to Victoria. One week there may be 500 and another week there may be 50.

Mr. BARNARD. That, of course, is not an answer to the question I asked. I assume that the Department of Public Works, when they authorized the expenditure for this building, had in view some certain capacity, or a building that would accommodate a certain volume of immigration during the year, and that is what I would like the hon. minister to let us know.

Mr. HERRON. I understood my hon friend the Minister of the Interior a year ago to say that there were no immigrants coming from that direction except Asiatics.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that in addition to the immigrants coming in from Asiatic countries there is a considerable number coming in from United States ports. There are daily steamers arriving from Seattle, Tacoma, and other United States Sound ports. With regard to the accommodation, as far as the hospital part is concerned, there is provision for 134 beds in the various wards.

Mr. BARNARD. That would mean that you could put up 134 people per day?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 134 people, if they were ill.

Mr. BARNARD. And, in addition to that, I suppose a large number of others?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose so.

Mr. BARNARD. This question cut a very considerable figure in the discussion which preceded the election in October last. While the Minister of Public Works tells the House that this building was asked for by the Immigration Department, and while in this House last year the asking for this building was repudiated by the then member for Victoria (Mr. Templeman) I might tell the House that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Templeman) publish-

ed a very fine campaign pamphlet which contained numerous beautifully etched illustrations of the different works he had obtained for the constituency, and amongst these illustrations was one of the immigration building which, during the campaign, was described as the Japanese Hotel. It is true that in the pamphlet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Templeman) did not say he asked for the building, but the inference was that he regarded it as one of his achievements for the constituency, and we are told that it contained all modern comforts and separate apartments for Chinese, Japanese and Hindus. Whether or not that statement so put in print assisted the hon. gentleman (Mr. Templeman) in the campaign or not is open to question. But the fact that he made that statement and the fact that in the report of the Minister of the Interior I find that out of a total of 6,024 immigrants who came to the province of British Columbia in the year 1908, there were only 190 who were not Chinese, Japanese, or Hindus, point to the further fact that when the government authorized the expense on this building it had in mind that it was for the accommodation of the Asiatic immigrants. The Minister of Public Works tells us that he has beds for 124 people in the hospital, and that he can accommodate a large number in addition, but, considering that the immigration to British Columbia via Victoria other than Oriental immigration is so small, how in the name of common sense could the government have decided to erect such a large building? I may say that the people of Victoria, whom I represent, do not want and never did want this immigration building and it certainly is not necessary unless the government are preparing to take care of Oriental immigration, which it is needless for me to say the people of British Columbia are utterly and absolutely opposed to. Like my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) I realize the responsibilities of government; I realize that the finances of the country are depleted and that we who criticise the government for its extravagance have no right to ask for extraordinary expenditure, but I do say that we are bound to criticise them for the useless expense of $93,000 on this immigration building, when, if it were applied to improving the harbour of Victoria the money would have been beneficial to that city and to the country at large.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the cost of this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimated cost is $85,000.

Mr. PRICE. If this building were erected for the accommodation of Chinese, Japanese, and Hindu immigrants I could quite understand it, but if it is simply for the accommodation of white immigrants, who are so few in British Columbia, how can the government excuse such a waste of money? For instance, in the hospital of this institution there are 134 beds, while only 193 white immigrants landed in Victoria last year. How can the government justify the erection of such a building under the circumstances?

Mr. CROCKET. Is it a brick building?

Mr. BARNARD. I can assure the House it is a very fine building on a very fine site.

Mr. PUGSLEY I do not think I can say more than I have said.

Mr. PRICE. I am not at all satisfied with that answer. We have a right to know why this building was put up and why this large expense was incurred.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have already said it was at the request of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. CROSBY. The minister did not know how many immigrants came to British Columbia last year and now that he has been told what is he going to say about it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was represented by the Department of the Interior that in a port like Victoria, to which a large number of people were coming from Asiatic countries, as well as from United States Pacific ports, it was desirable to have a suitable immigration building. An important port like Victoria would not be equipped as it should be unless it had a building where immigrants could be properly taken care of, and where those who might be considered undesirable could be humanely treated pending deportation. The money was voted by parliament, the contract was let, and this vote was to pay the contractor the balance due him. There is always a likelihood of a very large number of immigrants arriving in a great seaport like Victoria.

Mr. BARNARD. I understood the minister to describe Victoria as a great seaport.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A very important seaport.

Mr. BARNARD. I shall have something to say on that question later on.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to hear you.

Mr. PRICE. It would appear from the explanation given by the Minister of Public Works that there can be no doubt that this building was erected because the government expected a large immigration of Japanese, Chinese and Hindus.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. We should have some statement of the policy of the government

with respect to the immigrants who were expected to use this immigration building, but who owing to the efforts of those of us in British Columbia who would not stand this class of immigration have been prevented from entering the province for the time being. Since the government are determined to go ahead with this building the only inference is that they have some idea of putting it at some time to the use for which it was originally intended. If the government still have in mind to bring into British Columbia Oriental immigration on such a scale that they need at Victoria a building of this kind, I think it is the duty of the minister to ascertain from his colleagues if the information is not in the possession of his department and let us know what we have to expect in that respect. While I agree with all the minister has said as to the importance of Victoria as a seaport and as to the large number of persons who travel to it from Seattle, Tacoma, San Francisco, and other points in the United States, it must be remembered that these persons are not of the class commonly known as immigrants, that they are not the class of people who would use an immigrant shed, and that the class of travel to Victoria, other than Oriental immigration, consists of the highest type of passengers who under no circumstances whatever would be likely to require accommodation in an immigration building except half dozens at a time, in cases of exceptional poverty or misfortune which the government could attend to without this building. So far as sickness is concerned, the immigration building is not needed to take care of the sick pasengers who come on plague boats because this building will be within sight of the William Head quarantine station which is only three quarters of an hour's sail from it. Is there any probability that in the near future the Oriental immigration, now suspended, is likely to be renewed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government has no reason to suppose that the arrangement which I am happy to say was arrived at between the representative of this government and the imperial government of Japan will be departed from. The expectation is that the restriction of immigration will continue as at present, and that comparatively few Orientals will arrive in future. So far as this government can secure the carrying out in the future of the agreement which is now being rigidly adhered to, it will be done.

Mr. HUGHES. Then we are to understand from the minister that the plan was this: The gentleman who has made such a success of the North Atlantic Trading Company in bringing European immigrants to Canada, at so much a head, was translated to the shores of Asia and the plan was that he was to send in these Oriental immigrants, Japanese, and Chinese, in large numbers, and it was then decided to construct this public building. Then the action of the people of British Columbia caused a change in the programme, but the building had gone on so far that the government decided to continue it to completion and have it ready so that in a year or two, when Japan chooses to send in her emigrants the building will be ready for use.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope my hon. friend did not assume that I said anything of the kind.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the minister give a comparative statement showing the cost of the immigration buildings at Victoria, Halifax, Quebec, and St. John, especially with regard to the number of hospital beds in each building. At the Atlantic ports thousands of immigrants come in every year and one would naturally expect that as much accommodation will be required at these ports as at Victoria. The buildings in St. John, Quebec, and Halifax are of wood, while the Victoria building is evidently of a much superior class.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to obtain that information and present it on a subsequent occasion. The building in St. John is quite a fine building and cost quite a sum of money. Plans have been prepared for the erection of an immigration building at Quebec which will be much more costly than the one proposed at Victoria.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister is not referring to the Martello hotel building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a detention hospital.

Mr. BARNARD. I understand the minister to say that one reason for the erection of this building was that many immigrants were detained in Victoria. How many immigrants were detained in Victoria during the current year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My statement was that undesirable immigrants might be detained under the law, and deported. In the meantime it is proper that they should be cared for. Although an immigration building or the hospital part of it might not be constantly required, a time might come when the hospital accommodation particularly might be required. I do not think any one would say that in a seaport of the importance of Victoria an immigration building is not desirable. It may be that when the requisition was made by the Department of the Interior a large number of Asiatic immigrants were coming in and that the plans were prepared more liberally than they would be to-day with the restricted immi-

gration. I was not minister when the building was undertaken, and I do not know the arguments which were urged by the minister for its construction, but, as I said, the Department of the Interior was of the opinion that Victoria should have a suitable immigration building. I am not prepared to say how many were deported, that will be in the report of the Interior Department.

Mr. BARNARD. I do not know that the conditions may not have changed in the last year since the preparation of the last published report. I observe that as a rule ministers are careful, in asking for appropriations, to point to statistics to show the necessity of the appropriation asked, and we must give the minister credit in this case for basing his request upon the actual needs of the immigration as revealed in the statistics for that port. I find in the report of the Immigration Department that the total number of immigrants detained in 1898 was 79. With only 79 detained in the course of a whole year, surely it is unreasonable to erect a hospital with a capacity for 134 beds, just as it is unreasonable, if you cut out the question of Oriental immigration, to say that you require a $95,000 building for the purpose of putting up 190 immigrants during the year. I would like to ask the minister when the construction of this building was first requisitioned for and when it was first authorized.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The order in council for its erection was passed on the 19th of February, 1907. At that time the acting Minister of Public Works was authorized to purchase the land. The contract for the erection of the building was entered into on the 23rd of January, 1908.

Mr. BARNARD. Can the minister give me the date when the treaty with Japan was entered into?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give the exact date.

Mr. BARNARD. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture could give that information.

Mr. FISHER. I think that was in 1905.

Mr. BARNARD. Can the minister tell us the date when the Minister of Labour departed on his visit to Japan?

Mr. FIELDING. In the latter part of 1907.

Mr. BARNARD. I do not like to make insinuations, but it would almost appear that the building was authorized to be constructed and was requisitioned for shortly after the treaty was made with Japan, and that it was done in expectation of a large influx of Japanese immigration as a consequence of that treaty.

Mr. CROSBY. In view of the fact which has been brought out to-night, and the fact that we have not money sufficient to construct the buildings which are necessary, it would seem strange that we should continue to construct this building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to pay the contractor to finish the work.

Mr. CROSBY. In view of the fact that less than 200 white immigrants came into that port last year, and in view of the fact that no Oriental immigration is anticipated in the opinion of the Minister of Public Works, should the money be spent in that direction?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In my opinion we should vote the money to pay the contractor the balance.

Mr. CROSBY. In view of all that has been brought out to-night, will the minister say that we should continue to spend that money on that building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Williams Head quarantine station—improvements and repairs to buildings, and fittings, furniture, &c., $5,000.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. As this is the last item under this appropriation, I would like to ask the minister whether he has received any communication from Chilliwack in respect to a public building there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have had several communications, and quite lately I received a telegram from certain residents of Chilliwack.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Might I ask the minister if any results have followed from that telegram?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not as yet.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Because I have had urgent requests from Chilliwack to press upon the government the desirability, I might almost say the necessity, of proceeding with a public building at that point. I might remind the minister again that so late as October last the Minister of Inland Revenue who, I am sorry to say, is not present to-night, because he could bear me out in what I say, and would add his protestations to mine, since as an hon. gentleman he would no doubt want to see his promise carried out—promised the people of Chilliwack that they would have this building, and was in so generous a mood that he intimated to them that since the site just then chosen for this building was not the most suitable, he might have a drill hall put up on the lot and erect a post office on another site. I may say that there was $5,000 voted last session towards this building, of which only $3,000 has been expended on the purchase of the site, that

the accommodation of the post office there is entirely inadequate, and that the public interests are suffering because the postmaster has not room for the disposition of his mail; and I would like to suggest, if we must wait another year for the vote for the building and still another year for its erection, whether it would not be advisable to build a temporary addition to the present post office, so that during the two years that we shall have to wait for the public building, the public will have accommodation for the post office; that is, if it is possible to use the money already voted to relieve the necessities of the case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The claims of Chilliwack were earnestly pressed upon me by the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Taylor) predecessor. I do not think the hon. gentleman can press them more strongly. And I was impressed with those claims, and steps were taken in the direction——

Mr. HUGHES. How?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By the purchase of a site. I trust we may be able to arrange to go on with the building. As to making an addition to the present building, if the accommodation is not sufficient and the Postmaster General requests it, it might be possible to make an arrangement to have an addition made to the building by the owner and an additional rent paid that would compensate them. But, as the building is a rented one, my department could hardly undertake to make additions.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The building is owned by the postmaster. There is a vacant lot at the side of the post office. It would be perfectly feasible to make an addition to the building at no great cost. In the thirty-seven years we have been in confederation the revenues of this government from Chilliwack have been very large. It is not fair to a city of such importance that after thirty-seven years there should be no public building when the government is able to lavish such large appropriations in public buildings elsewhere.

Mr. HUGHES. I notice there is $28,000 for 1908-9 and $5,000 for 1909-10. Was that $28,000 expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be by the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. HUGHES. And is the same true of the $150,000 for the public building in Vancouver?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the amount is to finish it up.

Public Works—chargeable to capital—harbours and rivers—Port Arthur and Fort William—harbour and river improvements, $600,000.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to continue these works. The work at Port Arthur consists of the extension of a scheme of breakwaters, essential for the protection of shipping in the harbour, and also a good deal of dredging.

Mr. HUGHES. Is there any room for dredging there after all that has been done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The demand is coming from the people of Port Arthur and Fort William, as well as from Winnipeg and the west, for the deepening of these harbours to 25 feet. It was originally supposed that 22 feet would be sufficient.

Mr. HUGHES. What is being done to the old breakwater?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It remains and we are building the new work outside so as to give more room in the harbour. Later on part of the old breakwater will be torn away with the same view of affording more room. In Fort William the work is being done on a large scale. The Mission river is being deepened and widened and a turning basin is being made covering about thirty acres. This work is being done in connection with the terminus of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I am glad to say that that company is laying out its terminals on a very comprehensive scale, involving an expenditure of several millions of dollars. They are building an elevator of very large capacity, and their plans involve providing storage capacity for over 20,000,000 bushels. The contract for dredging is let, providing for a depth of 25 feet.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the depth of the Sault canal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only 21 feet.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the depth of the American canal at the Sault?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The new canal, it is contemplated, will have a depth of 24 feet. But the report that comes to us from the railway companies and the boards of trade of the west is that the vessels upon the lakes are constantly growing larger and that if we are to hold the trade for these ports of Fort William and Port Arthur we must afford a depth of 25 feet.

Mr. HUGHES. It would be better to provide the waterway to the eastward first; would it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not necessarily. Vessels in these harbours may not load entirely at one dock. Consequently, at some times the stern may be deeper in the water than it will be when the cargo is complete and the vessel on a level. With a depth of 22 feet these vessels are likely to ground. These are the reports that come to us, and I think they can be relied upon.

Mr. HUGHES. Official reports or verbal statements?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The resident engineer has so reported and I have been informed to the same effect by a number of people. The policy of the department is to dredge the harbours on the eastern shore of Georgian bay, Victoria harbour and Tiffin to the same depth.

Mr. HUGHES. How about Key harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are giving attention to it, and, if dredged, no doubt it will be dredged to 25 feet.

Mr. HUGHES. And Midland the same?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. What price is being paid for dredging at Port Arthur?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Different prices. In the Kaministiquia and Mission rivers, under the present contract, the price is nine cents per cubic yard, that is to a depth of 22 feet. For a depth of 25 feet no doubt it will be something more.

Mr. CROCKET. What does the minister think of that in contrast with 50 cents a yard at Indian Point to his friend John E. Moore?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Both may be quite reasonable; it depends on the conditions.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I would call attention to the fact that no provision is made in these estimates for the dredging of the Napanee river, concerning which I had an interview with the minister. A petition has been sent to the Governor General. There is a great need of a little money being spent at this point. No dredging has been done there since 1893, and several shallows have formed by the deposit of sand, preventing any but the smallest craft coming in—craft drawing no more than six or seven feet. As every one knows, and as the minister has just said, every year vessels on the lakes are growing larger. It is most difficult to get crafts to come into this harbour and carry anything like a heavy burden in the way of coal.

Now I am informed by the coal merchants of our town that unless there is some dredging done there to take out the shoals, the chances are that the people, not only in the town, but in the vicinity, will have to pay from 50 cents to $1 a ton more for their coal. That is most unfair to the people of that locality, inasmuch as we have had no public money spent, so far as I know, in that riding since 1893. This is a matter of urgent necessity. The council of the town of Napanee has passed a very strong resolution asking that this work be done, which resolution I have left with the deputy minister of the Public Works Department. I hope that the minister will give me some assurance to-night that this matter will get his careful consideration, and that we may have good reason to expect that during the coming season this dredging will be done. It will not be an extensive job, perhaps $3,000 or $4,000. As a matter of fact, to make a really good job would require considerably more money. But if these shoals were taken out we might be able to get along for a few years until the government feel richer. I believe this year they intend to practise rigid economy, and I endorse that principle, because we all know that the revenues have fallen off to a great extent. But works that are of actual and absolute necessity like these I think should be attended to, more especially when they only require a small outlay. I would strongly urge the minister to take this matter into his serious consideration, and if possible have that dredging done this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that I think there is no more important work in the interests of the country than dredging, and I am inclined to think that will be the opinion of every member of this committee. With regard to dredging the Napanee river, I have looked into it, and I am impressed with the public necessity of dredging out the river for five or six miles between a certain mill and the mouth of the river. If I can find it at all possible to arrange for a dredge early in the coming year, this very necessary work will be proceeded with.

Mr. DANIEL. In regard to this dredging at Port Arthur, can the minister say how far the material that is taken out has to be carried before it is dumped?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About three miles.

Quebec harbour—deep water wharf at Lévis. $400,000.

Mr. PRICE. I would like to ask the minister if this deep water wharf at Levis is to be built on what is known as the Carrier Lainé property, and if so, what is the price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. PRICE. Does this $400,000 include the price of the Carrier Lainé property, and if so, what is the price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It includes about all of it except $50,000. There was $50,000 voted last year, which was paid on account, and the balance will be taken out of this $400,000.

Mr. PRICE. What is the deep water wharf to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the plan sufficiently prepared to tell with accuracy. Something will depend on how far out we go, and what depth of water we get. My

own view would be that we should go out far enough to get a depth of 32 feet at low tide. That is what we should aim to get at all our ocean ports. Every year steamers of greater tonnage are arriving. I believe the time will come before long when we will have steamers crossing the Atlantic 1,000 feet in length; within ten years that may take place. Some of that size are already planned.

Mr. PRICE. What price was paid to the Bank of Montreal—as I believe the Bank of Montreal bought the property from Carrier, Lainé & Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Carrier Lainé property was expropriated, and we expect to pay $380,000 for it.

Mr. PRICE. I find in a Quebec paper that some one has sent me, a report that a syndicate has leased a part of this property, or the old shops that were there, and it mentions that the syndicate was composed of the Hon. S. N. Parent, Sir Charles Ross. M. P. Davis and others. May I ask if that is the case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is not so.

Quebec harbour—improvements at mouth of River St. Charles estuary, $280,000.

Mr. PRICE. I presume this item is to finish the extension from the embankment where the steamers now land?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not to finish it, but to continue it during the present year. The work is a very large one, if the whole plan is carried out to completion.

Mr. PRICE. There is a great deal of complaint in Quebec because we have not got the proper harbour improvements. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works when the government proposes to do more harbour improvements in Quebec. I do not know whether the minister is aware that, owing to lack of harbour facilities, no heavy pieces of iron can be landed at our wharf because there is no derrick sufficiently strong. Besides that, the wharf accommodation is altogether too limited. Up to the end of last year only two steamers could land their passengers at the same time. Several times this year, when two steamers desired to land their passengers, one had to anchor out in the stream and wait till the other one alongside the wharf was able to get away. I would like to know if the extension that will be carried out this year will give us room for three steamers to lie alongside each other at the same time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We recognize the fact that the accommodation for ocean steamers at Quebec is limited, and that is why this extensive work is being undertaken. My hon. friend asks when more accommodation will be given. We expect it will be given during the coming season, and that is what the appropriation of $280,000 is for. As the hon. gentleman is aware, there has already been constructed a concrete pier extending for a considerable distance into the St. Lawrence. Now we are building another pier around on the Charles river and dredging out a channel there—it is the return to the wharf. That will give considerable accommodation. The assistant deputy minister tells me that by July there will be accommodation there for three large ocean steamers at this new pier.

Mr. PRICE. I understand that the Grand Trunk Pacific will be finished within the next two or three years and if it carries the amount of grain that it is supposed to carry to Quebec I do not see that we have proper accommodation there to handle that trade. It will be necessary to continue the harbour improvements. I would like to know from the Minister of Public Works if the government will continue the policy of improving the harbour from Quebec up to Sillery and also what the policy is with regard to the terminal facilities; that is the railway line from the present site of the bridge to Quebec itself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question which my hon. friend is now asking is one which appertains to the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. PRICE. Will the minister answer the first part?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The whole of it belongs to the Department of Railways and Canals for the reason that the terminals of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway at Quebec will be a part of the Transcontinental Railway system. Therefore, it would not appertain to the Department of Public Works.

Mr. PRICE. How about the docks ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They would form part of the Transcontinental Railway system. I think that is the expectation; I am not prepared to say positively.

Mr. PRICE. That must be an enormous work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be a very large work. I may say to my hon. friend that the question of terminal facilities at Quebec has not been lost sight of by the government. We recognize that terminal facilities must be provided at the ocean ports and that it is desirable, if possible, to have them ready by the time the Transcontinental Railway is finished. The matter of terminals at Quebec is receiving, at the present time, very careful consideration, but just what will be done I am not prepared to say. If my hon. friend will repeat his question when the estimate respecting the Transcontinental Railway is under discussion I have no doubt my hon.

friend the Minister of Railways and Canals will be prepared to give him a satisfactory answer.

Mr. PRICE. In case the Minister of Railways and Canals finds that it does not come under the Transcontinental Railway, I suppose I will have an opportunity of asking the Minister of Public Works a question?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Red river improvements—St. Andrew's rapids, $600,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount is to continue the work of building the locks on the Red river. St. Andrew's Rapids on the Red river are about thirty miles north of Winnipeg. The expectation is that this will give lake navigation from this very extensive lake which is 300 miles in length, right to the city of Winnipeg. It is expected that $600,000 will be expended during the present year on locks and gates and that this will complete the work.

Mr. BRADBURY. Would the minister inform me whether that includes the bridge or not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would like to know whether there has been any arrangement made for the completion of the connection between the bridge and the highways? There are very important settlements on both sides of the river and I have a communication from the municipality of St. Andrew's calling my attention to the fact that the present contract does not provide for connection with the highways on both sides of the river. Consequently, the bridge would be useless as far as traffic is concerned. This is a very important matter to these people. During the late campaign a great deal was made of the fact all along the river that the government had provided the people there with a bridge that will cost $600,000 and which will be used for traffic purposes. The municipalities inform me that it has come out lately that the present contract does not provide for approaches to the bridge. Does the minister intend to carry out the wishes of the people in that respect?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In connection with the lock it will be necessary to have a service bridge. But, for the accommodation of the municipality the department decided to widen that bridge so that it could be used as a public highway. The view is held in the department that as the bridge is being provided for the accommodation of the municipality by way of widening our service bridge the very least we could ask the municipality to do would be to provide the approaches. There is no bridge at the present time, and there was no bridge there before this work was undertaken. It seems to me that if the government is willing to allow the people to use the bridge in connection with the lock and is going to the expense of widening it, the municipality, at the very least, ought to be prepared to bear the expense of the necessary approaches to the bridge. I have never been asked to provide the approaches, but I would suppose that the view which I now present is one which would commend itself to my hon. friend and to the people of the municipality and that they would not hesitate, where they are saving the cost of the building of a bridge which is ordinarily borne by the municipalities in Manitoba as well as in Ontario, although it is different in the province of New Brunswick where the provincial government builds all the bridges without any expense to the municipalities, to provide the approaches. My hon. friend says that the Liberal candidate promised that the government would build the approaches. I am not aware that any such promise has been made. There is in my department no record that any such promise was given to anybody.

Mr. BRADBURY. I am to understand then that the late candidate had no authority for promising that the bridge would be completed at both ends?

Mr. HUGHES. What candidate?

Mr. BRADBURY. Mr. S. J. Jackson, my opponent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware that he made any such promise.

Mr. BRADBURY. That promise was made by my opponent and during the campaign that was held out as an inducement all along the river why the electors should vote for Mr. Jackson. It was stated that the government had generously voted $600,000 to give them a bridge. There is a large settlement on the east side of the river.

Mr. PUGSLEY. $600,000 is not simply for the bridge; it is to complete the lock and dam.

Mr. BRADBURY. I think that the fact that they built the bridge increased the cost to $600,000 and it was represented that they would provide approaches for the accommodation of the people of St. Andrew's. This matter has been before the people for the last two years, the people expect that bridge and if the minister takes the position that they are not going to build it I want to know it.

Mr. BARNARD. May I ask the minister what this work is and what is contemplated as a result of it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work consists of the building of a lock with a movable dam

and all the necessary appliances. It is to overcome the St. Andrew's rapids, to give them navigation between Lake Winnipeg and the city of Winnipeg and is expected that it will enable vessels to navigate from Lake Winnipeg right up to the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. BARNARD. Are there any towns or cities of importance on Lake Winnipeg?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are some settlements but the information which is in the department is that Lake Winnipeg has, upon its shores, enormous quantities of wood which is useful for firewood, that there are minerals, that there are vast deposits of building stone and that Lake Winnipeg is teeming with fish. The business that is done there is enormous.

Mr. BRADBURY. It was teeming with fish at one time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am informed that there are large quantities there yet. There are also valuable deposits of minerals and of building stone on Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. BARNARD. Am I right in assuming from the minister's statement that this expenditure is intended to open up an undeveloped trade?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be to a large extent that.

Mr. BARNARD. Can the minister tell us the number and tonnage of vessels plying on Lake Winnipeg?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not that information with me. This is a matter that has been going on for a number of years. It is a matter of history that it was shown clearly to the government on behalf of the city of Winnipeg that the result of building this lock would given to the people firewood at a dollar per cord less than to-day, and as coal is very costly in Winnipeg they burn a good deal of wood for fuel. The timber on the shores of Lake Winnipeg suitable for fuel is almost illimitable so that to a city of 100,000 people this is a very important thing. I am sure that my hon. friend who represents that district will be able to testify to the great benefit that will result from the building of this lock.

Mr. BARNARD. The statement of the minister reminds me of a railway we have running into the city of Victoria which was subsidized by the city and the provincial government to the extent of $300,000. It runs two trains a day, the principal freight being cordwood and the express train on that line is known as the 'cordwood, limited.' It would almost appear that this expenditure of $600,000 is going to be for another cordwood, limited.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The fuel question in Winnipeg is too important to be laughed at.

Mr. BARNARD. I find that there is no appropriation in the estimates this year for harbour improvements in Victoria, British Columbia. I did notice in the estimates that there was an appropriation of $150,000 for 'Victoria Harbour,' and in the innocency of my guileless youth, and being a new member of parliament and being unaccustomed to the wiles of political life, I jumped to the conclusion that the government was going to continue the appropriation for the harbour of Victoria, British Columbia, last year when a sum of $60,000 for harbour improvements was voted. Not taking everything quite as a matter of course I made it my business to make inquiries from the Department of Public Works. I had representations from the city of Victoria asking me to see that if there was such an appropriation a certain portion of the money should be expended in a new rock drilling plant. I went to the department of Public Works and finding the deputy minister engaged I saw the assistant deputy minister, and we turned up this particular item in the estimates and I told him what constituency I represented, and through a misunderstanding, altogether bona fide both on his part and mine, I came away with the idea that the appropriation was for the city of Victoria, British Columbia.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And when you saw it three times as much as last year you were pleased?

Mr. BARNARD. Exactly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You thought your own city was the only city of that name in Canada?

Mr. BARNARD. I did not at first suspect it was for Victoria Harbour on the Georgian bay which I understand is a new port that is being opened. I would submit that it would be advisable in the interests both of Victoria, British Columbia, and also of a port called Victoria harbour in the county of Kings, New Brunswick, that this particular port in Ontario should take some other name so as to avoid confusion. The assistant deputy minister treated me with every courtesy and without any intention of misleading me he suggested that if the Harbour Association of Victoria, British Columbia, considered that a new dredging plant was necessary the best way to accomplish that would be to address a letter to the Minister of Public Works asking him to have the matter referred to the resident engineer for a report. I accordingly did so, and notwitstanding being a guileless politician and still having a shred of doubt in my mind I wrote to the Minister of Public Works and stated in the letter that I ob-

served that in the estimates there was an appropriation for Victoria of $150,000 for harbour improvements. I received a reply from the minister in which he clearly showed that he had no misrepresentation as to what particular city I was referring to because he wrote as follows:

I am in receipt of your letter of the 16th inst. having reference to the need of a new dredging plant in the harbour of Victoria, British Columbia, and will give your representations careful consideration.

On receipt of that letter all my doubts were set at rest. In the city of Victoria, British Columbia we have an association composed of the most prominent merchants of all shades of political opinion who are interested in the development of the harbour, called the Inner Harbour Association, and I informed the secretary of that association that there was an appropriation of $150,000 for Victoria Harbour. I have since, of course, explained how the error arose. Now, I wish to say a few words with regard to the justice of an appropriation for the harbour of Victoria, British Columbia. In the first place I may say that the secretary of this harbour association is a gentleman who up to the present time has worked for the improvement of that harbour practically without any remuneration whatever. Some years ago, he, at the request of the Department of Public Works furnished that department with a complete set of his plans as to the full development of that harbour, but unfortunately those plans were destroyed in the fire which burned the western block. However from time to time appropriations were made, very small appropriations it is true, in connection with the dredging work in the city of Victoria, but last year—I would not like to insinuate that the proximity of the election had anything to do with it—the city of Victoria was voted an appropriation of $60,000 for the dredging of its harbour. That was the first time in the history of that port, I think I am safe in saying, that it had received more than $10,000. That appropriation has not all been spent, $30,000 out of the $60,000 still remains unspent. The people of Victoria were allowed to suppose, I do not say it was distinctly stated but at any rate the people of Victoria had come to the conclusion that the scheme of development that had been outlined by the gentleman I mentioned and to whom the city of Victoria is so greatly indebted owing to his efforts on her behalf, had been adopted, and that the government were commencing on a scheme whereby they would, by the appropriation of a certain amount each year, in time complete the work in connection with that harbour. However, I find that this year there is no special appropriation for the city of Victoria.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is quite in error as to that.

Mr. BARNARD. I would like the hon. gentleman to correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman will find in the dredging vote an item for dredging for British Columbia, out of which the work will be carried on.

Mr. BARNARD. I said that there was no special vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And there being no special vote we can use the general vote.

Mr. BARNARD. There is a general vote for British Columbia. There is also a deputation from Vancouver asking for a very considerable appropriation in connection with dredging of the Narrows at the entrance to that harbour. Then a large amount of money is required for dredging in the Fraser river. A government dredge is coming from Germany and the impression is that the appropriation of $125,000 will not be sufficient to keep the government dredges in operation during the year, because in that province we are so favoured by climatic conditions that work can be continued for twelve months. In addition to that there is a large amount of work to be done in the Arrow lakes, at least the government have a dredge there, and I assume that they would not have it there unless it was necessary. The Minister of Public Works says there is an appropriation of $125,000 for general dredging in British Columbia. I am very glad to see that, but as compared with other provinces, particularly with the minister's province of New Brunswick, that the appropriation is insignificant. I notice that the minister's appropriation for dredging in St. John is $475,000, that is a special vote for St. John.

An hon. MEMBER. And that is not enough.

Mr. BARNARD. Possibly it is not enough, but if we are in times of financial stringency, as the Minister of Public Works tells us, then it is only fair that everybody should get a fair share, and the minister himself has stated to me this afternoon that he considers Victoria a most important port.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARNARD. I wish to quote a few figures to show the importance of Victoria in comparison, not with St. John alone, but with the other great ports of Canada. In the summary of the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, in the statement showing the number of tonnage of sea-going vessels, both steam and sail, entered and cleared from the following principal ports during the year, 1906-7 and 1908, it is stated that the sea-going tonnage of the various ports for 1908 was as follows:

Port.	Sea-going tonnage.
Victoria	2,695,987
Montreal	2,689,171
Halifax	2,054,406
Vancouver	2,045,243
St. John	1,859,157
Quebec	1,788,872

Thus Victoria has a tonnage 7,000 tons greater than that of Montreal and 800,000 tons greater than that of St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is that the tonnage of vessels or the tonnage of merchandise?

Mr. BARNARD. That is the tonnage of vessels.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That includes the daily passenger steamers.

Mr. BARNARD. I wish to be quite fair with the committee. I do not mean to contend that the city of Victoria compares with Montreal or Quebec or Halifax, in the amount of freight it handles, but I do say that the figures I have quoted are sufficient to show that both Victoria and Vancouver are cities of such importance in commerce that the Dominion government has no longer any right to ignore them in questions of national expenditure.

The tonnage I have quoted deals altogether with sea-going vessels. The figures in connection with the coasting trade are somewhat different. These figures are:

Port.	No. of Vessels.	Tonnage.
Montreal	8,111	3,901,000
Quebec	1,654	2,628,136
Victoria	4,953	1,525,445
Vancouver	8,522	1,324,714
Halifax	2,362	1,147,367
St. John	1,866	980,173

I am prepared to admit that St. John ships much more freight than either Victoria or Vancouver, but these figures are sufficient to show to any reasonable person that the ports of Victoria and Vancouver are just as deserving of consideration, notwithstanding the fact that they are in the little province of British Columbia—little in point of votes but big in area and importance—as are some of the ports in the maritime and other eastern provinces.

Again I would like to contrast, for the benefit of the committee, some of the expenditures in these ports for harbour works. The figures I am about to quote I have taken not from the blue-books, but from the Vancouver 'Province,' which quotes them as coming from the Ottawa 'Free Press,' a newspaper not unfavourable to the administration. This paper gives the figures from 1899 to 1908. I shall not weary the committee with the details but shall give the totals as follows: In the ports of Montreal and Quebec, Port Arthur, Fort William, Depot Harbour, Midland, Port Colborne, Kingston, Sydney, N.S., St. John harbour only and Halifax, there has been since 1899 an expenditure of $7,396,446. In the ports of Victoria and Vancouver, in the same length of time, there has been expended the magnificent sum of $256,178. I say that in all fairness, political affinities altogether on one side, the administration should make some appropriation not only for Victoria but also for Vancouver. Ocean steamship lines ply between there and Mexico, Australia, China, and California. In addition to these we have the China Mutual steamers coming in from Great Britain, we have tramp freight ships and we have also all the trade north to the Yukon and the northern ports of British Columbia. I plead for justice for the people of British Columbia. When you see $7,000,000 spent in ten years on the eastern ports and $250,000 in British Columbia, it is not surprising that such contrasts make the people of that province think that their position, so far as federal expenditure goes, is almost intolerable. When one sees an expenditure of $600,000 deliberately voted by this committee for the improvement of some rapids to connect a lake with the city of Winnipeg, where there is no shipping except an occasional prairie schooner, I submit that it is a most unreasonable expenditure. Unless the government can better regulate their expenditure they had better put the matter into the hands of somebody else.

Mr. BRADBURY. I am a little surprised at the remarks of my hon. friend from Victoria regarding the improvements at St. Andrew's rapids. I concur in what the minister says about the necessity of that work. It is of great necessity and is going to accomplish great good, not only for the city of Winnipeg, but for the town of Selkirk and the lake trade. I commend the expense, but I plead with the minister to complete the bridge. That bridge is in a locality where the municipalities are very poor and are absolutely unable to complete it. If the government does not complete it, it will lie there, and the money the government has expended on it will be wasted. I have been advised that it will take $75,000 to put in these two approaches. That is a sum away beyond the ability of these municipalities to contribute. During the campaign all the people along that river were led to believe that they were going to get that bridge, and I would ask the minister to try to arrange to complete it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to give him a hint that may be useful? In the province of New Brunswick the provincial government has built scores of steel bridges without calling on the federal government to contribute a cent. In Manitoba the provincial govern-

ment, I understand, does not aid the municipalities very much. Here is a case in which the federal government is widening this service bridge at some considerable expense to aid the municipalities, and it is not at all impossible, I suppose, if the attention of the provincial government of Manitoba were called to that fact, that it might be willing to co-operate with the federal government in the building of the bridge. I might also point to the fact that the government of Quebec and the government of New Brunswick are joining with this government in building a bridge across the Restigouche river at Metapedia, and that the Quebec government is also joining us in building a bridge across the Ottawa River at Chapeau. It is true, these are interprovincial bridges; but there is all the more reason why the government of Manitoba should contribute to this bridge which is wholly within the province of Manitoba. I do not say that there has been any determination arrived at by this government with regard to the approaches. The matter has not come before me in a formal way. When the hon. gentleman mentioned it I was rather surprised that the municipalities should expect us to build the approaches. At all events, the matter will be considered, but at the present moment I am not able to hold out very strong expectations to my hon. friend on that subject.

Mr. HUGHES. Are there not large areas of splendid land to the east of Lake Winnipeg ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand that there are valuable forests and therefore the soil must be good. Just a word with regard to the complaint which my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Barnard) has set up on behalf of that city. If my hon. friend had looked into what we are doing for British Columbia, I do not think that he would feel that he had ground for making that complaint. I recognize as strongly as he can the importance of the ports of Vancouver and Victoria and their claims upon the public treasury. At the last session of parliament, at the instance of the Hon. Mr. Templeman, who was then as now the representative of that province in the government, provision was made for improving the harbour. Considerable dredging work was done and at this very moment we have actively at work in the harbour of Victoria the dredge 'Mudlark' and the very powerful dredge recently constructed by the government, and a considerable part, if not all, of the appropriation which was made last session, will be expended before the close of the present fiscal year in doing the very work which my hon. friend thinks ought to be done in the harbour of Victoria.

Mr. BARNARD. The information I have received from the department was that only one half of the sum voted last year had been expended, and that the balance would lapse.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend was no doubt informed that that was the expense up to the 31st of December last. Since that time both dredges have been kept at work and will continue to work, and the appropriation will be used to pay for the work done to the end of the present month.

Mr. BARNARD. Will that exhaust the appropriation for last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably not entirely. If my hon. friend will turn to the item for dredging, he will find that we have put in $125,000 for dredging in British Columbia. With the new dredge brought from Germany, we shall have four at work in that province, the ' Fruhling,' the ' King Edward,' the 'Ajax' and the 'Mudlark.' These are all very important harbours. My hon. friend must not forget that the purchasing of these dredges by the government involves a very large expense. Of course, the operating expenses day by day will be very much less than the contract dredging in the eastern waters of Canada. You must not forget that we have brought from Germany—and I am glad to know that she has arrived safely in British Columbia after a voyage of 15,000 miles—a dredge which will be the best in Canada, with a capacity of 1,000 cubic yards per hour.

Mr. HUGHES. Of what nature?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A suction dredge.

Mr. CROCKET. What did she cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The price was $250,000, delivered in British Columbia. We do not pay a dollar until she is delivered and tested and found perfect. I think it is a splendid investement for Canada and will be of special advantage to British Columbia. We have also the ' Ajax,' which was built in Toronto. In these we have two of the finest dredges that the government has yet obtained, and both will operate in British Columbia.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the ' Ajax ' a suction dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, a dipper dredge.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $125,000. She has an eight-yard dipper, but, of course, her capacity is much less than the other.

Mr. HUGHES. How deep will the 'Ajax' dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think 35 or 40 feet. We shall continue dredging Victoria harbour. My attention has been called by a gentleman from Victoria, as well as by the Minister of Inland Revenue to the ne-

cessity of doing rock blasting. Certain blasting was done last year, and by means of the 'Ajax,' we have carried away the material so blasted. We propose to improve the entrance to a depth sufficient to accommodate the steamers that come in to the inner harbour. So far as Vancouver is concerned, the government is pleased, as I am sure the members of this House are, to know that Vancouver is growing with amazing rapidity. I was glad to learn from the Vancouver delegation who waited upon me that in False creek alone, during the last year, there entered 600,000 tons of merchandise. This indicates marvellous progress. Vancouver is evidently destined to be one of the largest cities in Canada, equalling before many years, in all human probability, the city of Montreal. We feel it our duty to make the harbour of Vancouver safe. Until recently it was regarded as safe—a splendid harbour. But ships are growing larger, the number of vessels entering Burrard inlet and going through the narrows is increasing, and the traffic is becoming congested and therefore dangerous. I have ordered a complete survey of the narrows, of Parthia shoal and another shoal there in order to learn what is necessary for the improvement of the harbour. When that survey is made we hope there will be little delay in the dredging to widen the narrows and remove the shoals and make Vancouver perfectly safe for the largest steamships. We must accommodate the traffic in False creek, and I have given directions that, as early as possible—and I trust the delay will not be very great—one of the dredges we have now in British Columbia waters should be put to work to deepen the entrance to False creek and make perfectly safe that part of the harbour of Vancouver. We expect to keep our dredges going during the present season, and the interest of Vancouver and Victoria will be well looked after. The necessity for these works has been strongly pressed upon us by my hon. colleague the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman, and attention will be given to his representations. We have another great work in British Columbia, the improvement of the Fraser river. It was especially for this that the 'Fruhling' dredge has been purchased . At New Westminster there are very large lumber mills, and up the Fraser river are vast areas of splendid forest growth. The quantity of timber coming down the Fraser is enormous, but it is but little compared with what will come down in the almost immediate future. We plan to make the Fraser river from New Westminster to the sea a ship channel for the very largest ocean steamers which come to British Columbia. We shall proceed with these works as rapidly as finances will permit—of course we must have regard to the revenue. But hon. members who represent British Columbia and the people of that province can rely upon the government as being alive to the necessity of improving the Fraser and the harbours of Victoria and Vancouver as well as Nanaimo and other harbours along the coast.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not think the minister (Mr. Pugsley) has any intention of giving a false impression, but he expressed regret that the Manitoba government is doing so little for the municipalities. I wish to tell him that the Manitoba government is doing all it can for the municipalities. And the fact that this government has seen fit to send into that country a large settlement along Lake Winnipeg, placing the people on land utterly unfit for them to live on, has entailed a large expenditure upon the Manitoba government. Last year the government spent $10,000 or $15,000 in grading the land west of Lake Winnipeg. I have always found the Manitoba government willing to do anything that could help the people. The revenue of the province is not large, and if this government would give the province of Manitoba what belongs to it I do not think there would be any trouble. I do not feel that I have any case to go to the provincial government with for they could not afford at the present time the expenditures necessary to make the approaches at the ends of the bridge. I would urge this government to take up this matter and implement the pledges made during last election by the candidate.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. What will be the total cost of this bridge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the cost of the bridge separate from that of the rest of the work. For the electrical machinery, the bridge and other steel work, machine shops, repair shops and movable dam, the total cost was something like $540,000. That was the contract price.

Mr. ROCHE. How much was the cost of this work at the St. Andrew's rapids increased by reason of the changes in the specifications? I understand there was a change of contractors, and a change in the specifications. Can the minister say why the original contractor was released, the amount of money he received, and the increased cost by reason of the change in specifications?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That took place some four years ago or more. I think I gave that information last session, and the hon. gentleman will find it in 'Hansard', I think the contract was given to Kelly Bros., they were unable to carry on the work, and it was decided to make some changes. My information is that after the contract was let to Kelly Bros., in July, 1900, in

view of the slow progress made, also of the abnormally high prices specified, and the chief engineer being unwilling to apply to additional works those schedule prices, authority was granted to the Minister of Public Works to proceed no further with the construction as originally designed, but to close the contract, return the security deposited by the contractors, and pay for the work done. They made a claim for $246,000 for work done, which was cut down considerably. I think there was an arbitration, and an award was made to the contractors for $137,911.

Mr. BRADBURY. What was the entire cost of the improvements at the Rapids?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will cost probably a million and a quarter dollars before they are entirely completed.

St. John harbour improvements, $475,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the minister state how he proposes to expend this money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amount will be expended in building the wharf extension on the western side of the harbour, also in dredging work.

Mr. DANIEL. Will any of this be expended in Courtenay bay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure as to that, that will depend upon certain action which might be taken by the Grand Trunk Pacific in fixing their terminals in the maritime provinces, and the exact location of their terminal at St. John. The Grand Trunk Pacific have told me that Courtenay bay is the only place where they can establish a terminal at St. John.

Mr. DANIEL. What will the minister do with these contracts which he has already let, or said he let last fall, for dredging in Courtenay bay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister did not state he had let any contracts for dredging in Courtenay bay. The hon. gentleman is drawing upon his imagination.

Mr. DANIEL. I will quote from the minister himself. On the 21st of October last there is a report in the 'Daily Telegraph' of a speech he made at Little River, in the course of which he said:

As a result of the operations carried on——

He is refering to borings and other things done at Courtenay bay.

—it will be possible to dredge out a channel 800 feet wide so that large steamers can dock there and carry away the produce that will be brought there by the Transcontinental Railway. This is one of the most splendid discoveries ever made in the city of St. John. It is better than a diamond mine, because a diamond mine gives out in time, but this will be more valuable to the city from year to year, and will provide work for hundreds of people. I have asked for tenders for carrying on this great work, and it will be commenced shortly.

Further on he says:

In view of that vote——

He is referring to the vote that was given here twelve months ago.

—I am authorized by law to call for tenders and to let the contract and ask parliament for appropriations.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman said I had stated that I had let contracts for the work. The hon. gentleman has not shown it yet.

Mr. DANIEL. This is in the hon. gentleman's own paper, called the 'County News,' and in it is published a plan of Courtenay bay, the works which are said to have been planned, the projected new wharfs, and dredging to the west side of Courtenay bay, as prepared by his own engineer, Louis Coste, of the Public Works Department, and it says:

This is the plan of the harbour works proposed by the Department of Public Works at Ottawa. A contract for dredging ten million cubic yards of material in the harbour of St. John has just been awarded by Hon. William Pugsley, and work will be commenced at once.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Whose statement is that?

Mr. DANIEL. I presume the minister is responsible. It is spread out in his own paper. Not content with the five daily papers which were supporting him in St. John he had to go to work and issue another. I think it was issued weekly. But here is the statement, and it is in thick, heavily leaded lettering. That was spread abroad through the constituency. I think it was never denied by the Minister of Public Works. He took every advantage of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister stated exactly what had taken place.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that statement I read just now a true statement or not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman will ask me what took place I will be very glad to inform him.

Mr. DANIEL. I will read it again to the hon. gentleman and ask him if it is true:

This is the plan of the harbour works proposed by the Department of Public Works at Ottawa. A contract for dredging 10,000,000 cubic yards of material in the harbour of St. John has just been awarded by the Hon. William Pugsley and work will be commenced at once.

I will ask the minister if that is a true statement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the hon. gentleman is through I will make a statement.

Mr. DANIEL. I will allow the minister to interrupt me to the extent of saying whether that is a true statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I stated in St. John exactly what was the case. My hon. friend will remember that he was very sceptical about the possibility of dredging Courtenay bay?

Mr. DANIEL. Never.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman informed the electors that it would take fifty years to do it.

Mr. DANIEL. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not the hon. gentleman remember that I was calling attention to the fact that he was counting time at the rate of progress in the old days of Conservative rule when 100 years was about equal to ten years at the present time, and when 50 years was about equal to five years of progress under the present administration. For the information of my hon. friend, who has apparently been misinformed, very grievously, I would say that what I told the electors was that at the last session of parliament there was a vote for harbour improvements at St. John, and that Courtenay bay, being part of the harbour of St. John, it gave me authority for calling for tenders for dredging at Courtenay bay as well as on the western side of the harbour. I stated that I had called for tenders for dredging.

Mr. CROCKET. And had you called for tenders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I had. I stated that I had received tenders for the work and I also stated that I had recommended to my colleagues the acceptance of the lowest tenders and that the matter was then before council.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister stated just now that I had made quite a number of statements during the election in regard to the great length of time that it would take to dredge Courtenay bay. I am quite aware that the minister made these statements and that his press repeated them, and I am also aware that I never made the statements. That is one of the many statements made in the interest of and possibly by my hon. friend that were not accompanied with that amount of virile veracity which we expect to find in a minister of the Crown.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What particular description of veracity is virile veracity?

Mr. DANIEL. Except possibly during election time. We always allow a little leeway at that time. I have no doubt that if I could get through this speech I would find the statement that tenders had been accepted for this work. At all events they are in the minister's own paper, the 'County News.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not the minister's own paper.

Mr. DANIEL (reading).

We are doing a lot of work on the Mission river, we are spending millions on dredging and we intend asking the government to carry out this work here.

That is the Courtenay Bay work. Perhaps the minister will tell us if he has asked the government to do that and whether it is the intention of the government, through the department of Public Works, to go on with this Courtenay Bay work and carry it to completion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very glad. I have myself represented to my colleagues in the government the desirability of going on with this work subject to the proviso that an arrangement is come to with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for the use of Courtenay Bay for their terminals. Of course, without a perfect understanding with regard to that, I could not expect my colleagues to go on with that work, but I may say for the information of my hon. friend, and I am sure that he will be gratified to learn it, that the Grand Trunk Pacific have assured me that they regard Courtenay bay as being well adapted for terminal facilities.

Mr. HUGHES. In writing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. When did the minister get that assurance?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Last fall. They were extremely gratified to find that the result of the borings which were instituted by my department jointly with the city of St. John and the provincial government showed that Courtenay bay, which most people supposed rested upon solid rock, simply consisted of a great deposit of silt and sand, so that we could get by easy dredging a depth of 32 feet of water at low tide. They were extremely gratified to find that that was the case, and they have given to me the assurance that they regard Courtenay bay as most eminently suitable for laying out their terminals on a broad and comprehensive scale. My hon. friend can well understand that a matter of this great importance will take time to mature. All I can say is that the matter is before council, but what conclusion council will arrive at I am unable to say.

Mr. DANIEL. That is the stand that I rather took during the election and that is the stand which the minister rather poked fun at me for taking. It was not a question of wait then; he said that it was absolutely necessary to do the work at once, that it

would not do to wait till the Grand Trunk Pacific was right at hand in coming to St. John. Am I correct in understanding that the minister gives the information to us to-night that he does not propose to go on with the Courtenay bay work this summer ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not immediately—no.

Mr. CROCKET. I understand the minister to state that he had asked for tenders for the dredging in Courtenay bay ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. And that none of the tenders had been accepted. Would the minister explain why the tenders were not accepted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The tenders were not accepted as far as the Courtenay bay is concerned. They were accepted as to the other part of the harbour. They were not accepted as far as Courtenay bay is concerned because the government are not prepared at this moment to proceed with the work.

Mr. CROCKET. But notwithstanding that the minister felt justified in asking for tenders for that work while the election was going on?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, at the time he did.

Mr. CROCKET. For a work that the government now admit they are not justified in proceeding with. I would like to know what the tenders amounted to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The lowest tender for dredging in Courtenay bay and also for a part of the western side of the harbour was 35 cents per cubic yard, and if the dredging in Courtenay bay were done by hydraulic dredge and the materials were deposited behind the revetment wall it would be 25 cents per cubic yard; for a portion of the dredging in the western side of the harbour at the bar the price is 50 cents per cubic yard and 35 cents for the other portion. The whole dredging work has been fixed at 39½ cents per cubic yard. The next tender was the same, 39½ cents, so that so far as Courtenay bay is concerned and so far as a portion of the western side is concerned the tender was somewhat higher. The next tender was some 74 cents or 75 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the value of the tender moneyed out on the quantity of dredging in Courtenay bay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be $2,000,000 by hydraulic work at 25 cents. If it were by the ordinary dredging it would be more.

Mr. CROCKET. Do I understand the minister to state that he asked for tenders for $2,000,000 worth of work which the government now says they are not justified in proceeding with?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I used no such expression as not justified ; I said the government did not intend to proceed immediately with that work.

Mr. CROCKET. I understood the minister to state that the government now felt they were not justified in proceeding with a work of that magnitude.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I don't think I used such an expression.

Mr. CROCKET. Well the fact is that the government is not proceeding with it; notwithstanding that the minister called for tenders for work that will involve an expense of $2,000,000 on the basis of the lowest tenders. Had he the authority of an order in council to do that or did he do that upon his own responsibility as minister?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On his own responsibility and under the authority of the Appropriation Act of last session.

Mr. CROCKET. When were these tenders asked for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was some time last September.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that the nearest the minister can go to it? I would like to know the exact date.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get it for you later.

Mr. EMMERSON. Assuming that this work was to cost $2,000,000 was it intended that it should be done within this year or would it cover a number of years?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That work would be extended over some six or seven years.

Mr. CROCKET. Then it ought to be good for another election.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister must be mistaken with regard to that because last year he stated that the Grand Trunk Pacific trains would be in St. John in September, 1912, and he was urging this work along so that there might be accommodation for the grain when the Grand Trunk Pacific trains arrive there. In view of that must we not look askance at some of the promises which the minister may make before the next election comes round?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman does not realize that a great deal of accommodation can be given before the scheme is finally completed, just the same as on the west side.

Mr. CROCKET. Can the minister say what was the latest date for the reception of these tenders

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was some time in October.

Mr. HUGHES. Before the 26th?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. Were these tenders accompanied by a certified cheque?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. I suppose the cheque was returned?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, because the contract was let for a part of the work.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister the advertisement there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not.

Mr. DANIEL. What is paid to the dredging company for the work they are doing now below the Beacon bar?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 39½ cents per cubic yard; it is the lowest that work has ever been done for in the port of St. John.

Mr. DANIEL. I believe it is. Have you inspectors on that dredging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, not only the resident engineer, but inspectors as well.

Mr. DANIEL. Who compose this dredging company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know; Mr. Moore is the president of it.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that 'Mr. John E. Moore?'

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that the man that was associated with the minister in the purchase of the 'Telegraph' newspaper?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That's a poser.

Mr. CROCKET. You have no answer to give to that?

Tiffin harbour—improvements, $125,000.

Mr. WRIGHT. How much has been spent at Tiffin to date and what is the total cost of the dredging there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had last year an appropriation of $125,000 and we expended up to the 1st of December $119,080.

Mr. WRIGHT. What will be the total cost of the dredging there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is pretty difficult to say what the total will be, but it will probably run up in the vicinity of half a million dollars when completed. We intend if possible by the 1st of October next to have the dredging done so that the lake steamers can go right up to the Grand Trunk Pacific elevator. There will be other work to do for a number of years afterwards. The Grand Trunk Pacific is laying out its terminals there and they propose accommodating about 10,000,000 bushels of grain.

Mr. HUGHES.

Mr. WRIGHT. I want to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that while the Trent valley canal is not being carried out by his department, yet I presume that the work at the west end lying almost at this place which is necessary to accommodate the large vessels which will come there will be undertaken by the Public Works Department. Is he making any provision to be ready for that when the work is completed? Large vessels will have to come there to the mouth of that canal. Is the minister making any provision in order to be ready for them when the canal is completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The matter has been under consideration.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Railways assured me to-day that the point at which the canal shall enter the Georgian bay has not yet been determined. Surveys were made by both the Severn and Nottawasaga rivers and the minister has undertaken to notify me before any decision is come to in order that I may have a deputation wait on him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Notwithstanding that it may be wise for us to think the matter over.

Mr. LENNOX. I hope the minister is not taking it over in any very definite way until we know which is to be the outlet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has been suggested that the canal boats would be taken care of in the two harbours of Midland and Tiffin.

Mr. LENNOX. That would be on the assumption, which I hope is not justified yet, that the Severn route is adopted.

Mr. HUGHES. The elevator at Tiffin is being built not by the government, but by the Grand Trunk Railway. They are doubling their track from Midland and Tiffin to meet the main line. This elevator is not for canal barges, but for the purposes of the Grand Trunk Railway, and the government are doing this work at Victoria harbour where the Canadian Pacific Railway are putting in their works and at Tiffin to meet the wishes of the railway company by giving good accommodation for vessels.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is right.

Mr. BRADBURY. Has the minister any complaint from the settlers around Lac du Bonnet in reference to a bridge built by the city of Winnipeg which is said to be much too low so that at high water there is only about three feet between the water and the bridge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A report has been asked for by the resident engineer.

Victoria harbour improvements, $150,000.

Mr. BARNARD. Can the government make some change in the name of that harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Victoria harbour has been selected by the Canadian Pacific Railway and I do not know whether there would be any objection to changing the name or not. The matter may be worth considering.

Mr. HUGHES. It is an old Ontario post office.

Mr. BARNARD. Would the minister give some assurance that he will endeavour to use his influence with the Canadian Pacific Railway or the post office authorities to have some change made, as it will lead to confusion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is said that a rose by any other name will smell as sweet.

Mr. BARNARD. Then why not Victoria harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Possibly; I will think it over.

Mr. LENNOX. Would the minister think of changing the name of Victoria, B.C.?

Mr. BARNARD. If my hon. friend wishes to discuss that I am prepared to go on. Victoria is the capital of British Columbia; it is the oldest city there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not seek to disturb the name of Victoria, British Columbia.

Mr. HUGHES. The town of Victoria Harbour is a very old one and I doubt if they would consent to have it changed.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is where Champlain landed when he went up there 300 years ago. It is possibly one of the oldest places in Canada, much older than Victoria, British Columbia. How much has been spent in Victoria Harbour and what does the minister estimate the total cost to be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We estimate the total cost at between $300,000 and $400,000.

Mr. HUGHES. You will spend a million there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Possibly so, but not immediately. Let us proceed with the Nova Scotia items.

Mr. HUGHES. A number of Nova Scotia members understood that these items would not be reached to-night and I ask the minister to adjourn the committee.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The Nova Scotia items are very small, only about $270,000. We have passed about $2,500,000 in the last 15 or 20 minutes, and some of the Nova Scotia members like myself would like to finish this to-night.

Mr. HUGHES. I would ask the minister to reconsider his decision and not go on with these items to-night.

Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, $279,310.

Mr. HUGHES. I would again ask the Minister of Public Works to adjourn. I think we have done very well to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We might as well go on for an hour.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would like to suggest that we have done enough work for to-night. I do not think it is fair that we should be asked to vote large sums of money, or anything, at this time of night. We are here to do business in a business-like way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is not a single new item in this book.

Mr. HUGHES. If we had dreamed that the minister was going on and was not going to conclude with the items we have just passed, a number of them would have been criticised very much more closely.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure that I gave no such information.

Mr. RHODES. The hon minister has intimated that because there are no new items in the estimates for Nova Scotia, they should go through quickly. With deference I would say that to my mind at least that is one reason why it will take some time to get these items through. So far as the county of Cumberland is concerned, there are two items which look very lonely—one for $2,000 and one for $1,000; whereas in the estimates of last year there were seventeen items for that county, aggregating $40,000, and it will be my duty to inquire why and wherefore the difference between the items of this year and those of last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be happy to give all the information to-night.

Mr. PRICE. This is very unfair. We have done our best to pass the estimates to-day, and I think it is very unfair to ask us to go on at this hour of the night.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member for Lunenburg has stated that within a few minutes we have passed upwards of $2,000,000. The minister says that there was no understanding that we should rise when these items were through. Although there was no actual understanding, the idea was, I believe, in the minds of all of us, that the minister would act reasonably with us if we acted fairly with him. It is now twenty minutes to one o'clock, and it has recently been impressed upon the minds of all of us that we have been sitting altogether too late. There is not only the item to be considered, but members who would like to take part in the discussion

of these items are absent, and therefore I think the minister should not insist on our going on at this time. We have done a good day's work, we have been reasonable in passing as many items as we have done, and I hope the minister will agree to let the committee rise.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have nothing to complain of in regard to my hon. friends on the other side. I told some gentlemen that the estimates for Nova Scotia would be up to-night.

Mr. HUGHES. Suppose we pass the first, the second and the fourth items, and then adjourn.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very well.

Some resolutions reported.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HUGHES. Any government business on Monday?

Mr. FIELDING. Monday is a private members' day

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 8, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS.

Mr. G. E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon) moved:

That the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, presented on the 5th inst., be now concurred in.

He said: On Friday last when this report was presented, the hon. leader of the opposition made some inquiry as to whether any undertaking would be required from the promoters of the Bill. I have received from the clerk of the Committee on Standing Orders the following memorandum:

The House might be informed that the clerk of the Railway Committee, in the case of special reports being made by the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders in connection with notices found defective, usually directs the attention of the chairman of the former committee, and I presume the same course will be followed in the present case when the Bill comes up for consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The memorandum contains some information which is of value, but I would not be inclined to regard it as wholly satisfactory. It is merely a statement of the clerk's view as to the observance of the usual practice, which I do not think is sufficient. The chairman of the Railway Committee should inform the House that when this matter comes before that committee, he will see that the notice is in order. That is all we require.

Mr. McCRANEY. I may say that since receiving that memorandum from the clerk of the Committee on Standing Orders, I saw Mr. Hartney, and he tells me that he takes note of all matters that come before the Standing Orders Committee, which have to receive special attention, and he satisfies himself that all the requirements have been complied with before they are taken up by the Railway Committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the chairman of the Railway Committee will give me an assurance that will be satisfactory.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The practice, I may say, is that the clerk of the Railway Committee notes any objections or omissions that have been made in compliance with the standing orders or rules, and before any Bill is presented the irregularities have to be waived or the formalities complied with. Otherwise the Bill is not proceeded with.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These are brought to the attention of the committee?

Mr. GUTHRIE. To the attention, not of the committee, but of myself as chairman, and the Bill is not presented to the committee unless the formalities are complied with.

Motion agreed to.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Frederick Tennyson Congdon, Esq., for the electoral district of the Yukon territory.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 93) representing patents of Ammonal Explosives (1908), Limited.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 94), respecting the Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Company.—Mr. Boyer.

Bill (No. 95) to incorporate the Royal Guardians.—Mr. Lachance.

Bill (No. 96), respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Bill (No. 98), to amend the Exchequer Court Act.—Mr. Aylesworth.

Bill (No. 99), to amend the Railway Act.—Mr. Conmee.

THE INSURANCE ACT.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 97) respecting Insurance. He said: Mr. Speaker: This Bill is to a very large extent the Bill which was presented to the House last session and held over for further consideration. It is not, however, the same in all respects. The Bill of last year was the subject of a protracted hearing and inquiry before the committee on Banking and Commerce, during which many suggestions were offered by way of amendment. We have had the benefit of that inquiry, and the benefit of the further study which has been had of the Bill in consequence of the delay; and with the better light which has come to us we have endeavoured to make some improvements in the Bill. I shall call the attention of the House to the points in which the Bill differs materially from that of last year. We do not make any change in the existing law with respect to the assessment insurance companies. A proposal in relation to these institutions was made in the Bill of last year; but even if we had gone on with that Bill, that proposal, as was stated at the time, would have been withdrawn.

The principal companies engaged in that line of business represented to us that they recognized the necessity for strengthening their position, that they were going about it in their own way and desired to be left to themselves for that purpose. We are aware that efforts are being made in that direction and so we do not propose in this Bill to make any change in the existing law with respect to these organizations. Probably the question of investments is the one which engaged the most attention before the committee last year. We have made some changes with respect to the provisions on that subject to which I shall invite the attention of the House. Section 60 of the new Bill will read:

> Any life insurance company which derives its corporate powers, or any of them, from an Act of the parliament of Canada, or which is within the legislative power of the parliament of Canada, may invest its funds, or any portion thereof, in the purchase of—
>
> (a) The debentures, bonds, stocks, or other securities of or guaranteed by the government of the Dominion of Canada, or of or guaranteed by the government of the United Kingdom, or of any colony or dependency thereof, or of or guaranteed by the government of any foreign country, or state forming a portion of such foreign country, wherein the company carries on or is about to carry on business, provided the Treasury Board has signified its approval of such securities, or of any municipal or school corporation in Canada, or elsewhere where the company is carrying on business.

That is substantially the same as in the Bill of last year.

Subsection (b) 1 includes among the securities in which a company may invest

> The bonds of any company which bonds are secured by a mortgage to trustees or a trust corporation, or otherwise, upon real estate or other assets of such company.

The former Bill required that these bonds should be outstanding for at least five years. In the present Bill we have dropped the time condition; if the bonds are secured by mortgage they are deemed to be good and may be used as a field for investment. The former Bill restricted these bonds to the bonds of a corporation incorporated in a country in which the insurance company was carrying on business. We have, after the discussion which has taken place, removed that restriction. Subsection 2 of subsection (b) reads:

> The debentures or other evidences of indebtedness of any Company, which has been doing business for a term of not less than five years prior to the date of such investments, provided default shall not have been made by such company in the interest payments upon its debentures or other evidences of indebtedness within the said period of five years prior to such investment.

In the former Bill it was required that such debentures should be of seven years' standing. In the present Bill we apply the time limit not to the debentures but to the standing of the company which issues the debentures. If a company is of five years' standing and has made no default it is presumed that its debentures may be treated as good.

Subsection 3 of subsection (b) reads:

> The preferred or guaranteed stocks of any company which has paid regular dividends upon such stocks or upon its common stocks for not less than five years preceding the purchase of such preferred or guaranteed stocks.

Last year's Bill provided that such stocks should have paid 4 per cent for seven years. The present year drops the 4 per cent condition and provides that the company shall have paid regular dividends for five years on this class of stock but does not specify the rate. The argument is that this is a high class of stock which may in some instances not pay as much as 4 per cent, and that it is not wise to insist upon the 4 per cent rate.

Subsection 4 of subsection (b) reads:

> The common stocks of any such company upon which regular dividends of at least 4 per cent have been paid for the seven years next preceding the purchase of such stocks: Provided that not more than 20 per cent of the common stocks and not more than 20 per cent of the total issue of the stocks of any company shall be purchased by any such life insurance company, and that no company shall be permitted to invest in its own shares

or in the shares of another life insurance company.

Last year's Bill provided that the common stock should have paid at least five per cent dividends for ten years. The present Bill recognizes the stock as good if it has paid four per cent for seven years.

There is a proviso here as to the percentage of money which may be invested in the securities of any one company. The object of that was to provide that the company should not create a subsidiary company and obtain a controlling interest in it. It was found, however, that the words of the clause seemed to be too broad, and we have now amended it. Last year's Bill limited the investment to twenty per cent of all the stocks or securities of the company. In the present Bill we are distinguishing between the stocks and bonds and our proviso is that the investment may not exceed twenty per cent of the stocks of any company, but we leave the company free to invest in the bonds if they are deemed to be good security.

Subsections (c) and (d) of this clause recognize ground rents or mortgages on real estate, and life and endowment policies as proper subjects for investment, but these are not changes and it is not necessary to say anything concerning them.

A question arose as to what action should be taken respecting any investments of a company in securities which might not come within the new law. Provision was made that in the case of securities not recognized by the new Bill the securities should be disposed of within a certain time. We have changed that to provide that where the investments were made in securities which at the time of their purchase were legal and proper the company shall be free to dispose of them at such time as it may find most convenient. In the case of securities which, at the time of their purchase were not strictly within the terms of the old Insurance Act—this applies in one or two instances—provision is made that such securities shall be disposed of within a period of five years.

A question which has received great attention in the discussion of insurance matters is the expenses of management. In the last Bill provision was made for a limitation of the expense on new business, and at one stage it seemed that such a provision was called for, if not by what had occurred in Canada by the developments in other countries. In the investigations abroad great importance was attached to this question but when it came to be discussed with insurance men here before the committee it was urged that it would be exceedingly difficult to apply a limitation of that kind without interfering with the volume of insurance. It was held that the proposed limitation would so hamper the insurance agents that they would not be able to make a respectable income and would not enter the field, so that there would be a falling off in the amount of insurance, which is not desirable, because we all feel that the encouragement of life insurance is a good thing. We have inserted a provision in the present Bill not to put any limitation on the expense of new business particularly but to provide a limitation upon the expenses generally. If this proviso were not qualified, it might prove a great handicap to new companies. The expenses of management of a new company are necessarily greater in proportion than the expenses of an old company with a large volume of business, so we propose that the limitation of expenses shall apply to old companies which have a standing of fifteen years, or to any company so soon as it comes to the age of fifteen years, and that in the case of new companies to be incorporated hereafter, this limitation shall begin when they have had ten years of existence. Last year's Bill required that the returns should show the expense of new business separate from ordinary business. Such a division has been found difficult and we have dropped this provision and substituted one providing for a return of what is technically called a gain and loss exhibit which it is thought might to some extent serve the same purpose. Last year's Bill proposed that each class of insurance should be dealt with in a separate policy.

This year's Bill continues that provision, with, however, this qualification,—that accident and sickness insurance may be deemed as practically one, and these two may be included in one policy.

There is a provision with regard to what I may call the exchange of securities; that is to say where a company is required by the terms of the proposed legislation to dispose of securities within a given time, it may be found convenient that they should exchange these securities for some others which, while not coming within the class approved by the Bill, would still be desirable securities and of a better class than those now held by the company. The conditions are somewhat exceptional, and we think it well to make a provision which will meet those conditions.

There is a provision that no life insurance company shall loan any of its funds to any director, shareholder, officer or clerk thereof. That should not be held to interfere with the ordinary loan to any policy-holder who is entitled to receive it, merely because he is an officer of the company. Possibly this clause needs to be made a little clearer on that point.

With regard to the election of directors by the shareholders and the policy-holders. some of the companies now provide for policy-holders' directors. It is proposed that there shall be a general law in that

respect, and that all life insurance companies, shall provide for their policy-holders, as well as for their shareholders, having directors. It was represented to us before the committee that a few people might possibly acquire the power of directors and bring about hasty, radical changes in the management, a thing that certainly would not be desirable. To guard against this, it is proposed to provide that a certain number shall retire annually, so that there shall not be, at any time, a radical change in the directorate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the proportion of policy-holders' directors?

Mr. FIELDING. The same number of each; policy-holders and shareholders have an equal number of directors, and two of each class retire every year. In the Bill of last year it was provided that proxies should be recognized. This is continued, with the proviso that proxies shall not be good for more than three months.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will a shareholder be eligible as a policy-holders' director?

Mr. FIELDING. No, every director must be chosen from his own class.

Mr. HENDERSON. But a shareholder may be also a policy-holder. What I desire to ask is whether a shareholder will be eligible as a policy-holders' director? No shareholder should be eligible for that position.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the provision of the Bill. Provision is made that a company may withdraw itself from Dominion jurisdiction. A case has arisen recently of a company that has a Dominion license, but wishes to confine its business to one province only, and so desires to withdraw its Dominion deposit and have it transferred to the Insurance Department of the province. There seems to be no objection to such a procedure, but we have no machinery in the Insurance Act to deal with it, and we propose to insert a clause granting that power.

Now, a question that was brought to the notice of the committee last year is that of publicity. It was urged by the representatives of the companies that some of the restrictions proposed to be placed upon them were not necessary, but that the best guarantee the public could have was adequate publicity. One of the features we inserted in the Bill was that the returns should show the sums received by any officer or agent of the company in excess of a moderate amount—that is, in excess of $4,000. It was presumed that the ordinary life insurance agent, the great bulk of them, would receive less than that amount, and that, though a limited number might receive a larger sum, there would not be any trouble in providing a return of that character. It is but fair to say that we were not aware of any serious difficulty having occurred in Canada in relation to that point, though it is well known that one of the abuses shown up in the investigation in the United States was that very large sums were paid to officers of the company. Our contention is that if any such large sum be paid for good and sufficient reason, the public should be made aware of the fact through the return. It was, however, pointed out to us that such a return, when made public, might be misleading, inasmuch as many of the insurance agents have to pay their subagents, and therefore the amounts that might be placed opposite their names would not represent their own earnings, but only money that had passed through their hands. We continue the clause in the Bill, with the proviso, however, that, wherever the agent referred to us in receipt of money which he has in part to pay to subagents, that shall be indicated by a remark in the return, so that those who read will be made aware that the amount received by the agent is not entirely for himself.

A change is made in the tables used for the valuation of policies. The table in use for many years was what is known as the Hm. table of the Institute of Actuaries of Great Britain. A more modern table is the British Offices Life Table which has come into more general use. It is proposed to adopt this table.

We have added another part to the Bill, part 5, for the purpose of including in the Act a number of the clauses which are to be found in the Companies' Clauses Act, which, as hon. members who have had experience in the Banking and Commerce Committee know, are frequently referred to, a common provision in a private Bill being that such and such clauses of the Companies' Clauses Act shall apply and others shall not apply. That is often confusing. We propose to import into this Bill all the clauses of the Companies' Clauses Act that are useful for the purposes of insurance companies. We have added a form of model Bill, which it is hoped will be adopted, and will facilitiate the insurance legislation of the future. So many things have been carried into the charters of companies that sometimes they become embarrassing. We have thought it best that everything should be gathered into one Bill, and then a company's charter should be, as bank charters are, a simple measure.

The Bill is a somewhat lengthy one, comprising, including the schedule, 94 pages. It is to be remembered, however, that it is not quite so ponderous as it seems, for the bulk of it is merely a consolidation of the existing law.

I propose, at an early day, after the Bill is in the hands of hon. members—as it will

be immediately—to move the second reading and ask that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. It has been suggested by an hon. member who is much interested in this measure, that we could effectively deal with it by appointing a small sub-committee of the Banking and Commerce Committee to consider it. That commends itself to my judgment, but the motion for that purpose would have to be made in the Committee on Banking and Commerce itself.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 98) to amend the Exchequer Court Act. He said: The purpose of this Bill is simply to make the Civil Service Amendment Act, which was passed last session, apply to the registrar of the Exchequer Court. It is probable that such was the intention when the Act of last session was passed. The status and the salary of the registrar are fixed by special Act, and his position not being mentioned specially in the Act amending the Civil Service Act the special Act would still continue to apply to him, unless we pass legislation of the character I am introducing.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. CONMEE (Thunder Bay) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 99) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The object is to amend the Act in respect of the maintenance of fences and cattle guards in certain sections where, under the present law, the onus is thrown entirely upon the settler. If his land is inclosed and an accident occurs he may recover damages, but if his land is not inclosed, damages cannot be recovered. Parliament must have intended the law to work a little differently, but that seems to be the effect, and my information is that the courts have held that such is the case. That is a matter which ought to be remedied.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INTERCOLONIAL FREIGHT CLERKS.

Mr. A. B. CROSBY (Halifax). About a year ago the freight clerks in Halifax and St. Johns had some difficulty with the Intercolonial Railway management. After some little time, it was decided to refer the matter to arbitration under the conciliation clause of the Act known as the Lemieux Act. There was a board of arbitration which sat in Halifax and in Ottawa during the summer, and whose finding, I understood, was in favour of the clerks. But nothing has since been heard of it and no settlement has been made. I would like to know why the finding of that arbitration has not been carried out.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). It is very doubtful whether the finding is in favour of the clerks or not. It is the finding to which my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) referred previously, and it has been referred to in questions and answers several times since. That finding in brief was to the effect that the number of the clerks could be diminished and the salary of the remainder increased without increasing the expenditure of the railway in that connection. If it had been simply a question of increasing the salaries, there would have been no difficulty, but there is also question of depriving several men of their employment, and the department had to ascertain all the information possible, as to the dates of the appointments of these men, their salaries and ability as clerks. That work is not yet completed. As soon as we can get the full information, we shall make up our minds.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BRADBURY. The return brought down regarding the quantity of summer caught fish is not complete. It only gives the amount of fish shipped during the summer, but there is a large amount caught during the summer and shipped during the winter.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). It was the intention to give exactly what the hon. gentleman wanted and I will talk the matter over with him.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would draw the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the fact that the return brought down regarding a survey made by Mr. Vaughan is not complete. I have not his plans or his correspondence.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). It should be stated in the return that up to the time of bringing it down we were not able to find the files concerning that part of the answer to the question. Search is still being made.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call attention to the fact that a number of returns ordered are still missing. On January 25, a return was ordered showing the armouries built, also with reference to certain publications, also with reference to Transcontinental Railway employees on January 26, and permanent loans and temporary loans. Also

with reference to lands sold along the route of the Grand Trunk Pacific for terminals on February 1, also with reference to dredging in New Brunswick on February 10.

Hon. WM. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). As to the loans, I hope to bring them down to-morrow.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. With regard to the armouries, I spoke the other day to my deputy and he said that as far as my department was concerned it would be ready almost immediately.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) to a motion with regard to some returns which passed the House on the 10th or 11th of February and which are not down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Regarding what subject?

Mr. DANIEL. Relating to dredging, tenders and things of that kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have it looked into.

PRIVATE BILLS—CANADIAN, LIVERPOOL AND WESTERN RAILWAYS

House in committee on Bill (No. 44) to incorporate the Canadian Liverpool and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

Mr. NANTEL moved that the following be inserted as section 14:

The company shall print in both the English and French languages the time tables and bills of lading which are to be used for its line within the limits of the province of Quebec.

Motion agreed to.

On the question: shall the Bill be reported?

Mr. FOSTER. May be I am a little late but there is a little unsatisfied curiosity in my own mind yet. I have not had the pleasure of listening to the explanation. It may have been given but I would like the promoter of the Bill to give me a satisfactory reason for the inclusion of the word 'Liverpool' I want to know what the meaning of it is.

Mr. GIRARD. That question has been discussed in the Railway Committee and before this House and the House has been informed with regard to it. However, I have no objection to repeating the explanation. The word 'Liverpool' is in the Bill on account of the intention of the company to have a steamship line between St. Catharine's bay and Liverpool.

Motion agreed to, Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

WINNIPEG AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 29) respecting the Winnipeg and North Western Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

On section 1:

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I have just a word to say in regard to this Bill. If you will permit me to digress just for the space of one minute I will give you the reason why I was not here when the Bill was before the House on Friday last. I was at that time in what is called room 89, the room set aside for the Conservative members, in committee considering a proper change of name for that room and on which the committee came to the decision that perhaps it would be well to call it the Saragossa Sea. The reason of that was because, like the Sea of Saragossa, all the relics, wreckage, debris, flotsam and jetsam are gathered there. I would point out to the minister who is in charge of the furnishing of that room that it would be well that he should send these ancient relics of the time of Alexander Mackenzie to a museum instead of leaving them there for the use of members. There are fourteen kinds of chairs hardly a table with four legs and I think this is very unfair treatment to be accorded to the loyal opposition in this House.

With regard to this Bill, I will say a few words which will not only be my words but which will voice the opinions of the people whom I have the honour to represent. This charter has been objected to by every municipality through which this proposed railway is projected to run. The objections were taken in the proper way, through the municipal officers and by petition to the government, copies of which petitions were sent to me. I will read you, sir, because I want in 'Hansard,' what one of these petitions sets forth:

Whereas, the Winnipeg and North Western Railway Company have given notice of intention to apply at the next session of the parliament of Canada for an Act extending the time for the construction and completion of this railway;

And whereas the municipality of Ste. Rose is interested in the matter;

(This happens to be the petition of Ste. Rose in Ochre river, Dauphin, Gilbert Plains, Grand View and Shell River; all the municipalities concerned, are associated with this petition).

And whereas the speedy construction and completion of a railway along the proposed route will be a great benefit to the people of this district;

And whereas the speedy construction and completion of such a railway is desirable;

And whereas, the privilege that has from time to time been granted to railways through-

out western Canada in general, extending the time for construction and completion of various lines of railways, for which certain corporations hold charters, has been greatly abused in the past;

Now, therefore be it resolved that we, the council of the said municipality of Sainte Rose, do hereby petition the government and parliament of Canada to refuse an extension of time to the Winnipeg and North Western Railway Company for construction and completion of this railway, unless upon such conditions as will effectually provide for the speedy construction of the same.

Before the Railway Committee, I proposed that caluse 2 of the Bill be amended to read as follows:

The company may commence within one year after the passing of this Act, the railways as authorized by chap. 141 of the statutes of 1907 by this Act, and if the said railways are not so commenced and at least 25 miles thereof completed within one year after the passing of this Act, and the remainder of the said railways completed and put in operation within five years after the passing of this Act the power of construction granted to the company by the said Acts shall cease and be null and void, with respect to so much of the said railways as then remains uncompleted.

That clause was a guarantee to the people of that country who petitioned this government that there should be steps taken by this government to show the bona fides of the applicants for this charter. That is what the people want and it is in the power of this parliament to grant them what they want. But, Sir, to my surprise it was asked that this matter should be reconsidered in the committee, and the vote given on that question was not a vote on the merits of the case. On the contrary, it was on the part of the Liberals in that committee a party vote and a party vote entirely. I stated here and no one can contradict me that every Liberal in that committee voted on party lines.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. How did the other men vote; on party lines too?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I beg your pardon, Sir, you were not there and you are not in a position to know. Unfortunately for my presentation of the case before the committee some of my Conservative friends voted against me, but all the Liberals voted solid also against me. It is a great mistake that partyism should be allowed to enter into the affairs of that committee. Later on, when I saw that this amendment which I had the committee insert for the benefit of the people and at their request, was to be cut out, I did not want to waste the time of the committee and I had to accept my defeat as gracefully as I could, but that does not prevent me from saying a few words here. I had put in this amendment that the company be compelled to

build 25 miles in the first year in order to show its bona fides. The promoters of the road had said through their solicitor that they had the money and that they were willing to complete the road in five years and considering that they were chartered to build from 1,500 to 2,000 miles and that they undertook to complete that in five years, surely it was not a hardship on them to ask that they should build at least 25 miles in the first year.

An hon. MEMBER. How long had they the charter?

Mr. CAMPBELL. For two years. I wish now to enter my protest. There is hardly a member from the west who does not express the opinion in private conversation that something ought to be done to compel these hot air lines to either get out of business and let some one get into business or compel them to show their bona fides right away. The only argument put up by gentlemen on the other side is that it has been customary to allow this, but if in the past we have done wrong is it not time to make a change and let us do right now?

Mr. GUTHRIE. At the first meeting of the Railway Committee at which this Bill was discussed it was stated that certain petitions had been sent to the government, and it was intimated that the government had taken no action in the matter. The deputy minister who was present, stated that no petitions had been received, and subsequently it turned out that the petitions referred to my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) did not go to the Department of Railways and Canals, but to the Board of Railway Commissioners, so that these petitions had never been before the Department of Railways and Canals. They were, however, before the committee when the Bill was finally considered and passed upon.

Mr. LENNOX. That is rather important. The hon. member for Dauphin stated in the committee that petitions had been sent in and that it was the duty of the Minister of Railways to acquaint the committee of any petitions that had been received against the passage of the Act. It now appears that the Railway Board received these petitions instead of the minister, and I venture to say it was the duty of the Railway Board to forward these petitions to the proper authorities. No one could be in any doubt as to what the proper distinction is for petitions of that kind and no one could doubt the importance of the committee being acquainted with such petitions before we proceed to deal with a Bill of this kind. Of course, in this particular instance, no hardship has occurred, because the hon. member for Dauphin reminds me that he read a copy of the peti-

tion at the time; but it is well to have impressed upon whoever is responsible for the matter in the Railway Board that it would be regarded as their duty to forward these petitions promptly when they come in.

Mr. BRADBURY. As one who took an interest in this matter before the committee, I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Dauphin with regard to the desirability of having some clause to protect the people of that district. When this Bill was before the committee, I supported that clause, but I am surprised to find that the Bill was brought back for consideration. I agreed to the compromise that was made on the strength of the statement by the gentleman promoting the Bill, and I think by the chairman of the committee, that a charter over the same route would be granted to any other person applying for it. As a member from the west, I do not feel that I ought to say one word that would make it hard for a promoter to obtain a charter if he means to build the road; but knowing what has occurred in the past, I feel that we have had too many charters that have tied up the district for years and prevented the people getting a much needed road. I notice in the railway committee that a great many gentlemen voted for the reconsideration of the Bill who practically knew nothing at all about it or about the district through which the road was to run or the hardships of the people. If what my hon. friend from Dauphin has said is correct, and it is admitted by the chairman of the Railway Committee that petitions have come in from every municipality of that district asking the government and their representatives to protect their interests, then I feel that the committee has been a little hasty in dealing with the Bill as they have. With the understanding of the committee that the promoters were prepared to complete the road in five years, it is not too much to ask that the people of the district should have some guarantee that they mean business, and I confess frankly that I was a little surprised that there were not more members of the committee who felt as I did. I feel that we have been too liberal in the past in granting railway charters—that we have not tried in any way to restrict the promoters and to make them go on with the work of construction. I think a clause should be put in every charter requiring the promoters to build a certain number of miles each year or to put up fifteen or twenty-five per cent of the cost of the railway as a guarantee. A Bill of that kind is proposed by one of the members from the west, and when it comes before the House, I shall have much pleasure in supporting it. But I think the committee were hasty in rushing this Bill through in the manner they did without taking into consideration all these petitions from the people directly interested.

Mr. McCRANEY. The speeches which have been made by my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) and my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) indicate a point of view which we hear discussed very much at meetings of the Railway Committee. What the people of Dauphin are after is to have railways constructed. How are we to get that done? Is it by stopping railways, or is it by helping them? I know that there is a very prevalent opinion throughout this country that a railway charter is a special privilege, giving an exclusive right to a corporation to build a railway from one point to another. I think that parliament can do a great deal to disabuse the minds of the public on that point. When I first came here I largely shared that view; but from my experience in this House, I have come to the conclusion that parliament does not give exclusive rights. The only right it gives is the right to go on and build, and anybody else who comes to this parliament can acquire the same right, and the right is only vested when the plans are approved of by the Minister of Railways.

Mr. FOSTER. Would they get the right over the same route?

Mr. McCRANEY. I should say that there is no reason why any company should not be given the right to build a railway from any one point to any other point.

Mr. BRADBURY. Does the hon. gentleman mean that if anybody else asked for a charter for a railway running over the same route that this railway runs over, he would be able to obtain such a charter?

Mr. McCRANEY. I can only speak as a member of this House; but my own attitude would be to support such a measure.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What does the minister say?

Mr. McCRANEY. There is also a prevalent idea that when a company is given a charter which permits it to build a railway from one point to another point, it is entering into a contract with the government to build; that it is in the position of contractors with the government for any other public work, and that when it comes here asking for an extension of time, it should be treated as any other government contractor. The point is altogether left out of consideration that the government is not supplying the money for the work, and therefore parliament cannot force the company to build where it does not want to build.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. gentleman states that a franchise of this kind is not a special privilege. I want to ask him if it is not often a very valuable privilege, and one that is sold.

Mr. McCRANEY. It is a special privilege. but not an exclusive privilege. It is not a privilege which is refused to any person who comes here and asks for similar legislation. My hon. friend asks: Is this not a right which is sometimes sold—is there not speculation in charters? Perhaps there has been in the past. I would like to see the policy laid down by this parliament of granting charters so freely that there would not be any value in a railway charter except perhaps the value that any railway might have because a certain amount of money has been expended to solicitors and others in getting the legislation through parliament. It is only by having parliament grant unrestricted charters that we can deprive charters of their value. The only way in which the government or parliament can compel the building of railways is to supply the money, but that means government ownership, and I do not think that is a subject for discussion upon this occasion. We have had discussion in this House with reference to paper charters. There is talk of the country being blanketed with charters, talk that one hears perhaps with regard to claims on coal areas or something of that kind, as though when a certain territory is shown as having a railway chartered to go into it, no one else could enter it. If this discussion has only one result, to disabuse the public mind of that idea, it will be justified.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Could the hon. member state just what the practice in reference to that is, I think it is just as well we should understand it. Suppose a charter is given to certain promoters for a railway between two given points. They are allowed by the terms of their charter a certain period within which to commence and a certain other period within which to complete the construction of their line. Every one understands, of course, that there is no technical reason why parliament should not give exactly the same kind of charter to another set of promoters, but in actual practice does the Railway Committee do that ?

Mr. LENNOX. No, never.

Mr. McCRANEY. I am not an old enough member of this House to say what the practice has been.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Nor any one else.

Mr. McCRANEY. My hon. friend is hardly in a position to say that. Since I have been a member, for the last four years, I am not aware of any charter having been refused for a line which has already been granted by Act of parliament.

Mr. LENNOX. Have any been granted ?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. member say that any charter has been granted to a second company for exactly the same line for which charter has been granted to the first company ?

Mr. CONMEE. Generally, practically the same ground.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like the hon. member to mention any. It has never been done.

Mr. McCRANEY. It has also been said that because a railway is chartered from one point to another, maps are got out by speculators and settlers are induced to go into the district and establish their homesteads along the proposed line of railway. I must say that in my own riding I have never had to deal with any case of that kind. The only case I know of is that of the Canadian Pacific Railway which in 1907 got a charter for a line from Moosejaw to Lacombe. They advertised for tenders and on the strength of what they had undertaken to do settlers did go out into the country and did settle, then they abandoned what work they had done, they did not go on with their tendering and there certainly was a great protest from my own portion of the country and from the Moosejaw district. Many farmers felt that if they had to go to the next winter without the facilities of a railway and the means of bringing in fuel there might be a great deal of distress.

But it is a different case altogether when a railway like the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern or the Grand Trunk Pacific, all of which are railways of standing in this country and all of which have had assistance from parliament, give assurances and undertake a work, because people expect that that work will be done. I must say that in my own part of the country we have never been misguided because some body obtained a charter for a railway from one part of the country to another. If we in this parliament should make the restriction proposed, we would make it possible only for those who can meet the conditions placed upon the corporations to build railways, and that would prevent any new corporation from going into the railway business in this country. I think there is a very general impression throughout the country that it is the common stockholders who build roads and perhaps this parliament may disabuse the public mind of that idea also; we will learn that it is not the common stockholders that build railroads but

the bondholders who negotiate for the construction on terms favourable not to the government or to the population to be served by the railroad but to themselves. That is the only way in which money for these undertakings can be raised. This particular case is one of the best cases to bring before this House because it is an extreme case and because the principle can best be discussed in view of the fact that this company has been incorporated for less than two years. I think my hon. friend stated too strongly what the promoters of the Bill said in the Railway Committee. My recollection was not that the promoter of the Bill who appeared before the Railway Committee said that they have the means in hand to go on with this; what he did say was that they were doing their very best to get the money.

Mr. LENNOX. I think he said it was in sight

Mr. McCRANEY. He said they expected to get it, but he gave no assurance that the money had been secured. What would be the position of affairs if the restriction desired by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) were imposed? If the bonds were floated and if less than twenty-five miles were built in one year what would happen? I am sure the bondholders would feel very insecure, and with that prospect in sight would be very unwilling indeed to invest their money in this enterprise.

I have been discussing the case of my hon. friend's constituency. I have a paper before me now which I received this morning and which gives a case in my own constituency which well illustrates the point. I have here the minutes of the Fertile Valley Liberal Association. I shall read one resolution:

Mr. F. R. Stephens moved and was seconded by Mr. G. H. McKague, that the Association place before the government an objection to an extension of time to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the completion of their Moosejaw-Lacombe line; that they recommend the government to refuse to grant such extensions and that W. Kennedy and the secretary draft a protest and ask Mr. Knowles and Mr. McCraney to take up the matter with the government and the Railway Commission. Carried unanimously.

The Liberal Association of Fertile Valley want to accomplish the same result as do the friends of the hon. member for Dauphin, they want to get the railway and they want me to do what my hon. friend's friends want him to do, to secure a refusal of the extension of time except on conditions. A year ago the Canadian Pacific Railway declined to go on with this very road and at the last session this House voted $3,200 a mile for this extension to a distance of 123 miles. That was the reason the road was built, it was not because they had a charter. As a matter of fact I think that the Canadian Pacific Railway did not want to build the road, that they had concluded that, for some time at least, the traffic in that particular part of the country would not warrant its construction. The reason the road was built was because this parliament voted $3,200 per mile. To my mind the way to get this road built is not to refuse an extension of time but to help the railway company. That is to be my answer to my own constituents who want me, in this and other cases, to refuse the extension of time. If there is anything this government can do to help the railways by assisting them financially, that is what I would support, and I would support it with reference to my hon. friend's constituency as well as with reference to my own. I think that is the only way in which this question can be dealt with, and that we should accomplish nothing by putting restrictions upon the applications for charters which come before this House.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member (Mr. McCraney) has not met the question quite squarely. Nobody has proposed to refuse this company an extension of time. The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) was as urgent in desiring that this company should have an extension of time as any other member of the committee. But he desired that the people should be served by a railway, and so he proposed that conditions should be provided which he thought reasonable and in the public interest to bring about the construction of the road. He succeeded in convincing the committee at its first sitting that he was right, and his amendment was carried. But a majority of the committee saw fit to reconsider the question and proposed the modification which, as I recollect, was not proposed at the first meeting but which is in harmony with our general practice. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCraney) does not wish it to go abroad, or to be suggested in this House, that the hon. member for Dauphin, or any other member of the committee, refused this company a reasonable extension of time. What the hon. member for Dauphin and those who supported him voted for was that the company should have a reasonable time to carry out their undertaking, having regard to the statement made that they had money ready to carry on their work. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. McCraney) spoke as if he was going to tell something of the inner life of the Railway Committee, which, I think, it might be well to have told in this House. But as to this question of paralleling lines, we need hardly discuss it, because it is not the policy of this parliament. When the Transcontinental line was under discussion, we were emphatic in saying that we did not want parallel lines, and ought to

keep every railway a certain distance from another. In fact, I should not be surprised if, in the statute-book, we had a provision that lines should not approach each other closer than within certain limits.

Mr. EMMERSON. Was not that in reference to construction lines?

Mr. LENNOX. We would not grant a charter to parallel an existing line except at a certain distance.

Mr. CONMEE. That is a line already built.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, but the policy of parliament is that it is better to have one line of railway with large traffic than two struggling for existence, each with a small traffic. For that reason it would be unwise for us to grant a charter to parallel a line for which a charter had already been granted. It would be absurd to expect the Minister of Railways or any other responsible adviser of the Crown to sanction the granting of a charter to a new company to build over practically the same ground the right to build over which had already been granted to an existing company. We do not do it, and we would not do it. In spite of what the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) says, I venture to say he cannot find an instance where we have granted a charter to cover ground already covered to a company that is not in default. The people have to pay the freight rates, and the Board of Railway Commissioners will fix those rates according to the traffic. If you divide the traffic by two, and then divide it by two again, making four lines where there is traffic for only one, you increase the burdens of the people, and it is folly to say that when we grant a charter to such a company as this with three or four alternative routes we do not cover that country and prevent other companies coming in to build so long as that charter exists. The consequence is that the company that has obtained a charter has a franchise which can be sold in the market. The proof is that it has been done over and over again and is being done all the time. We have no objection to a renewal of the charter, but we do object to their obtaining it on terms not in the interests of the public.

Mr. TURRIFF. If there is any impression that the Railway Committee refuses to grant charters because charters have been granted over the same ground, I can only say that it is a very erroneous impression. In the past five years I have never known a charter to be refused by a railway company because a charter had already been issued. But I may point out to my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) that not only does the Railway Committee and this House, grant such charters, but the Railway Department has, in several cases, approved the plans and allowed the railways to build, paralleling each other over the same ground. You have only to look at the map of the country west of Winnipeg—I do not at this moment speak of the eastern portion of Canada—and you will find railway after railway running parallel to another for miles. West of Saskatoon, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Pacific parallel each other within a stone's throw. West of Edmonton, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific run parallel to each other for over a hundred miles, practically on the same territory. In my own constituency the Canadian Pacific Railway branch lines parallel each other for nearly 80 miles. I voted against the amendment of the hon. member for Dauphin, and did so because this is the first time that this company has come before parliament asking for an extension of time. And it is not altogether asking an extension of time, because in its application it asks for a charter covering two or three other branch lines that it had not before ; so that, to some extent, it is a new application altogether. And we were assured by the representatives of the company that they were in a fair way to get the money to build the road next year, but if that clause was put in this year, it would prevent them getting the money, and so prevent their going on. This road is chartered among a number of existing branches of the Canadian Northern. I do not know how it is in this case, but I know that in other cases, railway companies have engineered just such petitions as have come in here, and if we had knocked this charter out, the effect would have been to leave that company with absolute control of all the roads in that part of the country. I agree with my hon. friend from Dauphin that a railway company should be made to build each year, but I claim that this should apply to every railway company and not to one in particular—not to pick out and penalize one company. I trust that when I get my Bill, now on the Order Paper, to the right point, I should receive the general support of both sides. The Bill would make it incumbent on all these railway companies to build at least twenty-five miles in the first two years—that is if the road chartered is less than 250 miles long—then in the third and fourth years an additional twenty-five miles each, and complete in five years, and, if they do not do this, they will be compelled to come back to this House and get an extension of time.

Mr. WRIGHT. The hon. gentleman made the statement that it has not been the practise of the Railway Committee to duplicate charters from one given point to another,

and he gave us an illustration in the Grand Trunk Pacific. But every one knows that the Grand Trunk Pacific was given a special charter with special conditions and with a distinct promise to the country that it would not parallel any existing line but be a great colonization road. We learn now, however, that it is simply a parallel line to two or three others and is not serving the purpose for which it was intended.

Mr. BARKER. I want to say a few words on this matter because I have given a good deal of attention to what goes on in the Railway Committee. If the right hon. gentleman who leads the House could occasionally give enough time to visit that committee, he would see that there is an absolute need for reform. Every hon. gentleman who is on that committee knows that every day a considerable percentage of its members sit at the far end of the room swap stories with one another and pay no attention whatever to the subject before the committee. Then when the gentleman who has charge of the Bill—especially if he happens to be a government whip—stands up, they vote straight every time. I do not think there is an hon. gentleman on either side who will contradict me.

Mr. LENNOX. Do you say they vote straight?

Mr. BARKER. They vote according to the wishes of the promoter of the Bill without considering anything else. The hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill seems to think that there can be no harm even if you do give several charters in the same district. He would advocate free trade in railways and let every company be incorporated and build if it pleases. But anybody, who has any practical knowledge of the methods of getting money to construct such works, will know that there could be no more effective way to prevent capital being invested in railway construction in the northwest. What the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Glen Campbell) said in the committee is perfectly right. He said he had no desire to obstruct the particular company referred to in the Bill and he wanted to see the railway built, but he wanted to get rid of hot air companies, and he argued that if the company in question professes to be able to construct 1,500 miles of railway in five years, it surely will be able to construct 25 miles in one, and he proposed to put that in the Bill.

The counsel who was there representing the directors said they had been endeavouring to get the companies floated in Paris or London but had not been able owing to the financial crisis. Now, however, they thought they were in the way of getting it placed and were confident they could do so. Any one who saw the project laid out on the map like a great spider, with its arms projecting in all directions over some 1,500 miles of railway, would see that instead of that company assisting in a construction of railways in that district, it would have the opposite effect. If any other people wanted to take any section of that territory and build 500 or 200 miles of railway, they would be met at once by the fact that these people had mapped out the whole district and covered it with projected branches in all directions, so that no one would advance a cent for other lines. That is just where hot air companies, by holding up their territory from year to year, can delay the construction of a railway in every inch of the territory thus covered. For that reason and not because he wanted to do so struct or delay—he wants just the opposite —the hon. member for Dauphin objected to these charters being renewed as a matter of course. One gentleman will say, what is the harm ? They have only applied once or twice. Their charter perhaps was given some ten years ago, and not a dollar has since been expended, yet they remain quite confident they can build the road. Any one who sees what is going on knows that as long as such charters are renewed, so long will they cherish the hope of making something out of it, and while there is the remotest chance of their doing so, they will apply for a renewal.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not think the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is quite fair in the reference he made to the committee. It is true that many of the members of the committee do not take a very active part in its work, but that is the case with all committees. The same may be said of this House. A great many members do not take part in any of the debates and a very limited number only take part in the debates upon general subjects, but I do not think that would warrant any one saying that the members of one political party merely followed their leader. I do not think that is more true of the Liberals than of the Conservatives, because I know of several Bills in regard to which the members of the Conservative party in the Railway Committee were lined up on certain occasions and followed their leaders very closely. But I am not prepared to say that the Conservatives voted for party purposes. I do not think that the hon. member for Dauphin really meant that the Liberals who voted against his view did so for party purposes, because if that were true his own Conservative friends were removed by similar motives. I wish to say that we canot build railways by legislation. If by an Act of parliament we could cause a railway to be constructed in this or that direction, but that we cannot do. There are occasions, when, if restrictions are put on railway charters which are promoted by individuals, you hamper these individuals and defeat the very purpose you have in view.

The hon. member for Dauphin expressed the opinion that if a company were compelled to build a certain number of miles during a certain number of years, that would bring about more rapid construction of railways.

I am quite satisfied that the reverse would be the case. I know of more than one railway undertaking that has been wrecked by premature expenditure. Take this case. I do not know the local conditions; therefore I am not going to speak as if I did, but I will ask my hon. friend to assume this condition of things: Suppose they build twenty-five miles and there is no traffic there would be perhaps nearly a million of money expended. If there is no traffic, the undertaking is not successful, there is no good purpose served by the expenditure of the money that is invested. What good is that going to do anybody? That does not do the country any good and it embarrasses the company because they are not in the same position to go into the money market and obtain capital. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) stated that nothing would embarrass a company more than the granting of a charter in the vicinity of this line. I cannot agree with him. Nothing will help the company more. It will give the investing public knowledge that that section of the country is important when some other company wants to build a line of railway. It is just a case of the survival of the fittest. Let those build who can build. If you put restrictions upon the charter, if you take away the opportunity from one set of men who have perhaps spent a great deal of money and devoted a great deal of energy and time to the undertaking to proceed with the work you are not advancing the construction of the railway. The reasonable thing would be to give to any others who wish it the opportunity to build the road. If they have the capital, or if they can procure it more quickly then, they will build the road. There will not be two lines built. Our country has not yet got into that condition where our railways are injured by competing lines. I can remember—and I will not admit that I am very old yet—when the Grand Trunk thought they were the objects of a severe attack because it was proposed to build another line between Montreal and Toronto. The line was built and it did the Grand Trunk good. The prosperity of the country was increased. These railways bring traffic; they do not take traffic away from each other, except at competitive points. It is just so in other sections of the country. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) says that we do not grant charters to lines paralleling other lines. We are doing it every day. There has been hardly a year in the last four or five years but what, for fifty miles or a hundred miles, or in some cases, for the entire length of the line, charters have been given practically in the same territory as that occupied by previous charters and no evil has resulted from it that I know of. There is no danger of getting too many lines constructed in this country. We need railway lines paralleling each other at a distance of twenty miles even in prairie country, and we need them worse than in mining sections in even closer contact. We need transportation in all parts of Canada. There is nothing that we need so much. I would approve of a law that would be very much more liberal with regard to the construction of railways than our present Act is. I approve of the law in the state of Minnesota because there any four or five gentlemen can organize themselves into a railway company and they can obtain a charter from the Secretary of State and start to build the railway in three days. I had occasion to go there to get an extension of the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway charter in the state of Minnesota and I found that we would have to organize a new company. I went to Minneapolis and left there in five days with the charter in my possession. This system has worked well in that state. The law protects private property. People obtaining charters only get the right to build a railway in a certain section of country. They cannot take the property of any company or individual and they cannot injure the property of any company or individual unless they pay for it. There is no grievance, but there is a free invitation to capitalists to build railways wherever they are wanted, wherever the railways would pay and wherever the people need the services of railways. In my judgment it would be a mistake to act upon the suggestion which some hon. gentlemen have made in this case. I want to tell hon. gentlemen who are now advocating the imposition of conditions with regard to the building of this railway that they will find, if that principle is adopted, that they have given a monopoly that they little dreamed of to the big lines and to the big corporations who will build this road whenever they please and as they please. Hon. gentlemen in this House know—in fact I need not hesitate to state it—that a great many important lines that we have to-day in operation are not the work of great corporations or of great capitalists. They are the work of the local community who agitated for them, who organized them, who went before the public and who besieged parliament with deputations until they obtained their charters and the necessary aid, and until they got their enterprises into a position to attract capital and the larger operator into whose hands the roads finally passed. If it were not for that class of promotion we would

not have to-day many of the railways that are serving the people of the country and we would not have had them at such an early stage as we did. I say to the gentlemen who are advocating this restriction that they will be making a mistake in the interest of the community that they are seeking, honestly, I have no doubt, to help. Now, our Railway Act is not altogether without conditions. A company which obtains a charter must expend fifteen per cent of its capital within a limited time or it must give back the charter. The Act provides for forfeiture if it does not carry out its provisions, and that is all that would happen in the case of the condition as to a specific number of miles, only it would, in my judgment, destroy the opportunity of securing capital for carrying on the enterprise.

Mr. MAGRATH. I do not know if the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat had me in his mind, but he was looking over here and I therefore desire to say a word or two upon this question. I endorse a very great deal of what he said. He warned us in the west to be cautious about limiting these railway corporations. We have no desire to do that at all. If a man is running a corner grocery and an individual comes in and makes some statement in an effort to do business with him, as a business man he wants some evidence of the man's bona fides. My time is, I think, valuable to me, and I hope it is valuable to the people who have sent me here. I do not want to go up to the Railway Committee room and have gentlemen get up there and say: We have two millions of dollars and we are going to commence work to-morrow. If the chairman of the Railway Committee or the Minister of Railways and Canals will get up and say that these gentlemen have satisfied me that they mean business and that they have the capacity to carry out the undertaking, then I will support it. I am desirous of advancing any scheme which will result in the building of railways in this country, but I do not want any gentlemen to come into the Railway Committee room with a set of plans saying that they are willing to run through the Rocky mountains where they can never build a railway. I have in mind two instances in which plans have been exhibited for railways that they could never attempt to build, and this fact is evidence to me that these men have not investigated the situation at all. I am not opposed to charters. I have talked long upon this matter in the Railway Committee and talked hard upon it. There is a principle involved. Are we going to give charters to everybody who wants them, and such is really the contention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee). If so I will have to be satisfied, but I do not want to go back to my constituents and have to say that I have been voting blindly for railway charters through my own district without having made some effort to discover the standing of the men who promote these charters and their capacity to carry out the railways they undertake. One hon. gentleman has stated that this omnibus chartering of railways is misleading to the people in the west. There is no doubt about that. I have said so before, and I say again that the settlers are deceived by this chartering of railways which may never be constructed. Since this Bill came before the railway committee a gentleman in my district wrote me asking my advice about going into a certain section of country and in his letter he says:

> The great drawback seems to be the great distance from a railway. I should like your opinion very much indeed as to railway building through this district. If one can believe all that the papers say and what the various plans show it would seem that it would soon be a network of railways and very little room left to grow grain.

This gentleman seems to have hit off the situation pretty accurately. We get some very valuable settlers into that country from the United States; they meet the land man who sends them out 30 or 40, or 50 miles from a railway; he shows them the plans of railways running through their location and the fact of the matter is that these people are simply humbugged. As their representative I object to that kind of thing. If those who ask for charters satisfy the Minister of Railways or some other competent authority of their ability and their intention to proceed with the construction of these railways, then they should have a charter and I shall do all that I can to help them along; but if a certain number of men apply to this parliament for a charter simply for the purpose of exploiting it then I am most determinedly opposed to any such proceedings.

Bill reported; read the third time and passed.

LONDON AND LANCASHIRE PLATE GLASS COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the London and Lancashire Plate Glass and Indemnity Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Mr. EMMERSON. As we all know there is a great English company known as the London and Lancashire Insurance Company and I notice that the incorporators of this Bill reside in the city of Toronto which would lead to the inference that the company we are now chartering is not a subsidiary company to the London and Lancashire of England. Was the question of the similarity of name discussed in the Banking and Commerce Committee? Of course,

the objects sought are different, but there very readily arises in the minds of people a misapprehension as to the character of the company, and it seems to me that those who are promoting this Bill should come with a different name from the one proposed. Of course, if that was discussed in committee and fully decided upon, it is not for me at this moment to raise any objection; but I simply ask that question.

Mr. FIELDING. This question of the similarity of names very often comes before the Banking and Commerce Committee, and sometimes it is exceedingly difficult to decide on the proper view. However, there is no difficulty in the present case, because the incorporators are in Toronto, the company is practically a subsidiary company to the English company. It is promoted by that company, and the first gentleman named among the incorporators is the manager of that company in the province of Ontario. So I think we may safely assume that in this case at all events there will be no objection.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BANK OF VANCOUVER.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 52) respecting the Bank of Vancouver.—Mr. Cowan.

On section 1,

Mr. LENNOX. This Bill seems in effect to be a repeal pro tanto of the General Banking Act. Sections 14 and 16 of the Banking Act, which are referred to in this renewal, are express in saying that if the certificate is not obtained within a year, all the power ceases. I want to ask the Minister of Finance if this is the way renewals are granted, by a partial repeal of the general Act.

Mr. FIELDING. It would be a repeal of the general Act so far as this bank is concerned. I believe this is the usual form in which extensions are granted.

On section 1a,

Mr. LENNOX. Is not this a very substantial amendment to make in a Bill—to add to the board of directors names that were not in the original Bill? What about advertising in a case of this kind?

Mr. FIELDING. I would think that it was a matter that concerned only the gentlemen engaged in the promotion of the Bill. If they wished to add to the list of provisional directors, I do not see how any public interest could be served by preventing them from doing so.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Mr. EMMERSON.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Ralph Smith.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 77) respecting a Patent of the Submarine Company.—Mr. Proulx.

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—Mr. Geo. Taylor.

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Monarch Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 85) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Geo. Taylor.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Cobalt Range Railway Company.—Mr. Hodgins.

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Arnprior and Pontiac Railway Company.—Mr. Hodgins.

SUPPLEMENTARY TREATY WITH FRANCE.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) delivered a message from the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:

GREY:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons a copy of a supplementary convention respecting the commercial relations between France and Canada entered into at Paris on the 23rd day of Jan., 1909, Between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister the correspondence ready?

Mr. FIELDING. I thought I would be able to bring the correspondence with the convention, but I shall have it ready tomorrow.

QUESTIONS.

CIVIL SERVICE PAYMENTS, 1896 AND 1909-10.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What was the total payment in 1896 to the permanent Civil Service employees of the in-

side service at Ottawa, and of those employees in the then Inside Civil Service, who were paid out of lump votes and Civil Goverment Contingencies, respectively in the branches and departments added to the Inside Civil Service by the Act of 1908, and what is the sum estimated for the similar divisions for the year 1909-10?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State):

	1895-96	Estimated for 1909-10.
Civil government salaries..	$ 967,771 72	$2,732,504 25
Civil government contingencies	48,153 78	18,550 00
Outside salaries and lump votes	284,598 57	703,335 77
	$1,300,524 07	$3,454,390 02

CANADA EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. What was the price originally paid by the government for the Canada Eastern Railway?
2. Since the acquisition of the line between Fredericton and Chatham, what has been spent each year for betterment, and what does the government expect to spend under this head during 1909-1910?
3. What is the approximate value of the rolling stock that has been added to that previously in service on this branch?
4. What has been each year, since its acquisition by the government, the approximate expenditure for running expenses and the approximate revenue in connection with this branch?

He said: I was in hopes the information asked for in this question would be down in time for the debate which I expected to take place this afternoon.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I was also, but the accounts are kept in such a way that it is difficult to get the particulars for any one section of road. I find it is the same on all railways.

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS—NEW WING.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What amount of the total expenditure made upon the new wing of the parliament building and consequent alterations was paid to the department staff for (a) labour, (b) supervision?

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

(a) $16,161.43.
(b) $990.00.

VETERINARY HOSPITAL, KINGSTON.

Mr. EDWARDS asked:

1. What are the dimensions of the veterinary hospital at Kingston, and how many horses is it intended to accommodate?
2. From whom were tenders received for construction of same and the amount of each?
3. When was the contract awarded, to whom, at what price and covering how much?
4. What is the cost of the building to date, what is the estimated total cost of the building, fittings and furnishings complete and ready for use?
5. Has any of the work been let without tender? If so, to whom and to what amount in each case?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The answer to all these questions would be in the negative. While upon my feet I should explain that there is an item in the main estimates this year which no doubt led my hon. friend to ask the question. The item is an error. An amount of $1,500 was asked for at the last session for a veterinary hospital but I had made up my mind, after consultation with the Minister of Militia, to drop that item. By a mistake of the printer, an item of $15,000 was carried out opposite the $1,500 vote of last year, the mistake being made by reason of the item immediately above, for barrack accommodation I think, being $15,000. It is a mistake and upon concurrence I am going to move that the item will be struck out so the whole answer will be in the negative. Nothing has been done in regard to a veterinary hospital.

THE ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL.

Mr. ECREMENT—by Mr. Devlin—asked:

1. What is the width and depth of the St. Lawrence channel between Montreal and Quebec?
2. What amount was expended last year in dredging it?
3. What was the number of dredges and workmen employed during the past year?
4. Does the government intend to continue these works next spring, especially to have the River St. Lawrence dredged in front of Berthierville, for the purpose of making its waters navigable at this place through the whole season of navigation?

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

1. There is now a complete channel to a depth of 30 feet at extreme low water from Montreal to Cap Levrard, four miles below Batiscan, a distance of 105½ miles below Montreal. Below this advantage is taken of the tide during low water season to obtain this depth to pass Cap à la Roche and Cap Charles. The completed channel has a minimum width in the straight portions of 450 feet and on the curves 500 to 800 feet. The widening has all been completed except for a distance of five miles in the straight portion of Lake St. Peter, between The White Buoy and No. 3 curves, the present width there being 300 feet. In the incompleted channel

now being widened and deepened to 30 feet at extreme low water (Cap à la Roche and Cap Charles) the present available depth is 27½ feet at low water, with a minimum width of 300 feet in the straight portions and 450 feet at the curves. The work below Quebec has in view a 30-foot channel at low tide at the St. Thomas flats and at Beaujeu bank, the width everywhere to be 1,000 feet. The Beaujeu bank channel was officially opened on July 29, 1908, to 30 feet depth at extreme low tide and 600 feet in width, where formerly there was only 21 feet at low tide.

2. The total expenditure on dredging operations and construction of new plant on the River St. Lawrence ship canal between Montreal and Father Point, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1908, was $895,599.88.

3. The dredging plant working on the River St. Lawrence ship channel, between Montreal and Father Point, consisted of six elevator dredges, one hydraulic dredge and two hydraulic hopper sea-going dredges. 4 staff steamers and 9 tugs, with their attending plant. The number of men employed on the dredging fleet equals 526. The number of men employed in the government shipyard at Sorel, Que., equals 800. Total, 1,326.

4. Yes, the government intends continuing the deepening of the River St. Lawrence ship channel between Montreal and Father Point next spring. The channel at Berthierville belongs to the Public Works Department.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The answer to section 4 of this question is partly in my department.

4. Dredging was performed at Berthierville during season of 1907, making a channel to a depth of from 9 to 12 feet at low water, which was considered sufficient for navigation at the time. If further dredging is required, the matter will have due consideration.

LIQUIDATION OF CENTRAL BANK OF CANADA.

Mr. DONNELLY asked :

1. Has the Receiver General received from the liquidator of the Central Bank of Canada, through the registrar of the court the balance left in the hands of said liquidator?

2. If so, what is the amount of said balance, and what is it charged with?

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

1. Yes.

2. $3,668.15, of which $776.17 was to meet amount of dividends declared by the liquidators of the bank unclaimed; and $2,891.98, representing the balance in the hands of the liquidators at the time of their discharge for distribution pro rata to claimants showing themselves entitled thereto.

Mr. BRODEUR.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CALVIN McKENZIE.

Mr. RHODES—by Mr. Jameson—asked :

1. Is Calvin McKenzie, of Eureka, Pictou county, an employee of the Intercolonial Railway, or of any other department of the government?

2. If not at present such an employee, was he at any time during 1908?

3. If so, how long was he employed and what was his employment?

4. If he is at present employed what are his duties?

5. What rate of pay did he receive, and what is the total amount paid him?

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

1. Calvin McKenzie is employed on the Intercolonial Railway.

2. Employed on the Intercolonial Railway, since January, 1905, as boiler maker's helper.

3. Answered by number two.

4. Answered by number two.

5. His rate of pay is sixteen cents per hour and the total amount paid him up to 31st January last, was $2,407.39.

TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND JAPAN, 1894.

Mr. BORDEN asked:

1. At what date did the treaty of July 16, 1894, between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the Empire of Japan first take effect?

2. At what date will the period of twelve years mentioned in article 21 of the treaty expire?

3. At what date will either of the high contracting parties have the right under article 21 to give notice to the other of its intention to terminate the said treaty?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. On July 17, 1899.

2. On July 17, 1911.

3. Either high contracting party shall have the right, at any time after eleven years shall have elapsed from the date the treaty took effect, to give notice to the other of its intention to terminate the same, and at the expiration of twelve months after such notice is given the treaty shall wholly cease and determine.

CAUSEWAY BETWEEN CARIBOO AND CARIBOO ISLAND.

Mr. CROSBY asked:

1. What is the amount expended in each year since 1896 on the breakwater or causeway, between Cariboo and Cariboo island Pictou county, Nova Scotia?

2. What is the total amount expended since 1896?

3. Is the work completed? If not in what condition is it at the present time?

4. When is it intended to complete the work, and what is the estimated expenditure required to do so?

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

1. 1896-97 no expenditure.
1897-98 "
1898-99 "
1899-1900 "
1900-01 .. .. $1,305 60
1901-02 .. .. 256 25
1902-03 .. .. 650 06
1903-04 .. .. 1,552 07
1904-05 .. .. 1,224 44
1905-06 no expenditure.
1906-07 "
1907-08 "
1908-09 (to date) 5,107 99

2. $10,096.41.

3. (a) No. (b) Up to the end of December last, the causeway had been raised to a proposed height of three feet above extreme high water, over a distance of 700 feet from the mainland and to about two feet above high water for the remaining 630 feet; piles had also been driven in a proposed pile and brush work, 555 feet in length, to protect the middle third of the causeway.

4. (a) So soon as the appropriation is obtained. (b) $3,000.

HOLLAND RIVER CANAL.

Mr. SHARPE asked:

1. Did a deputation from North York wait upon the government to advocate the construction of the Holland river or Newmarket canal? If so what was the date of the meeting of such deputation with the government?

2. Did the engineer report? If so, on what date?

3. How many engineers reported at what dates and what was the substance of such reports?

4. How much money has been expended each year since the work began, how many men were employed on the works during the months of August, September, October November and December 1908?

5. When is it expected the works will be completed?

6. Does the government contemplate making any further extensions beyond Newmarket or from the main direction of the present canal?

7. How high is Newmarket above the level of Lake Simcoe?

8. Is Newmarket the highest point between Lake Simcoe and Toronto? If not, where is the highest point situated and how high is this point above the level of Lake Simcoe?

9. What is the population of Newmarket, what are the chief industries and what is the postal revenue from the post office?

10. What is the nature and quantity of the traffic expected to be served by this canal?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). For questions 1, 2, and 3, see return brought down, No. 2, House of Commons, which gives all information.

4. See answer given in reply to question asked by Mr. Wallace, page 1980, Unrevised 'Hansard,' March 3, 1909, for money expended:

Average number of men employed during last week in August, 280.

Average number of men employed during last week in September, 259.

Average number of men employed during during last week in October, 250.

Average number of men employed during last week in November, 210.

Average number of men employed during last week in December, 110.

5. No date fixed.

6. It is not under consideration.

7. The water level in the canal at Newmarket will be 43·09 feet above the low water level of Lake Simcoe.

8. No. The department has no information other than that shown in the returns to the House.

9. The census of 1901, gives population as 2,125. The postal revenue for year ending March 31, 1908, was $5,297.22. The industries: office furniture, flouring mills, wooden ware, printing, foundry, brick and tile works, aerated waters, canning plant and monuments.

10. The usual business that seeks water transportation.

EMPLOYEE THOMAS FAGIN.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Is Thomas Fagin in the employ of the Department of Marine and Fisheries or of any other department of the government?

2. If so employed, is Thomas Fagin a temporary or permanent employee, and what is his salary and what are his duties?

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

1. T. A. Fagan is employed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

2. Salary, $1,000 a year. His duties are to act as assistant to the superintendent of works for the district between Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. MONK. The hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) has not stated whether this officer is a temporary or a permanent employee.

Mr. BRODEUR. His salary is by the year, $1,000.

WELLAND CANAL—COST OF TRAFFIC.

Mr. McCALL asked:

1. What is the total cost to date of the Welland canal and feeder, and other work used therewith?

2. What has been the amount of tonnage or quantity of freight carried through the Welland canal in the last five years, from 1903 to 1908, and what amount thereof was

Canadian produce, and what amount from the United States?

3. What was the total amount of tonnage or quantity of freight carried through the said canal during the five years immediately following the enlargement of the said canal, and what amount thereof was Canadian produce and what amount from the United States?

4. What has been the cost of maintenance and operation of the said canal for the five years now last passed?

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

1. Capital expenditure to 31st of March, 1908	$28,082,629 82
Capital total expenditure 1st of April to 31st of January, 1909	214,944 13
Total	$28,297,573 99
Income renewals total expenditure to 31st of March 1908	$ 1,153,560 56
Income renewals total expenditure 1st of April to 31st of January, 1909	104,565 76
	$1,258,126 32
Grand total	$29,555,700 31

	Canadian.	U. S.	Total.
2. 1904			$ 811,371
1905			1,092,050
1906			1,201,917
1907			1,614,132
1908	$776,245	$927,208	1,703,453

Note.—No information can be given as to the quantity of Canadian and American produce passing through the canal from 1903 to 1907.

	Total.
3. 1888	878,800
1889	1,085,273
1890	1,016,165
1891	975,013
1892	955,554

4. Maintenance staff and repairs—expenditure for the past five years ending fiscal year 31st of March, 1908, $881,659.36.

Note.—Only nine months included in fiscal year 1906-7

Information given above will be found in the annual report issued by the Department of Railways and Canals, and canal statistics.

FISHERIES CRUISER FOR PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked:

1. When was the appropriation made for the building of a fisheries cruiser for the Pacific coast?

2. Have tenders been called for the building of the same?

3. If so, how many tenders were presented, from whom, and what were the amounts?

4. Has the government accepted any of the tenders yet? If so, what is the firm?

5. When are the builders supposed to have the vessel completed?

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

1. In 1907-8.

2. Yes.

3. Seven. Swan, Hunter and Wigham Richardson, Wallsend-on-Tyne, Eng. Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, Collingwood, Ont. Fleming and Ferguson, Paisley. Vickers Sons and Maxim, Barrow-in-Furness. Clydebank Engineering and Shipbuilding Works, Clydebank. London and Glasgow Engineering and Iron Shipbuilding Company, Glasgow. Polson Iron Works, Limited, Toronto.

4. No. The tenders are still under consideration.

5. Answered by No. 4.

IMPORTS OF NAILS, 1907-8.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. How many pounds of nails were imported into Canada during the years 1907 and 1908?

2. By whom were they imported and at what ports of entry?

3. Where were they shipped from, and what is the name of the shippers?

4. What was the price per pound?

5. Are nails free of duty?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. The trade and navigation tables show the principal imports of nails for the year ended March 31, 1908, as follows:

	Lbs.	Value.	Average value per lb. Cents.
Iron or steel cut nails and spikes	412,400	$10,359	2½
Wire nails of all kinds, n.o.p.	787,400	27,035	3 4-10th
Nails, brads, spikes, and tacks, n.o.p.	271,631	16,443	6
Composition and sheathing nails and spikes	16,595	2,632	15⅞

2, 3 and 4. It is not usual to publish the details asked for in questions 2, 3 and 4, and the information cannot be furnished at present. I fancy the hon. member (Mr. Lalor) will not press for it. I do not know whether I could get the information, and, even if it could be collected, it would be a long time.

5. Nails are not free of duty.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES BY CLASSES.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Herron—asked:

1. How many clerks are employed on the Intercolonial and what is their average pay per day?

2. How many class employees are there on the Intercolonial Railway, what is the name of each class?

3. Where do the clerks stand as compared with the other employees in regard to pay?

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

1. Four hundred and sixty at $1.85 per day, average pay.

2.

Class	Number.
General officers	7
Other officers	82
Station agents	236
Other station men	681
Engine men	356
Firemen	435
Conductors	265
Other trainmen	998
Machinists	473
Carpenters	493
Other shop men	875
Section foremen	263
Other trackmen	1,028
Switch tenders etc	86
Telegraph operators and despatchers	273
Employees, floating equipment	44
All other employees	1,868
Total	8,923

3. They stand thirteen on the list of the others shown.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES.

Mr. RHODES asked:

1. Were the claims of any person or persons in Nova Scotia against the government, by reason of personal damages or losses of animals or damages to property on account of the Intercolonial, settled or paid between June 1 and December 31, 1908?

2. If so, what are the names and addresses of such persons, the nature of their claims, how was settlement effected, and on what date was settlement effected in each case?

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as motion for return.

SOUTH AFRICAN PATRIOTIC FUND.

Mr. WALLACE asked:

1. Has the government any knowledge of the existence of the South African patriotic fund? If so, how much of this fund is left in the treasurer's hands, and who is the treasurer?

2. Who have benefited by this fund, and to what amount?

3. What is the intention of the government with regard to this fund?

4. Are any salaries paid to any person out of this fund?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). At the request of the Minister of Militia, I beg to say that as the government have not control over this fund, they are unable to answer any of these questions. The Canadian Patriotic Fund Association was incorporated by chapter 92 of the Act of 1901 and the Act of incorporation was amended in 1908.

MR. R. J. WATSON.

Mr. SEXSMITH asked:

1. Has Mr. R. J. Watson, ex-M.P., been appointed to an office under this government?

2. If so, what is the work he will have in charge, when does he commence, what are his particular duties, and what salary?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Watson is being employed to make an inspection of certain timber berths in the railway belt of British Columbia, with a view of deciding what portions of these berths may be withdrawn as being suitable for settlement. He has already left for the west and his salary during employment will be at the rate of $2,500 a year.

OPPORTUNITIES IN CANADA, 1909.

Mr. McCARTHY—by Mr. Herron—asked:

Who are the publishers of the book intituled: 'Opportunities in Canada, 1909'?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The publisher is Mr. Ernest Heaton, of Toronto.

DREDGING ST. JOHN HARBOUR.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. On what date was dredging work begun by Mr. Gregory at Ballast wharf, St. John harbour?

2. On what date was dredging work begun by the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company at Beacon Bar, St. John harbour?

3. Have any contracts been made for dredging in St. John harbour since August, 1908, other than mentioned by the minister on page 1983, revised 'Hansard'? If so, what, with whom, at what rates, what tenders, if any, were invited and received therefor, and what are the names and prices of the tenderers?

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

1. February 17, 1909.
2. February 26, 1909.
3. (a) Yes.
   (b) Dredging at York Point.
   (c) Maritime Dredging and Construction Company.
   (d) Prices per cubic yard:

Towed to dumping grounds.

Rock.	Other materials.
$6 00.	$0 90.

Cast over.

Rock.	Other materials.
$6 00.	$0 90.

(e) Tenders called for by public advertisement and only one received, that of the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company with the above mentioned prices.

BRIDGE AT ST. ANDREWS LOCKS, MANITOBA.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

1. Does the present contract for the bridge over the dam at St. Andrews locks, Manitoba, provide for a proper connection being made with the highways on both sides of the river so as to make the bridge practical for traffic?

2. If not, is it the intention of the government to have this work done at once, so as to connect the highway with the bridge by a practical road for general traffic?

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

1. No.

2. It is considered that this is a work which should be undertaken by local government and municipality.

RAILWAY CROSSING AT PEMBROKE.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

Referring to a return brought down on the 4th instant on motion of Mr. Lennox, sessional papers No. 99, and to a list of cases decided by the Railway Board, marked 'A,' in this return, and it appearing by the return that in 68 of the total of 69 railway crossings cases decided, the railway companies paid all or a great part of the cost, what are the special circumstances in connection with the only case in which the government was interested, namely, the crossing at Pembroke, order 192, which made it proper that the railway company in this case should be exonerated and that the total cost of protection should be borne by the country, represented by the Department of Public Works?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). In reply the board begs to state that an error has occurred in the memorandum submitted by the board marked 'A' and referred to in the above inquiry in citing the order as No. 192. The order in question is order No. 3,244, and is dated July 4, 1907. Order No. 192, dated October 18, 1904 was signed by the late Chief Commissioner, the Hon. A. G. Blair, but was not in fact issued. The order was not issued until subsequently, but in substance the two orders are identical. Referring, therefore, to the inquiry, the application was made to the board on October 4, 1904. Subsequently, on May 5, 1905, the application was heard at a public sitting of the board in Ottawa, Mr. White, K.C., and Mr. J. E. McMullen appearing on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and Mr. U. Valiquet, engineer of the Department of Public Works, appearing for the Department of Public Works. The board, after hearing what was alleged, as set forth in the notes of proceedings. volume 16, pages 1684 to 1696, reached the following decision, namely, that the applicants (that is, the Department of Public Works of Canada) be granted leave to cross, at rail level, with the proposed wharf the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's tracks, opposite the town of Pembroke, as shown on the plan filed, and that the crossing be protected by an automatic bell, the cost of the installation and maintenance to be borne by the applicants, that is, the Department of Public Works. It appears from the evidence that the contention of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was that the streets of the town of Pembroke did not extend beyond the water line of the Ottawa river; that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had constructed their line on a trestle in the water; that the wharf, having been constructed outside the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's trestle, the approach to it from the town side and the crossing of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's tracks was something the company should not be held liable for the cost of the protection of. It would appear that the issuance of the order was delayed to enable the Department of Public Works to decide whether they would take the order subject to the condition that they paid for the protection, or to endeavour to arrange with the town to pay for the cost of protection. Finally, however, at the request of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under date of a letter of April 3, 1907, an order was issued.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing:

1. How many licenses to fish and pack lobsters in the coast waters of Prince Edward Island have been issued by the Dominion government since January 1, 1904, to this date, and to whom same were issued.

2. A copy of any petitions, requests, or correspondence received by the government from any person or persons, or corporations since January 1, 1904, asking for licenses to fish and pack lobsters in said province.

3. The number of new licenses likely to be issued by the government during the present year.—Mr. Fraser.

For a return showing the names and addresses of the several immigration agents in Canada whose duty it is to locate or settle immigrants upon their arrival in Canada; what salary or remuneration has been paid to each such agent for the fiscal year 1908 and up to the first of February, 1909; and on what basis they are paid.—Mr. Macdonell.

For a return showing the names and addresses of the several inspectors of immigrants employed by the government; what salary or remuneration has been paid to each

such inspector during the fiscal year 1908 and up to the 1st of February, 1909; and on what basis they were paid.—Mr. Herron.

For a copy of all correspondence, communications in writting and documents from the grand secretary, or any officials of the Fisherman's Union of Nova Scotia, or any branch or station of the said union, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or to any official of the department, and the replies or communications from the minister or any official of the department since the 1st of January, 1907?—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a return showing what expenses under the following heads: (a) bank commission, (b) underwriting charges, (c) brokerage, and (d) advertising, were incurred by the government on each of the following loans, and to whom the several amounts were paid, viz.:—

	£	s.	d.
1874 loan extended to 1911, 4 per cent..	1,753,830	4	10
1875-8 public works guaranteed loan, 4 per cent..	3,200,000	0	0
Loan of 1884, 3½ per cent..	5,000,000	0	0
Canada reduced 1885, 4 per cent.	6,443,136	2	9
Loan of 1885, 4 per cent..	4,000,000	0	0
C.P.R. land grant loan 1888, 3½ per cent..	3,093,700	0	0
4 per cent loan of 1908-12, 4 per cent..	1,379,600	0	0
3½ per cent loan 1908 (February issue) 3½ per cent..	3,000,000	0	0
3¾ per cent loan 1908, 3¾ per cent..	5,000,000	0	0
3½ per cent loan 1908 (October issue) 3½ per cent..	5,000,000	0	0
3¾ per cent loan 1909, 3¾ per cent..	6,000,000	0	0

Payable in Canada.

Reduced loan of 1883, extended 3½ per cent..	$1,425,800 00

Dominion stock issue.

A reduced in 1897, 3½ per cent.. ..	58,899 67
B reduced in 1897, 3½ per cent.. ..	325,900 00
C reduced in 1897, 3½ per cent..	49,066 34
E extended for 10 years, from 1st July, 1906, 3¾ per cent..	2,500,000 00
Dominion stock issue 1891, 3½ per cent..	404,202 00

$5,000,000 for one month; Bank of Montreal, Ottawa; March 2, 1909; 4 per cent.—Mr. S. Sharpe.

For a copy of all reports, specifications, offers, tenders, contracts, alterations of contract, correspondence and documents of every description relating to or in connection with the contract of Thadee Desbiens for an extension to the Chicoutimi pier; and the same in connection with the contract of the General Construction Company, for work done by the dredge 'Algonquin' at or near said pier.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all petitions, reports, specifications, offers, tenders, contracts or papers of any description in connection with the protection pier at Rivière du Moulin, near Chicoutimi, Saguenay county, P.Q.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all reports, correspondence, statements, receipts, vouchers and documents of every description with respect to the granting and payment of the railway subsidy authorized under 6-7 Edward VII., chapter 40, section 1, subsection 16.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all applications, advertisements, tenders, leases, correspondence and papers of every description, with respect to timber berths Nos. 1316, 1317, 1318, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1333, 1334, 1335, 1336, 1360, 1361, 1362, 1363, 1564 and 1365.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a copy of all applications, correspondence, reports, documents and papers relating to the establishment and service of a post office at Hand Hills, Alberta.—Mr. Magrath.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY BRANCH LINES.

Mr. DANIEL. With regard to the motion of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) relating to the leasing of branch lines, I might say that it would appear to me rather inadvisable for him to bring it up just now, because the House is awaiting the return of several documents that have been ordered to be printed directly bearing upon this subject, being the report of the Intercolonial Railway Commission, and also of the commission appointed by the New Brunswick government, and other information relating to the question. It appears to me, therefore, that the House is hardly in a position to discuss it intelligently without that information before it. I do not think it would interefere at all with the hon. gentleman, or do his motion any harm, if he would postpone it for a week, or until that information is laid before the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. The report alluded to has been printed and is before the House.

Mr. HUGHES. It was presented only ten minutes ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, this afternoon, and it is now in the hands of members. I desire to go on with the motion this evening.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—BRANCH LINES.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland) moved :

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable in furtherance of the transportation interests of this Dominion, that the sphere of influence of the Intercolonial Railway as a government operated railway should be widened and extended by securing by lease or otherwise such of the branch lines of railway now connecting the Intercolonial as will serve as direct and profitable feeders to the traffic of said railway.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I trust I take no exaggerated view of the subject involved

in this motion which I have the honour to present to the House when I state that I consider it of the very greatest importance not only to eastern Canada but to the whole Dominion. It is a question which has a direct bearing on that very great problem of affording the best means of transportation for the commerce of our country. I regret Sir, that I am unable to approach the subject with that ability and comprehensive knowledge which it undoubtedly demands. I feel that I cannot deal with this particular subject of the branch lines connecting with the Intercolonial Railway without in some way reviewing the transportation history of the past, and for convenience sake I shall divide that history into four periods. First of all, at the very dawn of confederation the problem which confronted the people of that day was the construction of the Intercolonial Railway to connect the eastern and western provinces which then constituted Canada, and allied with that was the question of the extension and completion of our canal system. It is not mere tradition to say that in the confederation compact the construction of the Intercolonial Railway was placed as a set off against the extension of the canal system. Rightly or wrongly it was viewed that the canal system of Canada appertained more directly to the transportation interests of what was known as Upper and Lower Canada and that the Intercolonial Railway was conceived as a means of solving the transportation problem for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which were then the other two provinces in the confederation. The second period in our transportation history commenced with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The third period was that in which the government of the day dealt with the transportation question by aiding the building of railways throughout Canada by the granting of money and land subsidies and co-related to that same period was the governmental guarantee of bonds (in addition to the subsidies granted) of railways that were deemed to be in the general interest of the country.

The fourth period may well be referred to as the period of the National Transcontinental Railway or Grand Trunk Pacific period. That great work was dealt with by the last parliament, with a view to meeting the larger transportation questions that have arisen by reason of the additions to our territory and the expansion and development of our commerce. I shall, as briefly as I can, deal with these four periods before I come to discuss the immediate question submitted to the House by my resolution.

The Grand Trunk Pacific period involved not merely a direct expenditure on the part of the Dominion, but also aid towards the construction of a railway owned by a private corporation by the guaranteeing of its bonds, a policy which had previously been carried out with respect to other railways, particularly in western Canada. It will be interesting to note just how much money the people of Canada have been obliged to spend in connection with each of these periods. We recognize the Intercolonial Railway as a great work, the undertaking of which was discussed prior to the days of confederation. Beginning with the late forties and extending down to the consummation of confederation the construction of the Intercolonial Railway was deemed a question of importance to British North America as a whole and particularly to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec. I need not recount the number of conferences that were held; I need not refer to the great work performed by the revered Joseph Howe ; I need not name the men who in those upper provinces took such a great interest in the carrying out of this project, destined to bind together the provinces which then constituted Canada. It will be borne in mind that at the time of the conference at Charlottetown the very first question that had to be settled was the question of the proposed construction of the Intercolonial Railway—how it was to be done and the purpose which it would serve; and it was undoubtedly held out as an inducement to the eastern provinces to form a part of the Dominion that had been conceived in the minds of the statesmen of that day.

I need not say that in the selection of a route for the railway there were great differences of opinion. There was a discussion as to whether the construction of the railway would not be beyond the powers of the new Dominion. There were strong objections on the part of the people of Ontario in particular to so great an undertaking. Ontario at that period was, as she is to-day, one of the first provinces of the Dominion—her population far in excess of the combined populations of the maritime provinces, her natural wealth far beyond that of any other province. In population, in wealth, in area, in every thing which goes to make a country great, Ontario was far ahead of any of the other provinces; and naturally her people thought that the burden of the construction of the railway would fall very largely upon their shoulders, and they did not think it was a matter of prime importance to them even that there should be such a railway. In the selection of a route many interests were involved. There was first the political consideration that could not be ignored; there were the sectional interests that are ever with us, and there was the imperial interest, the military interest of the motherland, in the colonies of British America. When it was determined to se-

lect what was known as the Robinson route, the northern route, the route along the southern shores of the St. Lawrence river, and thence crossing the divide to the northern shores of New Brunswick, it was asserted on all sides that such a railway could not be made a commercial success. It was described as traversing large areas sparsely if at all populated, as passing through a section that was bleak and barren. But the railway was thus routed and it was thus constructed; and the fathers of confederation said: Even though it does not prove to be a commercial success, we would rather build one, two, three, four—and one hon. member said even six—such railways if their construction would bring about the confederation of Her Majesty's colonies in British North America under the government of one great Dominion. And that was the general opinion; it was the opinion of every shade of political thought; and it was decided that the railway should be thus constructed by the Dominion of Canada as an off-set to the construction of new canals and the improvement of old ones, so that there could be facilities of transportation for the people of both eastern and western Canada.

The Intercolonial Railway was constructed. I need not go further into its history. I shall not further elaborate the objections that were raised. I will simply invite your attention to the cost of that railway as it stands to-day to the people of Canada:

The Original Intercolonial Railway..	$73,013,210 01
The Cape Breton Railway..	3,860,679 14
The Oxford and New Glasgow Railway..	1,949,063 21
The Eastern Extension Railway	1,324,042 81
The Montreal and European Short Line Railway..	333,942 72
The Drummond Counties Railway	1,464,000 00
The Canada Eastern Railway..	800,000 00
Total..	$82,744,937 89

This is the total amount invested by the people of Canada up to this time in the Intercolonial Railway. Now, I am not going to discuss in detail the question of the dollars and cents of advantage that has accrued to the people of this Dominion from the expenditure of that very large sum of money. It will undoubtedly be admitted by every hon. member of this House, and by every man outside of this House, that the Intercolonial has been of immense advantage to the people of this country, even though its annual credit balances have not shown large in its book-keeping, by reason of the very low rates of freight that have prevailed and the encouragement which those low rates have given to the trade and navigation of the country. I think it will be admitted on all sides that the advantages that have been derived by the people of Canada directly from the construction of the railway are beyond calculation in dollars and cents. It has cemented the provinces together; it has brought the people in closer touch with each other. I need not say that at the time of confederation the people of Ontario and the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were aliens and foreigners to each other; there was no communication between them; they were as wide apart as were the Jews and Samaritans in days of old—indeed, farther apart; while at that time the people of eastern Canada were in close touch with the people of the New England states, both as to trade and as to social intercourse. They knew each other and that is one of the reasons why there are so many Canadians to-day in the eastern cities of the United States and in the western cities as well. The construction of the Intercolonial Railway led to an interchange of ideas between Canadians. The traffic was diverted this way partly by the low freight rates on that railway, and the fact that the people in the maritime provinces to-day are familiar with the people in Ontario and the west is due very largely, in my judgment, to the construction of the Intercolonial Railway.

But during that period we made other expenditures. Starting out as the twin sister of the Intercolonial Railway was the canal system of Canada. Up to the time of confederation there had been expended in the construction of canals something in the vicinity of $20,000,000. These canals, which were situated in Ontario and Quebec, were designed to carry on an interprovincial traffic between Upper and Lower Canada as well as to contribute to the export traffic of the ports of Montreal and Quebec, and I am bound to say that the people of the east rejoice in the fact that these canals have been an immense success in the accomplishment of that object, although it cannot be denied that the traffic thus created and carried by those canals in no sense reached the maritime provinces nor did it benefit their trade in any respect. The Intercolonial Railway has been the medium of practically all the traffic between eastern and western Canada; it certainly was up to the time of the construction of the Canadian Pacific short line from Montreal to Metawamkeag and the city of St. John. The canals have done a great work for Canada. They have contributed to its export trade; they have made its traffic rates lower and they have made possible the great export and commercial trade of Montreal and Quebec with the ports beyond the seas.

How much have we contributed in that direction? Canada has invested $91,734,718.21 during the period between the 1st of July, 1867 and the close of our last fiscal year.

That was exclusive of all imperial expenditure in connection with the canal system of Ontario and Quebec, so it may fairly be said that the people of Canada contributed between 1867 and the present year in aid of the Intercolonial Railway the sum of $82,744,000, particularly in the interests and because of the solicitations of the people of eastern Canada. Let me admit that. But at the same time there was contributed to the aid of the other partners in confederation and for their benefit towards the construction of these canals the sum of nearly $92,000,000.

This first period in our transportation history was perhaps the hardest period of them all. It required a greater courage than any of the succeeding periods; but Canada grappled with the difficulties of that day as she can and will grapple with the difficulties of to-day. The next great question that invited the consideration of the people of Canada was the construction of a railway designed not merely to connect Ontario with Nova Scotia but to bind together the eastern and western provinces, to span the continent from the Atlantic to the shores of the Pacific. The Canadian Pacific Railway was commenced about 1874, during the days of Alexander Mackenzie. Surveys of the road were then taken, and portions of it were constructed as a government built road. During that period, as we all know, and since, there has been a great deal of discussion with respect to the magnitude of the problem which Canada faced in the construction of a transcontinental railway and the manner in which she grappled with that problem. I need not speak of the importance of that railway, it has been discussed so often, and we are all so familiar with it, that it would be but a waste of time to discuss it now. But we must also ask ourselves what that railway cost to the people of Canada, what we have paid out during that great period to meet the problems that confronted us at that time. When I turn to the public accounts to enquire as to the cost of that railway I am confronted with figures that seem large indeed, and I have to stop and realize that the moneys expended on the Intercolonial Railway are represented by a railway that is owned by Canada to-day, a great national asset of Canada. When I think of the canals and review what they have cost Canada I realize that we have the canals, that they are ours and that they represent the money thus expended; they are a national asset But when I view the expenditure with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I realize, and every member of the House must realize, that we have expended large sums of money, that we do not own the railway, it is not ours. The very questions that have been discussed during this session of parliament, involving the capital stock of that railway and the interest incident to the largeness of that capital account, indicate that Canada, as a nation, does not own any portion of that railway; that while we have spent our dollars and contributed our lands towards its construction, it is not ours to-day. It is not even owned by Canadians individually; its shareholders are to be found in every civilized country. As a Canadian nation, we cannot point to it as a national asset. I find that we have expended on this system, in subsidies and in constructed lines, $87,425,000.60.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not going to knock off even the sixty cents, as I desire to be accurate. First, there were surveys made by the government in the early seventies, and portions of the line were constructed west of Lake Superior and down the Fraser canyon. We have contributed to the Canadian Pacific Railway and its branches 27,924,190 acres of our best lands. It is simply a question of arithmetic what this shall be held to represent. If you consider the land worth $1 an acre, you simply have the number of acres representing the same number of dollars. But if you value these lands at what I conceive to be a fair valuation—certainly not an extravagant one—$5 an acre, you have as a contribution on this account by the people of this Dominion to the Canadian Pacific, $139,620,950. This makes a grand total cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway and its branches to this country of $227,045,950.60. You can lessen that, if you will, by depreciating the value of the lands. I venture to say these lands are being sold by the company at a very much higher price per acre to-day. Figure the amount what you please, and it makes no difference with respect to the argument which I am making—we have contributed an immense sum of money to the construction of this railway, and as a Canadian people we do not own the road. I admit that the railway has done a great work for Canada; in calling attention to these figures, I am in no sense minimizing the importance of that great railway, nor am I calling in question the wisdom of those who saw fit to take the action they did during the parliaments that have sat since confederation. I simply want to invite your attention to the figures, so that the people of Canada may realize just what the railway has cost them to perfect our transportation facilities down to the period ending with what I have described, for convenience, as the Canadian Pacific period of our transportation history.

So, we have invested in the Intercolonial $82,000,000, we have invested in the canal

system of Canada, $92,000,000; we have invested in the Canadian Pacific Railway upwards of $225,000,000. Each of these great systems has played an important part in our history and has contributed and will contribute to our growth as a nation.

Mr. S. BARKER (East Hamilton). With the hon. gentleman's permission, I would like to ask him a question. His figures are very interesting. He is comparing the cost of various great national undertakings. He has given us the capital expenditure—made originally, made many years ago—he has given us the Canadian Pacific Railway grants multiplied by the present value, and so on. But he has not given us what the cost of the Intercolonial would be, capitalized up to date. If he will give that, we should be better able to judge its comparative value.

Mr. EMMERSON. I gave the capital invested. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) would seek now to incorporate into this another question entirely.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) has multiplied the grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway by five.

Mr. EMMERSON. I quite see the diversion my hon. friend seeks to make. I have not taken into consideration the question of annual deficits on the Intercolonial, nor have I taken into consideration the deficits on the canal system of Canada.

Mr. BARKER. I am not asking that.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, the hon. gentleman does not wish to know anything about that, nor would it be a matter of importance from his standpoint.

Mr. BARKER. Nor from yours.

Mr. EMMERSON. One offsets the other, so far as the discussion of this question is concerned.

Mr. BARKER. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) in his argument. I am not going into the question of losses. But he is dealing with the original expenditure. He has given us the original expenditure on the Intercolonial and the original expenditure, including lands, on the Canadian Pacific Railway. But he multiplies the grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway by the present value, which is about five times the original estimate, and leaves the other at the original cost.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was self-evident. I did not hide the facts; I presented them. I simply said that we had expended on the Canadian Pacific in cash $87,425,000, and, in addition, we had given nearly 28,000,000 acres of land, and I mentioned that it was simply a question of arithmetic what value you should put on those lands—whether one dollar, two dollars, three dollars, four dollars or five dollars an acre. Just for the purposes of calculation, I put the valuation at $5 an acre, but I did not take into consideration some other things. I have not in the past taken into consideration the fact that after we had constructed the Intercolonial Railway, we aided in the construction of a competing line, a short line, to St. John, and that we have been paying annually for twenty years the sum of $186,000 towards the operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to St. John. And I have not invited attention to the cash subsidies which we have given, and properly given. But I want it distinctly understood that when you give any attention to the Intercolonial Railway and its results, particularly its financial results, you must bear in mind that when we constructed the Intercolonial Railway, we aided, but a very few years afterwards, the construction of a competing line to take away from the Intercolonial Railway a large portion of its traffic and make it operate at a disadvantage. Nor did I refer to the fact that the Intercolonial Railway was constructed along a route where it was brought at every point in competition with water carriage. I have not referred to these facts because time calls on me to shorten this preface to the resolution which I have the honour to move.

There is a third period, that of subsidies and the guarantee of bonds in aid of railways. I find that after the government of Canada has invested its money in the Intercolonial Railway, in its canal system and in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there was inaugurated a new policy—wisely no doubt in the interests of the country—the policy of aiding the construction of railway lines throughout Canada by means of subsidies granted at the rate of so much per mile. This policy adopted by the Dominion, was followed by the provinces, and followed, I think, very unwisely. If there was one defect in the British North America Act, it was in giving the provinces the power to aid the construction of railways; and I think I can fairly make this argument, that the fathers of confederation never contemplated that the provinces themselves would aid the construction of railways. The terms of the British North America Act would seem to bear out that view. The financial arrangements made for the carrying on of the provinces certainly could never have contemplated their going into the railway business. We know what the discussion was at the time of confederation with respect to the amount of money which would be required to carry on the ordinary affairs of government in the respective provinces; and when the cry went forth in 1865, particularly throughout the eastern provinces, that the people were being purchased by the upper Canadians at eighty cents per head, it car-

ried with it the idea that the people of the respective provinces were simply to have eighty cents per head for the maintenance of provincial government. But that is a digression. The important fact is that the policy was inaugurated by the Dominion. Railways were promoted in every section, their construction was commenced and that construction has from time to time been continued down to the present. We have expended, apart from the $25,000,000 given as a cash bonus to the Canadian Pacific Railway, upwards of $36,000,000 in subsidies in aid of the construction of railways, and that $36,000,000 does not include $2,294,000 which was placed to the credit of the province of Quebec in our debt account with that province, and upon which we have been paying interest every year since at the rate of five per cent per annum, making an annual expenditure of $119,700 per year. We not merely give this amount in cash to these respective railways, but we gave in lands about 4,000,000 acres as subsidies to aid in the construction of railways which have not been since absorbed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I find that we have given to all railways, inclusive of the Canadian Pacific Railway and its branch lines, 31,864,074 acres. Deducting the Canadian Pacific Railway land, 27,924,190 acres, that leaves to the Canadian Northern and other railways 3,989,884 acres. You can figure out those lands at any price you please, but whether at one dollar, two dollars, or five dollars per acre, the amount is very considerable; and I think it might fairly be said that we have invested in all other railways, of which we do not own a single fragment, an amount equal to our investment in the canals, greater than our investment in the Intercolonial Railway, and very considerably reaching the larger figure which we gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I make this statement, sir, that if you figure the amount that we have paid towards the construction of railways, other than the Intercolonial Railway, either in cash or in lands, we have invested in these privately owned railways throughout Canada, an amount exceeding $457,000,000. Now, that $457,000,000 is represented by our indebtedness, it is represented by the earnings of the people of Canada thus expended, but the people of Canada have had the benefit, and I do not ask your consideration of the figures with any idea that I am condemning the course that was adopted, but I wish the facts placed before us so that we can make a comparison when we come to consider perhaps the smaller question—the question involved in the resolution now under consideration.

Now, Sir, I come to the fourth period, a period so recent in our history that we are all at once familiar with it, and I need not take up any of the time of the House in considering this period, which I have been pleased to term as the Grand Trunk Pacific period in the transportation history of Canada. We know what was done in this parliament in 1903 and 1904. We know the agitation that has been created through the country, and we know that on every hustings throughout Canada this question has been discussed. It is fresh in the minds of the people at this moment, and the questions to what that railway has cost up to this moment and as to what it may cost when it is a completed work, are questions which I will not now undertake to solve, but they are questions worthy of consideration.

Mr. BARKER. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker says, 'hear, hear.' Is it because he thinks that was not a solution of the problem that confronted the people of Canada? Is it because he thinks we are to pay too dearly for the solution of such a problem, or is it merely the hon. gentleman's partisan colour that leads him to say 'hear, hear' in respect to that? I am endeavouring to deal with this question in the cold light of facts. I do not wish to incorporate into it one iota of partisan feeling. I do not wish it to be coloured by any political bias or any partisan thought. If it is incorporated into it, it will be by persons other than myself. I am dealing, in this resolution, with a business problem, one that I conceive, rightly or wrongly, to be in the interest of all Canada, one that is of paramount importance, in my judgment, to the people of eastern Canada, and I cannot refrain, and if I did refrain, I would be recreant to what I conceive to be my duty, from inviting the attention of the House and of the country to just what has occurred with respect to our transportation expenditures since the dawn of confederation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot very well take into consideration the declaration of this resolution without assuming one fact, which fact, if you take it from under this resolution, permits the resolution to be so absolutely futile and nugatory that its consideration even would be a waste of time by this House, and I would be but wasting your time and my own time and energy if I were to continue without the basis of that fact. I have declared in this resolution:

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable in furtherance of the transportation interests of this Dominion, that the sphere of influence of the Intercolonial Railway as a government operated railway should be widened and extended by securing, by lease or otherwise, such of the branch lines of railway now connecting with the Intercolonial Railway, as will serve as direct and profitable feeders to the traffic of said railway.

It must be taken as an assumed fact, and it is not and should not be a violent

assumption that the Intercolonial Railway is to continue as a government-owned and government-operated railway, that that is to be the policy of this parliament and of this government, as it has been the policy of past parliaments and past governments. I have the right to assume that. I need only refer to the political history of this country, the history of this parliament and the history of all governments, to lead me to the conclusion that it is a fair assumption that the Intercolonial Railway is to be continued as it was conceived—a government road, operated by the government and the people of Canada. If it is not to be, if the assumption is too violent, then, Sir, my remarks are of no avail, they have no point and they are without foundation either in fact or fiction. Let me, therefore, invite your attention to what has occurred since confederation. Take the history of the Conservative party, the attitude of all Conservative administrations down to 1896, and I am bound to say that on its face it was not an attitude of hostility, but an attitude of friendliness. If you turn to the debates of parliament in 1883, when Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways, and refer to the votes and estimates of that period you will there recognize that in all of the works proposed, connected in any way with the Intercolonial Railway, whether it was the subsidizing of a branch line, whether it was the construction of terminals, whether it was the building of breakwaters or wharfs, the basis of the application to parliament for these money votes was the extension of the Intercolonial Railway and the improvement of its traffic that its earnings might be benefited. Sir Charles Tupper, in proposing to parliament line after line to be subsidized, said: It is a feeder to the Intercolonial Railway, part of the government system. Even that railway, known now as the Atlantic and Lake Superior, more generally known as the Baie des Chaleurs, when it was first brought to the notice of this House, was brought forward in the form of a resolution providing money for the construction of that railway by the government as a branch line of the Intercolonial Railway. Later the aid was changed to a subsidy to a railway company.

The branches thus constructed, the wharfs and breakwaters and harbours and terminals built and improved were all for the purpose of enabling the Intercolonial railway to continue its work. There were additions to the road; a short line was built from Oxford Junction to Stellarton, other lines were built in Cape Breton and Nova Scotia, the St. Charles branch from St. Charles to Lévis was constructed and other extensions and improvements were made. It is true that about 1896 there were rumours that it was the intention of the Conservative government of that day to transfer the Intercolonial Railway to a private corporation. I know not if these rumours were well or ill founded, but I do know that if there was any truth in them, the Liberal party of Canada gained advantage to the extent that these rumours were believed in. However, so far as the proceedings of this House will demonstrate the Conservative party was committed to the continuance of the Intercolonial as a government railroad. At all events, from the year 1896 when the Liberal government assumed power down to the present moment, every Act of that government was such as to impress the people of Canada with the idea that the Liberal party as a party is a friend of the Intercolonial and bent on its continuance as a government operated railway. Every act of the Liberal government: the construction of lines, the improvement of the Intercolonial itself, its extension into Montreal, the leasing for a long period of years of part of the Grand Trunk line and access to its Montreal terminals, the purchase of the Canada Eastern Railway; a thousand and one acts of the Liberal government demonstrate that it was in favour of maintaining the present status of the Intercolonial. Read over the acts of 1903 and 1904 in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway; read them over carefully and there is hardly a clause or a line which does not indicate that provision is made by the government and by the parliament of Canada for the future of the Intercolonial as a government road. The possibility of forfeiture, the possibility of failure on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific, are safeguarded in every direction by provisions that the government shall be in a position to nullify any disaster that may accrue by the absorption of the portion of the line that may be forfeited as a part of the Intercolonial railway system. There can be no question but that down to this period the attitude of the Liberal government, and the attitude of all parliaments in which I have sat indicate no other thought than that the Intercolonial should be continued as a railroad owned and operated by the government of Canada. I think therefore that I have the right to assume that there is no other intention on the part of the government or the parliament of Canada. I remember, when I had the honour to preside over the Department of Railways and Canals, there were similar rumours with respect to the Intercolonial Railway. There are always rumours set afloat for this purpose or for that and generally because of some ulterior purpose to be served. I remember that on one occasion a rumour was circulated (for what purpose I know not) that the Intercolonial Railway was to cease as a government operated road and to become the property of a private corporation. I remember,

speaking for the government—and I do not think I have ever exceeded my authority —I remember making the statement that the government of Canada as then constituted had no intention of disposing of the Intercolonial Railway, that on the contrary that they were determined to maintain it in its entirety and in its present status as a portion of the transportation system of Canada, and that in so doing they were also determined that it should be made a paying asset.

Now, Sir, before discussing the direct question of the acquisition of the branch lines, I must ssume that this railway is to continue as a government railway to be operated by the government. If I were not able to assume that then there would be no point to my resolution and no object to be served by it. Taking that assumption as correct I would therefore bring to the notice of this House the question of the absorption of the branch lines connected within the Intercolonial Railway as a part of the Intercolonial Railway system. I shall bring it to the notice of the House purely as a business proposition; a proposition designed to be of advantage to the Intercolonial itself of advantage to the people served by the Intercolonial, of advantage to Canada, and incidentally of advantage to the communities served by these branch lines. Let me analyse the meaning of this resolution. It does not involve the purchase of a single line of railway unless the parliament of Canada so authorizes. It does not declare that the government shall purchase all the branch lines, or even one of them. It does not involve any addition to the public debt. It simply declares that power should be taken by the government of Canada to extend the Intercolonial railway by acquiring by lease or otherwise such of the branch lines as would be deemed to be of advantage as feeders to the Intercolonial.

Now, we have the benefit of a declaration by the right hon. leader of this House with respect to this question. It will be borne in mind that I had the honour to move at the last session of the last parliament a resolution which covered the resolution which I am moving to-night, but which went further and involved the extension westward of the Intercolonial, with a view to facilitating the import and export trade of the Dominion through Canadian channels. There was some discussion in this House on that resolution and incidentally we had the benefit of a declaration by the Prime Minister on the question of the absorption of the branch lines. He stated that if the Intercolonial were owned and operated by a company, unquestionably it would be a part of its business to absorb the branch lines, and that any well-managed railway company would so do. He did raise the question as to whether government operation was elastic enough. That was simply raised as a doubt; but we had this declaration, that if the Intercolonial were to be run as a business proposition the branch lines would be so absorbed. We had also a declaration from the Minister of Railways; but he went much further and was much stronger in his declaration of policy, stating that during the interim between the last session of the last parliament and this first session of this parliament he would cause to be had an inquiry with respect to the advantages of these branch lines to the Intercolonial, the possibilities of their traffic, and the extent to which they would contribute to the traffic of the Intercolonial. It seems that such an inquiry has been had, and although we have not had the benefit of having laid before this House a copy of the report of the commission appointed for that purpose, we know the nature of their report—a report which was deemed to be of such importance by the government of Canada that mention was made of it by His Excellency in the speech from the Throne, with a view undoubtedly of its being laid before parliament so that it might receive the consideration of parliament.

Now, Sir, does the resolution propose any new thing in the history of railways either in this country or in any other country? We find that everywhere in Canada where the Grand Trunk Railway has been brought into contact with a branch line it has absorbed that line if it could. We find that throughout Canada, both in the east and in the west, wherever the Canadian Pacific Railway has had an opportunity of securing a branch line of railway, it has secured it. The history of all countries demonstrates the same thing. The railways in Great Britain were originally many. A few of the larger ones absorbed the smaller ones and the branches, and they became systems. In the United States we find great railway systems which have become so by means of absorption. The New York Central started out as a very puny railway, but by extending its influence and absorbing its branches it has become one of the great railway systems of the world. The same is true with respect to the Pennsylvania system. The Grand Trunk has absorbed the Buffalo and Lake Huron, the Midland with eight branches, the Great Western with five branches, the Northern, and Pacific Junction, the Hamilton and Northwestern, the Lake Erie and Georgian Bay, the Hamilton and Lake Erie, the Canada Atlantic and Parry Sound, and others. The number of branch lines absorbed by the Canadian Pacific is innumerable; I shall not attempt to recite them. If you go into the United States, you will find the same conditions prevailing there, in the Vanderbilt system, the Gould system, the Harriman system. It is true, in many instances these are con-

solidations of other railways, but they are as well the gathering in of the shorter branches, the more insignificant railways. In Great Britain the history of railways points to the same result. The Midland railway, originally a small railway in the neighbourhood of Derby and Nottingham, is now one of the great railways of the world. It absorbed several other railways, and numerous branches and feeders. I need not attempt to give the details. I simply point to the fact that in all countries the history has been that the trunk lines secure the feeders—for what purpose?

For the benefit of the trunk lines as well as of the feeders themselves. No argument is needed to convince any one that it is to the advantage of the people resident in the districts traversed by these branch lines that there shall be a consolidation, so that they will have to deal with but one system. It would be an advantage pecuniarily in respect of freight rates to the patrons of those railways, it would be an immense advantage in the assembling of the product and the traffic within the zone of influence of these trunk lines. In the province of New Brunswick, wherever the Canadian Pacific Railway was brought in contact with branch lines of railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway at once seized upon the branch lines to the advantage of these lines and, as I submit, to the greater advantage of the Canadian Pacific Railway itself. This is submitted to this House as a business proposition in the interests of the Intercolonial Railway, in the interests of the people of all Canada, in the interests of the people in the eastern sections of Canada, and particularly in the interests of the people served by these branch lines. I hold no brief on the part of any branch lines in Canada, I have no interest direct or indirect, near or remote in any branch line in Canada connected with the Intercolonial Railway, but I have an interest in the people of that section of Canada who are served by these branch lines. I recognize the disadvantage they are under, the discrimination against them with respect to freight rates. I recognize that they are practically shut off from the investment of capital, I realize that in my own province of New Brunswick you cannot get a dollar of capital invested in industries to be established on branch lines. Why? Because of want of permanency, because of insecurity, because of the existing double freight rates, because of the inability to get through traffic rates for the benefit of any branch of industry. The natural resources of the counties of Albert, Kings, Gloucester and Kent, of all the counties of New Brunswick, are at a great disadvantage and their values are discounted to-day. Why? Because of the lack of transportation in some cases and of imperfect transportation in others. There are latent resources in some of those counties that would be brought to life, and would form the basis of important industries if these branch lines were so consolidated as to afford an efficient system of transportation. Why should not the government of Canada take this matter into their seirous consideration? In the earlier years of Canada's history, it was thought wise to aid in the construction of railways for the benefit of these communities. We have these immense sums of money invested there, and surely if we recognized the values of those communities then we should not forget their values to-day or the advantages that would accrue to them from the absorption by the Intercolonial Railway of such of these branch lines as are of value and there are a number of them that have a great value.

Some hon. members of this House may not know that a great proportion of the traffic that originates on some of these branch lines of railway finds its outlet from the maritime provinces via the Canadian Pacific Railway, although the branch lines connect with the Intercolonial Railway. and in a measure are a part of the Intercolonial Railway system because of that point of contact. Even on the Kent Northern Railway, which runs from Kent Junction. north of Moncton, to Rexton, in Kent, a large proportion of the express traffic, the passenger traffic and even the freight traffic destined to Montreal and other western points is brought down to Moncton, carried to St. John and there transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Intercolonial Railway losing the long haul because it has not control of that road, as it would have if the objects which I have in view in this resolution were carried out. The same thing is true with respect to lines in Nova Scotia. Take what is known as the Joggins Mines Railway running from Maccan Junction down to Joggins mine, traversing a very rich district and furnishing transportation facilities to no less than four or five coal mines. There are situated along that railway the mines of the Canada Coal and Railway Company, which owns what is known as the Joggins mine, the Menudie mine, the Fundy mine, the Strathcona mine, the Jubilee mine and one or two others. These mines all have to look to this railway, owned by another competing company for transportation facilities, and a great proportion of the traffic that finds an outlet to the Intercolonial Railway at Maccan, destined for western points, goes to St. John, travels over the short line through Maine and is not hauled by the Intercolonial Railway up to Lévis and Montreal, although the rates are supposed to be the same and although the Intercolonial Railway has every advantage. Take, for instance, the Cumberland Coal and Railway

Company, known as the Springhill Railway and Springhill Coal Mine. I am informed on the highest authority that almost all the traffic that originates on that railway goes over the Canadian Pacific Railway and not over the long haul of the Intercolonial Railway. What I have stated as true with respect to these railways is true with respect to nearly every one of the branch lines through Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Should this be? Would it be if the Intercolonial Railway were owned by a private corporation? If the government of Canada confessed their impotence, their inability to operate the Intercolonial Railway as a business proposition, then I could quite understand that it would be futile to attempt to carry out the objects of this resolution. But I cannot believe that, and my personal knowledge of the operating of the Intercolonial Railway convinces me that that railway can be as well operated with respect to its branch lines by the government of Canada as it can be by a company. I would be very sorry to have the Minister of Railways obliged to confess that it would be an impossibility and that the Department of Railways could not do this. The absorption of these branch lines means the gathering up of the traffic that is within the sphere of influence of the Intercolonial Railway, the traffic that of right belongs to the Intercolonial Railway and a traffic that if it were within the sphere of influence of the Canadian Pacific Railway would be jealously guarded, would be watched, would be taken hold of, and I hold that it is the duty of the government controlling and operating the Intercolonial, to so act that it can get for the advantage of the Intercolonial all the traffic that of right belongs to her, all the traffic which would be destined to go over that route, and, I am sure, was destined to so go when we aided in the construction of these railways. The Intercolonial, in my judgment, has been made the packhorse. I do not think it has received fair treatment. It seems to me that efforts have been made in every direction to discredit it at every time in its history. Go back to the days when it was controlled by a Conservative government, and you will find that ulterior purposes led many to discredit that road and do everything to its disadvantage. To-day, history is repeating itself: The Intercolonial is being operated by a Liberal government, and—though I do not say it rises from party antagonism or from any political bias—to-day, for purposes ulterior to the main purpose, in my judgment, the Intercolonial is being discredited.

I have adverted to the fact that this route was, perhaps, not the correct one from a commercial standpoint. But there are so many elements that have contributed to the disadvantage of the Intercolonial, that I am at a loss to point them out within the time I can fairly claim the attention of the House. The Deputy Minister of Railways has called the attention of parliament to the fact that annually the Intercolonial loses $100,000 merely in the transportation of the English mail, that sum not appearing to the credit of the Intercolonial. In former years. I have referred to the fact that rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway in eastern Canada were from 25 per cent to 100 per cent higher than those on the Intercolonial. I repeat that statement, and if any one asks for proof, I refer him to the tariff sheets of these respective railways which I presented to this House in March, 1907, and had placed on record. They show that discrepancies between the rates charged by the Intercolonial on the one side and by the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk on the other, to range, as I have stated, from 25 per cent to 80 per cent, and, I think, in one or two instances, to 100 per cent.

Now, the only answer I have heard made to the carrying out of this policy of absorption of branch lines is that Canada has invested a very large amount in the Intercolonial to place it in its present position and has received no adequate financial return. I could readily answer that by pointing out that Canada has received a full return for every dollar invested. I admit that it would be no answer to say that the canals of Canada stand in precisely the same position. But when you consider the Intercolonial was built as an offset to the canals, I say it is an answer. And I go further and say that not only the national life of Canada has been advantaged by the Intercolonial, but that individual life has been advantaged also.

The people who do not run railways know all about running them——

Mr. GRAHAM. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals says 'Hear. hear' with gusto. I suppose he has received more advice within the last six months than would satisfy a young nation. I have read with considerable interest the discussion that has taken place in connection with the Intercolonial, particularly the newspaper discussion. I think there has been more editorials on the Intercolonial than could be described in one short evening. One independent journal, (?) published in Toronto, says that there are 1,500 too many men employed on the Intercolonial, and that all the ills of the system are due to its being overmanned. It declares that over $1,000,000 could be saved by dispensing with the services of these men and so stopping this leak. Statistics show that the number of

employees on the Intercolonial is far less per mile than on the American railways, and less than on any other Canadian railway, except the Canadian Pacific Railway which runs for a large part of its length through an unsettled territory with stations at long distances apart. The following are the figures:

Average number of men employed per mile of railway.	
Intercolonial..	4.65 men per mile.
Grand Trunk Railway.. ..	6.5 "
Canadian Pacific Railway.	4.29 "
American railways...	6.11 "

I hear some body whisper 'double track.' Well, in the first place, there is not very much double track in Canada, but in the figures the double track mileage is taken into consideration, for each roadbed requires so many men to look after it, and these cannot be reduced in number because the necessities of the railway demand a certain proportion of men per mile. The cost of operating the Intercolonial Railway is less, according to its traffic and mileage, than that of any other Canadian railway. In view of the attacks upon the existing system and conditions and the senseless barking against the Intercolonial railway, this may seem to be an incredible and an astounding statement, but it is incontrovertibly true. The unit of calculation, in discussing the cost of railway transportation, is the cost of hauling an average train over a mile of road. A railway hauls so many trains a year over so many miles of road and its total operating expenses are so much. You divide the one into the other, and you have the operating cost per train mile. In 1907 the operating cost per train mile on the Canadian Pacific Railway was $1.45, the Grand Trunk Railway $1.77 and the Intercolonial Railway $1.21, and the average in Canada of all railways was $1·249 or say $1.25. I have also mentioned the fact that the rates on the Intercolonial Railway were much less than on any other Canadian or American railway. I indeed go so far as to say that the freight rates of the Intercolonial Railway are the lowest of any known railway in the civilized world. and I have taken pains to verify this statement. We hear much about the Australian system and the French and German railways and European railways generally, but the Intercolonial Railway stands ahead of them all with respect to the rates it imposes on traffic. The average gross earning per train per mile is an index for comparison. In 1907 the average on railways generally was $1·953. On the Intercolonial Railway it was $1.02. On the United States railways, the average is $1.88; and as I observe by a return in connection with the Australian railways, the rates charged by them are three times as great as those charged on American or Canadian railways generally and three and a half times greater than those charged on the Intercolonial Railway

We hear very much about the great success of the operation of government railways in Australia. How could it be otherwise? They have a monopoly of the traffic. The government own all the railways and they charge a freight rate three and a half times as large as the rate charged on our Intercolonial Railway system. Including the terminal charges, the freight receipts per ton mile in New South Wales in 1907-1908 were 2.4; in the United States, .75; and on the Intercolonial Railway the rate was less than in the United States, so that any comparison is entirely in favour of the Intercolonial Railway.

The railways of Canada are a very important factor as they are in the life of any nation. The United States railways are in magnitude almost staggering. When we realize that they have in mileage approximately 225,000 and employ 1,675,000 men, and their gross earnings are $2,585,913,000 or more than $7,000,000 per day. Figures of this magnitude can be better comprehended by comparison, and it may be said that the number of employees on the pay rolls of the American railways in 1907 was only about 80,000 less than the standing army of the United States, Great Britain, Germany, France and Japan combined. Their gross earnings were three times the total revenue of the United States government, twenty-nine times the total gold production, and six times the total gold production of the world.

The mileage of Canadian railways was approximately 23,000, and the men employed was 124,000. The gross earnings were $147,000,000, or for each day of the 365 days about $403,000, and they employ more men than the total population of Prince Edward Island with that of Halifax added.

The business of the railways practically equals our total money circulation; and out of each one hundred dollars earned in Canada by the railways, over $41, are directly and immediately paid out to employees. About $12 is paid for fuel, waste, oil, and water, and $10 of these $12 go for labour to produce these supplies. About $18 for rails, ties, cars, engines, structural steel, and a few other things required for the operation of the line; and of these $18, approximately $16 go for labour. Five go for permanent improvements, such as additions to yards, terminals, tracks, extensions of shops, round houses and the like. And $4 of these $5 are paid for labour, so that approximately in Canada $71 out of every $100 earned by the railways are distributed in payment for labour, or equipment and material in which labour forms by far the largest component part. The railways receive more and keep less almost than any depart-

ment of business activity in Canada. I only mention this as incidental to the importance of the subject involved, even in the matter of branch lines of railways of eastern Canada. This proposition does not involve a dollar of burden or addition to the public debt. It does not add in any respect a future burden on the people. If hon. members had an opportunity of referring to the reports with respect to these branch lines, they would learn that many of them are self-sustaining even to-day, and most of them have great possibilities as to their future and the development of the country. The traffic is there only to be developed and cultivated, and the mere act of attempting to operate involves no great additional expense, even in the matter of bridges. I hold there is material enough along side the Intercolonial Railway in the shape of old rails and bridges to have every branch line connected with the Intercolonial Railway that could be thought of as proper to be absorbed, improved and bettered, and have bridges placed where required.

Why is this so? Because, during the past fifteen years, the Intercolonial has been undergoing a very great change. There has been a new class of rails used, there have been new bridges, a new type of locomotive, larger and heavier rolling stock, the whole character of the railway has been changed and the material that was removed and replaced by larger and more modern material is there lying in the yards and along the line. It is not saleable, it is of no advantage to the government to-day and it can be made of advantage to these lines if they were operated as a part of the Intercolonial. In that direction alone, it would be money saved to the people of Canada, because money that has been prevented from being wasted is money saved. The cost of the betterments that would be necessary would be infinitesimal. We are starting out in Canada with the idea that we are going to be a success as a nation. It is wise to be prudent and cautious. It is wise to be economical and to study economy, but it is not wise economy to have the Intercolonial kept in the position in which it is now and without giving it the advantages that would accrue to it as a great railway system if there were connected with it these various branch lines in the several provinces. I hold that the Intercolonial should control every coal road along its line, I hold that it should control every railway that connects with the remote sections, I hold furthermore that there is not one of these lines to which I have just now presently referred but what would be a paying proposition. The question was asked with respect to the Canadian Eastern, how much it cost. The cost of it was a little over $6,000 per mile, and I venture to say that the purchase of that railway was of immense advantage to the Intercolonial as a traffic line, that it preserved to the Intercolonial the traffic that long ere this would have been seized by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that as a money proposition the absorption of the Canada Eastern has in no sense been a loss either to the Intercolonial or to the people of Canada.

There are many other matters to which I might refer. I hold that the government of Canada must, if it is true to the interests of the people, true to the pledges of the past, continue the Intercolonial as a government operated road. I go further, Sir, and I say that this parliament has no mandate to dispose of the Intercolonial to a private corporation. I go farther even than that, and I say that it would be beyond the powers of this parliament to so transfer or dispose of the Intercolonial. I do not pretend to be a very great constitutional lawyer, but if I understand that 147th clause in the British North America Act wherein provision is made for the construction of the Intercolonial, I say that there is to be read within that section the obligation not merely to construct by the government of Canada but to operate by the government of Canada. The great constitutional authorities in the United States and in other countries, in so far as I have been able to read them, convince me that that is clearly constitutional. I do not profess to be able to anlyse the great Dartmouth College case in the United States, but if I can gather anything from it and from the argument in that case, it clearly points to this fact that the government of Canada or this parliament cannot dispose of the Intercolonial unless indeed the pact of confederation and the British North America Act are amended to enable them to do it. Therefore, I assume, in the first instance, that the government will retain the Intercolonial; I assume, further, that it has no mandate from the people of Canada to dispose of it, that it would not dispose of it until it first submitted such a question to the people and that if it did it would be committing a breach of faith with the people of Canada. I know this and I want to speak candidly with respect to the matter when I say that at every election from 1878 inclusive down to the present moment in eastern Canada, on every platform, Liberal speakers have put forth, in the interests of their party, the idea and the fact that the Liberal party were the friends of government ownership as far as the Intercolonial was concerned. It has been my privilege during that period of time, commencing with 1878, to take part in every general and in almost every by-election that has been held in the east, and from every platform and on every occasion and in every election one of the grave issues always was as between the Conservatives, on the one hand,

and the Liberals, on the other, that the Liberal party would be true to the Intercolonial, that they would support its retention and that they would continue it as a government operated road. It has been pointed out, time and again with respect to this railway, that it was a part of the compact of confederation. Reference was always made to the government system. I do not dwell so much upon that but these are facts that you cannot get over. If there be any point in the idea that the Intercolonial cannot be disposed of, if I am to gather an inference that cannot be ignored by reason of the attitude of all parties and governments in the past, I would conclude that there is no intention, that no such idea would grow up, of disposing of the Intercolonial and that we will hold that which we have regardless of what may be done in other directions with respect to public utilities. Taking it to be an accepted fact that the railway is to continue a government-owned road, I shall not discuss now, because I do not think it quite germane, the question as to how it shall be conducted or by what form of management. I may have an opportunity of saying a few words later on during this session with respect to that, but if there is to be a continuance of that railway there surely must, from a business standpoint, be an absorption of these branch lines. I am sure, if you listen to the voice of the people, that these branch lines will be absorbed. Take the last general elections in New Brunswick, and if there was one issue pre-eminent before the people in almost every county of that province, and especially in the northern and eastern counties, it was the question of the acquisition of the branch lines.

Mr. BLACK. And the same in Hants county.

Mr. EMMERSON. I believe the same to be true of the maritime provinces generally. The people of the province of New Brunswick particularly, pronounced with no uncertain sound in favour of that policy. I cannot conceive that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) could possibly have any other idea in his mind than that the branch lines should and will be absorbed, for, was it not my hon. friend who when Prime Minister of his province carried through the legislature a resolution unanimously pronouncing in favour of the absorption of these branch lines by the Intercolonial Railway. The legislature of Nova Scotia also pronounced in favour of the proposition. Every board of trade in the province of New Brunswick, and most of the boards of trade in the province of Nova Scotia have pronounced in favour of this policy ; almost every municipal council in New Brunswick and every Liberal organization in the eastern counties of that province have forwarded to me resolutions in favour of it. The people demand it, the interests of the country require it, and the interests of the Intercolonial Railway proclaim it to be a necessity. My idea about the future of the Intercolonial Railway is that it shall be enlarged, that it shall grow, that it shall expand, that it shall be worthy of the people whom it serves, that it shall be commensurate with the needs of the country which it traverses. The very moment it is expanded, the very moment that business principles are applied with respect to that expansion, that very moment, new life and new energy will be given to the Intercolonial Railway. That it is a great national asset to-day no man can deny. The very fact that private corporations are looking with anxious eyes towards securing the Intercolonial convinces me that the railway magnates of Canada attach a great money value to it. We hear rumours of what may occur; I have heard it said that the northern division of the Intercolonial is sought by the Canadian Northern Railway Company. Well, I would not blame the Canadian Northern Company for seeking to secure that portion of the road. Side by side with that rumour goes the further rumour that the Intercolonial south and east of Moncton is to be the common property of the three great railway systems: The Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Pacific Railway, to be operated by the Canadian Northern for the benefit of the three. I say, Sir, that I do not blame the Canadian Northern for looking anxiously at the possession of the Intercolonial. The Canadian Northern is a system which controls and operates and owns railways in the west and in the east, they are seeking for a connecting line between Port Arthur and Sudbury and soon the benefit of the three. I say sir, that I from Sudbury to Quebec. And, when they get to Quebec they will be in the winter time cut off from an open seaport; they will so to speak be in a cul de sac. I do not blame them for seeking to acquire the Intercolonial Railway. But, Sir, if the government of Canada were in any way to attempt to hand over to that great corporation, either by means of operating rights which would take from the Intercolonial Railway the intermediate traffic or by any other means, I would condemn this government or any government that would adopt such a policy as that. Of course, if the Canadian Northern had the Intercolonial Railway they would connect it with the railway system which they own in Nova Scotia and thus be enabled to have a transcontinental line of railway. Small blame then to the Canadian Northern Company for coveting the Intercolonial Railway if they can get it. But the very fact that this corpora-

tion wants the Intercolonial; the very fact that other great corporations are trying to acquire portions of that railway, confirms the statement I have made to this House in times past, that the Intercolonial Railway is the greatest national asset we have to-day. I have heard it said, Sir, that there are men who are willing to come forward and offer practically all that we have invested on capital expenditure in the Intercolonial—a further proof of the fact that railway experts recognize that the Intercolonial is worth the money and that we have good value to show for the $82,000,000 we have expended on it.

I have taken up more of the time of the House than I had intended to, but my apology is that my heart and my soul are in this subject. I want to see the Intercolonial Railway made a success, I want to see it expanded. I know that the people whom I have the honour to represent; I know that the people of other constituencies in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia deem this issue of paramount importance to them for the present and in the future. I would, therefore, urge upon the government to reach a decision with respect to the matter. It is true we are passing through a period of financial stress, but that does not prevent the government from announcing the policy of deepening and widening the present Welland canal, or building a new one. True, the government have said they cannot undertake such a work this year, but they have announced their intention to do it. That announcement has been made in parliament; it has been reported in the press, it has gone broadcast throughout the country. Let the same announcement be made with respect to the enlargement and expansion of the Intercolonial Railway, and why should it not. I do not ask that under existing financial conditions the government of the country should rush forward with this project which I advocate, but if the government is to continue to operate the railway, then, from time to time as the conditions will permit, let them do what the Canadian Pacific Railway would do; let them absorb these branch lines or such of them as will be of value. If they do not, while the storehouse of my regrets is pretty full, yet I think I could find room for one more very great regret. And, I think the regret I would have at their want of action in this respect, and of their lack of progress, would be shared in by the very great majority of the people of eastern Canada. And, Sir, let me say that I am not speaking from a sectional standpoint; let me say that I believe there are as many hearty and warm supporters of this idea in Ontario and the western provinces as there are to be found in the east. I believe, Sir, that while there are a great many in the west who would not go so far as to declare that we should have a great expansion of government ownership, yet, a very great proportion of the people in the west would declare: what we have we'll hold. I take it that the great organs of public opinion in western Canada and in Ontario know whereof they speak when they pronounce in favour of the retention of the Intercolonial Railway by the government and of its operation from a business standpoint. And, if the railroad in obedience to the demand of public opinion east, and west, and north, and south, be retained by the government, it follows that if there is to be an application of business principles the railway must be carried on in the manner and after the methods adopted by the great privately-owned railway systems of Canada. I want as a last word to ask to be excused by the House for having taken up so much of their time. I have presented my case from no partisan standpoint, but from the standpoint of the whole people, and I trust that there will be, as I know there will be, given to the consideration of this question, all that its merits demand.

GEO. W. KYTE (Richmond, Nova Scotia). Mr. Speaker, I recognize the obligation that rests on new members to refrain from frequent participation in the debates of this House, and I regard this obligation as particularly binding upon myself, inasmuch as I cannot hope to add one single jot or tittle, in respect of either thought or language, to the common fund of knowledge of public questions that is now enjoyed by hon. gentlemen who are good enough to listen to me. I desire, however, Mr. Speaker, to trespass on your time for a few moments while I submit one or two considerations which appeal to me as being in support of the principles enunciated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson), who has moved this resolution. It is entirely fitting and to be expected that this resolution should be moved by one final voice in the hon. member for Westmoreland. We in the maritime provinces remember with appreciation and admiration his splendid efforts on behalf of the Intercolonial while he presided over the department having charge of that important public utility. He looked to the general good of the whole country, so far as the influence of the Intercolonial extended and he showed a heroic disregard at all times of petty, local and sectional desires. I do not approach this question from the standpoint of one who is familiar with the conditions which existed at the time the Intercolonial Railway was first conceived and carried through by those responsible for the great constitutional movement that resulted in the confederation of the Dominion of Canada. I am rather disposed to rivet my eyes

upon the future than to turn them towards the past. Looking to the future with that hopefulness which I trust is characteristic of all the youth of Canada, I sincerely hope that the government will take this question into its consideration and give effect at the earliest possible moment to the resolution which has been moved by my hon. friend from Westmoreland. The chief objection which I understand is urged against the absorption of these branch railways has reference to the cost which it will entail on the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman who moved this resolution went very fully into that question. He pointed out the immense amount of money which has been expended by the people of Canada for the purpose of constructing the canals as auxiliaries to the great transportation business of this country. He did not, however, refer to the fact that when the canals were built there were tolls levied on every person who used them, on every ton of freight and every vessel that passed through them; but it is conceded that the full benefit of these great arteries of commerce did not accrue to the people of Canada while their use was restricted by the tolls which were levied, and some ten years ago this government, with the unanimous consent of parliament, abrogated the tolls on all the canals, and made them free to every person in Canada. It was not then considered necessary or desirable that the canals of Canada should afford a revenue to this country, or considered undesirable that they should be made free, notwithstanding the fact that their operation entailed large deficits on the country: and I am at a loss to understand why the deficits on the Intercolonial Railway should appeal so strongly to some people when we consider its vast importance and usefulness. I intimated a moment ago that I was looking to the future. I have no very strong or well considered ideas at the present moment as to what ought to be the future of the Intercolonial Railway. To my mind, the government should continue to own and operate it, with this one condition, that it should be operated with the same spirit of improvement as characterizes the operation of the large railway systems throughout western Canada. If the government of Canada are to continue in the railway business, I think it is only right and fair that they should adopt such a progressive policy in respect to railway transportation as makes the large railway systems of Canada profitable as well as advantageous to the country at large. If the government of Canada are going to continue in the railway business, I do not think they should be content to stop where they are at the present moment, but should extend the Intercolonial into those sections of the country which are now debarred from the advantages enjoyed by other sections.

The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution has pointed out that the Intercolonial Railway has been carrying freight at a very much lower rate than that charged by the other railway systems of Canada. If the government of Canada are to operate railways I cannot understand why they should adopt different business methods from those which have made a success of the other railways of this country. I do not think there is any justification in the government of Canada carrying freight and passengers at lower rates than are recognized as a proper remuneration for carrying freight and passengers by the other railways of Canada. I am well aware that I am not enunciating a proposition that will find favour with hon. gentlemen who live along the line of the Intercolonial Railway; but I desire to speak from the point of view of those who are not so fortunately circumstanced. It would be most unfortunate if we who do not live along the line of the Intercolonial Railway should have to suffer for all time to come because forsooth the further extension of the Intercolonial Railway might add to the deficits of the railway. If there are deficits existing at the present time, it is due to the fact that the government, in their railway business, have not adopted the principles pursued with respect to the railways operated by the large railway corporations of Canada. It would be most unfortunate if the mere circumstance of the selection of the route for the Intercolonial Railway forty years ago should deprive all other sections of the maritime provinces of those advantages enjoyed by the people living along that route. It may be said that the branch lines of railways suggested to be taken over by my hon. friend are not such profitable railways as would justify the government in taking them over. My reply is that if they are not, that is due to the unfortunate circumstance that they are at the present time in competition with the Intercolonial Railway. Having a short mileage, they are unable to carry on a general business in through traffic, because the moment a ton of freight carried by them reaches its terminus, it is held up for an additional rate. There is another circumstance that appeals to me as having some bearing on this question, that is that the Intercolonial Railway in the maritime provinces finds itself in competition with water carriage, which does not redound to its advantage, so far as its profits are concerned. This is a situation that must be grappled with, and that should not be permitted for all time to operate to the detriment of those districts which have branch railways. I was very much struck in reading one of the reports of the Canadian Pacific Railway

Company, in which was set forth a proposal that the company should enter upon the construction of a branch railway in the western part of Canada. We are all delighted that the conditions in the west justify our great railways in engaging in further enterprises. But these railways do not wait for business before they build the road, they build the road first and depend upon traffic coming afterwards. I notice in a report of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the year ending July 30, 1907.

That authority was given for the continuation of a branch line from a point on the main line in Saskatchewan extending for a distance of 50 miles, but it is not unlikely that in the near future circumstances will make it desirable that this branch line should be continued 100 miles further.

That is the policy that has made for the success of the great railway corporations; whenever they see a prospect of traffic being developed they pre-empt the territory and depend upon the settlers coming in to create business for the road. I admit that while the Intercolonial Railway is operated by the government of Canada they cannot enter into all the different phases of the development of their system to be found in the operations of these great corporations but it would be a most unfortunate circumstance if the mere accident of the Intercolonial Railway being owned by the government of Canada should debar the people of the maritime provinces for all time from any hope or expectation of further railway advantages. I have in mind the conditions existing in eastern Nova Scotia, which illustrate the point I desire to make. When the Intercolonial Railway was built through the island of Cape Breton 26 years ago, it was built along the northern side of Bras d'Or lake, leaving the great expanse of fertile and mineral producing country in the southern part of that island without railway accommodation .Some seven or eight years ago a company was formed to build from Port Tupper on the Intercolonial Railway through the southern section of the island to tap the important mining areas lying in that section of the island. Unfortunately adverse circumstances arose, as they sometimes do with respect to the operations of private companies, and after that road was built for thirty miles from Port Tupper to the town of St. Peters, the company were for some reason unable to carry out their financial obligations and the road has not been extended further. They are operating a very excellent system of railway for that 31 miles, but as already intimated, the haul is so short that they are unable to get any through traffic, because every ton of freight they would get would be held up at Port Tupper for additional freight tolls and the consequence is that all that freight is carried by water transportation in competition with the existing road. But all the country east from St. Peters through the richest part of the island of Cape Breton along to Louisburg, and the large and important mining and industrial centres of Glace Bay, Bridgeport and Dominion No. 4, is at present without a vestige of railway accommodation, so far as the government of Canada is concerned. The only railway in that part of the country is a road owned by the Dominion Coal Compnay, built to carry coal from their mines to the winter port of Louisburg. That company will not undertake to perform the functions of a common carrier, and no other coal company operating there is permitted to have the products of its mine carried to Louisburg or Sydney; the consequence is that these mines, which are of immense value are still undeveloped and will continue undeveloped until the government of Canada adopt the policy enunciated by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) and acquire the Cape Breton railway and extend it into these centres of population. Glace Bay has a population of 20,000, and it is almost incredible that that large town is to-day practically without any railway communication except the accommodation permitted to them by the coal company operating the coal mines. The same thing is true of all the other centres of population in the southern part of Cape Breton, and I am sure hon. gentlemen listening to me will not say that the prospect of building a railway through the southern part of Cape Breton into these mining centres offers no prospect of remuneration. Hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the conditions existing in that part of the country will admit that there is no part of eastern Canada that offers greater prospects of remuneration to a railway than these mining centres in southern Cape Breton, but not for fifty years can it be hoped that any new mines will be opened in southern Cape Breton for the reason that the Intercolonial Railway has pre-empted the most profitable part of the carrying trade at one end and the Dominion Coal Company at the other. It is not to be expected that another company would go in there to build a railway to operate in that limited territory. The solution of the difficulty, so far as that section of the country is concerned, would be in the policy enunciated by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), the acquisition of the Cape Breton Railway and its extension into southern Cape Breton, giving easy access to the centres of Canada which would afford a ready market for the products of that particular district. I must apologize for giving my argument a sectional illustration but I think the illustration is so pointed and so well calculated to give effect to the argument I am endeavoring to make that I could not resist the temptation to use it.

There are other aspects of this question which have been dealt with by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), and I do not desire to trespass further on the time of the House than to exhort the members of the government, so far as I am able, to take into their serious consideration the questions brought up by the hon. gentleman and enunciated in his resolution. As I said, I believe that if the future of the Intercolonial Railway is to continue as a road owned and operated by the government of Canada, it is only right and proper that the people of eastern Canada should expect that the government will perform their functions in respect to the operation of that road and the carrying on of the railway business as it is carried on by the other railway corporations of Canada. If, on the other hand, the government of Canada are content with existing conditions, I do fear that a very strong and intense movement will take place among the people of eastern Canada to hand over the Intercolonial Railway to a company that will afford them some prospect of better communication with the trunk systems operating in this country.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker, I regard this discussion as the most important from the standpoint of the maritime provinces that has taken place during this session. It is of such importance to the constituency that I have the honour to represent and to the province from which I come that I feel I would not be doing my duty if I did not express my views in regard to it. I am in accord, in the main, with the resolution moved by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) and his remarks in support of it. I would not indiscriminately take over all the branch lines that exist along the Intercolonial Railway. I would select such branches as show apparent prospects of paying the expenses of operation. No doubt that there are some branches along the Intercolonial Railway that would not pay running expenses. I can well understand that a branch railway, weighted down with a head office staff and all the other adjuncts of a railway, might not pay expenses and might be a losing venture, whereas, when it is run as a part of a great system like the Intercolonial Railway, it might be a profitable railway. But I would go further than my hon. friend has gone in his resolution and I would amend it by providing that we should not only take over such branch lines as already exist along the line of the Intercolonial Railway but that we should build branch lines where they do not now exist. In fact, Sir, it appears to me that this is our first duty in regard to the question that comes before us in this resolution. The people who live along these branches that are now being operated by a company have some kind of accommodation, they have a railway service. But I had in mind certain parts of the province of Nova Scotia that had not these disadvantages at all. I submit, Sir, that it will be the first duty of the government, not to take over the branh lines and weigh the Intercolonial down with them, but to provide for those sections of the maritime provinces that have not yet been given the advantages of railway communication.

A great many proposals have been made during the last few months in the newspapers as to what should be done with the Intercolonial Railway. My hon. friend from Westmoreland referred to the resolution passed by the various boards of trade throughout the country. One of the proposals made by the board of trade of Halifax was that the Intercolonial between Moncton and Halifax should be double-tracked, to provide for the increased traffic that will seek an outlet in that direction on the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific. It was found, however, that there were objections to the proposal to double-track the main line of the Intercolonial, partly, chiefly, on account of the fact that the grades on the Intercolonial are very heavy. Another proposal was made that the road should be diverted around by Parrsboro in an endeavour to find grades suitable as a continuation of the Grand Trunk Pacific. We have not yet the report of the surveys made by way of Parrsboro, but it is reported that engineering difficulties were found in that direction. No doubt the grades on the Intercolonial are very heavy at certain places. Any person familiar with the topography of Nova Scotia, will know that the Intercolonial crosses a mountain range known as the Cobequid mountains. This mountain range extends across the counties of Cumberland and Colchester. Amherst is almost at sea level, and so is Truro, but, in order to get across the range of mountains from Amherst even the best engineering skill available when the Intercolonial was built was compelled to rise 618 feet to the summit before the descent to Truro could be begun. This rise involves grades, in some cases, I understand, 1½ per cent. It would not be a business proposal to spend the enormous sums we are spending in building the line from the Pacific ocean to Moncton with grades of four tenths of one per cent, and then continue that railway along a road with grades of 1-5 per cent. I have a proposal to make to the Minister of Railways, and through him to the government, by which this road could reach the Atlantic sea-board with grades similar to those by which it crosses the rest of Canada. Besides the grades of the Cobequid mountains, there is another heavy grade near Dorchester, New Brunswick. My proposal is to divert the Intercolonial at some

point west of Dorchester, and run it across the flat country north of Amherst, continuing it easterly until it strikes the Intercolonial at a point east of Oxford, using the short line of the Intercolonial as far as Brown's Point, thence up the valley of the East river through the coal fields of Pictou, using the Sunny Brae branch to Country Harbour on the Atlantic. This part of Nova Soctia, as everybody who knows the country is aware, is a flat country. There is no range of mountains to cross in the counties of Pictou and Guysborough, as there is in the present route between Amherst and Truro. There are some other advantages that the port of Country Harbour has over the port of Halifax. In the first place, as I have stated the grade is the most important feature of a railway. Every railway engineer will tell you that nothing is so important in building a great railway as the grades. We cannot find the desired grades on the road across the Cobequid mountains, but we can find them on the route I have indicated between Moncton and the port of Country Harbour. There are certain other advantages that the port of Country Harbour has over Halifax. The distance from Moncton, as compared with the present route, is not an important element, because the two lines are of about equal length. The route to Country Harbour compared with the route around by Parrsboro has an advantage of 17 or 18 miles. I might also point out that the proposed line would pass through the valuable coal fields of Pictou, probably the most valuable on the mainland of Nova Scotia. This would be a great advantage to the traffic of the road and also to the coaling of the engines. Another point is that Country Harbour is 100 miles nearer England than Halifax. Passengers and mails landing at Country Harbour and forwarded by a fast express train would be as far west as Moncton on the way to Montreal before a vessel crossing at the same time could be moored at Halifax. I have nothing to say against the Harbour of Halifax. It is, perhaps, the greatest and best of all the ports of Canada; it is equal to any port in the world, so far as natural facilities are concerned. But the port of Country Harbour is equally as good as the port of Halifax, and I am pointing out that, by the plan I propose, we could get grades similar to those of the Grand Trunk Pacific across the prairies, and could have a port 100 miles nearer Europe than the port of Halifax, and these, I consider, would be very great advantages. If this question is to be settled on its merits, I have no fears as to the result.

I am free to say that the proposal to build new branch lines will involve the expenditure of a great deal of money. It will involve increasing the capital account of the Intercolonial. But why should not we continue the general policy we embarked upon many years ago of endeavouring to keep Canadian trade in Canadian channels and carry it through Canadian seaports? This is only a part of that great policy. And why should we not spend money in developing the provinces of eastern Canada as well as the provinces of western Canada? I have no sympathy with the doctrine as laid down by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. J. Haggart) a couple of years ago, that capital expenditure on the Intercolonial should cease, that we should have no more branch lines, no more new equipment for improvements, that we should have no more capital expenditure on that great avenue of commerce. If I have mistated the position of my hon. friend (Mr. J. Haggart) he is here and he can correct me. But I understood that was the policy laid down for himself and his party—that there should be no further expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. J. HAGGART I never said that or anything pointing in that direction. What I was referring at the time was the charging of expenditure to capital instead of to income.

Mr. SINCLAIR. If I have misrepresented my hon. friend, I have been led astray by the language he himself used. Here is what he said:

> What do the people of this country care about investing their money in capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway? What they want to know is how the money which is taken out of their pockets is expended. They believe that capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway should cease. Yet there has been a drain on the resources of the country on that account of over $3,000,000 a year since these hon. gentlemen went into power. What possible asset to the people has been the expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway for the last ten years? When I was managing the Intercolonial Railway in 1896 and the years preceding, I insisted that the expenditure on capital account should cease, as a capital expenditure, and that it should be charged to the revenue of that road.

Now what does that language mean? The hon. gentleman asks 'what do the people care about investing their money in capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway.' Evidently, if these words mean anything, they mean that in investing their money in capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, the people were making a bad bargain and throwing away their money.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Not at all. Surely the hon. gentleman knows better.

Mr. SINCLAIR. My hon. friend asks 'what do the people care about investing their money in the Intercolonial?' Does that mean that they are in favour of it?

Mr. J. HAGGART. What I meant was that it made no difference to the people whether the expenditure was charged to capital or to income. The money was spent on the road and what I was contending was that it ought properly to be charged to income and the capital account closed. I never made any such absurd statement as that no money should be spent on the Intercolonial Railway, nor is there anything in the context which will give that meaning.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am taking the hon. gentleman's own words.

Mr. J. HAGGART. You can read them over half a dozen times, but perhaps you do not understand them.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The hon. gentleman says that the people of Canada believe the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway should cease.

Mr. J. HAGGART. So it should, and that is what the late Alexander Mackenzie himself said in this House. He said that the capital account ought to be closed on the Intercolonial Railway and that the expenditure on that account should be charged to income. But to conclude from that, that I argued, or that Mr. Mackenzie argued, there should be no more capital expenditure on the road is absurd.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would like my hon. friend to tell me how he is going to charge the capital expenditure to income when there is no income?

Mr. BARKER. He will then show the actual deficit. That is all.

Mr. SINCLAIR. When this policy of my hon. friend was announced, we from the maritime provinces knew very well it would be very unpopular among our people. We must have additional capital expenditure on the Intercolonial from time to time. I have no sympathy either with the statement we so often hear that the Intercolonial Railway is a burden to this country, that we have to meet parliament every year with a deficit, and certain of our hon. friends make a great deal of political capital out of the small deficit which exists from year to year on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. A small deficit? $1,750,000 in one year.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) forgets that in other years there were surpluses. It was never intended that the Intercolonial Railway should pay dividends. When it was built it was well known by the people of Quebec and Ontario that it would be a losing speculation from a monetary point of view. In the discussions in parliament and in the press of that day it was stated over and over again that these provinces went into this venture with their eyes open, knowing there would be a loss of money from year to year, but expecting other advantages to counter-balance that loss, which advantages they have since realised. As my hon. friend from Westmoreland has said, the Intercolonial Railway was built as a part of compact of confederation, and if the House will permit me, I will read the clause in the British North America Act which authorizes the building of the Intercolonial Railway:

> Inasmuch as the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have joined in a declaration that the construction of the Intercolonial Railway is essential to the consolidation of the union of British North America and to the assent thereto of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and have consequently agreed that provision should be made for its immediate construction by the government of Canada: therefore, in order to give effect to that agreement, it shall be the duty of the government and parliament of Canada to provide for the commencement, within six months after the union, of a railway connecting the river St. Lawrence with the city of Halifax in Nova Scotia, and for the construction thereof without intermission, and the completion thereof with all practicable speed.

There is nothing there about dividends. And there is nothing in the discussions which took place at the time to show that the opinion was then entertained that the Intercolonial Railway would be a paying venture. On the contrary, they show just the opposite. Permit me also to read an extract from the Toronto 'Globe' of that date to show what that great organ of public opinion then thought of the Intercolonial Railway. The date of this editorial is the 26th of September, 1865, after the date when the conference was held but prior to the date when confederation was consummated:

> The scheme of the government for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway opens an account that never will be closed. Every storm of snow in the inhospitable regions below Rivière du Loup will lay a new burden on the people of Upper Canada. The tax payers will watch the passenger travel and freight traffic with the liveliest interest as indicating the extent of the demands upon them for the year. It is a dream of many persons in Nova Scotia that this Halifax and Quebec Railway will draw to their harbour the trade of the west, but it is a dream and nothing more. No passenger, no shipper of freight will ever think of going to Halifax when he can find shipping at Quebec or Portland.
>
> With Upper Canada decidedly opposed to the scheme, and Lower Canada divided, we are happy to say that we do not see any great danger of hasty action. We are only astonished that the ministry should have committed themselves to a scheme which finds

so little support in any part of the province. The lower province delegates humbugged them beautifully. It is evident that the Bluenose is a sharp fellow. He is rubbed bright on his rocks. We shall have to be careful in our dealings with him. If Lower Canada is afraid of him because he is British, we must learn to watch him because he is not very rich, but is very keen and shrewd. —Toronto 'Globe,' Sept. 26, 1865.

That was the opinion of the Toronto 'Globe' of that day.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman agree with that?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The 'Globe' itself will not make that statement to-day. As a matter of fact, every one knows that the poor blue nose was victimized in the bargain. This was acknowledged later by the fact that the maritime provinces were given afterwards much better terms than they were accorded in the original bargain of 1867. In looking over the debates in parliament at the same time I find that the opinion prevailed that the Intercolonial Railway would not be a paying venture. The Hon. Geo. Brown, in the legislature of Canada, in 1865, made the following statement:

As a commercial enterprise the Intercolonial has not, I apprehend, any considerable merit. As a work of defence it has however many advocates, but if the union of the provinces is to go on, it is an absolute necessity and as the price of the union, were there no other arguments in its favour, I heartily go for it.

That was the opinion of the Hon. Geo. Brown prior to the time the road was built. Allow me also to give you an expression of opinion from the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie in his speech on supply in parliament in 1870, when the question of the construction of the Intercolonial was up. Mr. Mackenzie said:

Everybody knows that the Intercolonial Railway would be utterly valueless in a commercial point of view, it was to be built because they had bargained to build it and they should keep to their bargain.

I also find in a speech by the late Walter Shanly, M.P., in 1870, in this House, a gentleman who was, at that time, I believe, the member for Grenville, that the following language was used:

The railway project by itself was not popular in Upper Canada. But when the greater question assumed shape and form after the conference at Quebec, and when it became apparent that in order to bring about the Confederation of the British North American provinces each of the parties to the compact would be called upon to make some sacrifice of local prejudice or local interest, then Upper Canada accepted of the Railway part of the project as a political and social necessity. A leading politician of Upper Canada, generally recognized as an exponent of the public opinion of the day and said 'Rather than not have confederation he would agree to build ten Intercolonial Railways.' That very fairly expressed the sentiment of Upper Canada.

At confederation there were two courses open to the people of the maritime provinces. Prior to that time the trade of the maritime provinces was with the United States. The provinces were prosperous. They had had the advantages of reciprocal trade with the United States, and they were enjoying a large degree of prosperity. They had their choice of continuing their trade with the United States, having little or no trade with the upper provinces, or building the Intercolonial and changing the course of their trade altogether. They embarked upon this project of building the Intercolonial. Everybody knows that the flour that fed the 800,000 people who were then living in the maritime provinces came from Boston, or some other port in the United States, that it was ground at American mills, from wheat that was probably raised on the western prairies of the United States, and that they received very little from the upper provinces at that time. The agricultural implements used on the farms of the maritime provinces were made in the factories of the United States. Yankee mowing machines, rakes, pitchforks, axes and buckets were to be found on every farm in the maritime provinces, and the question was whether we were going to continue that condition of affairs or try to find means of carrying on a trade with the other provinces of Canada. We embarked on the construction of the Intercolonial with these ideas. We knew very well that it would cost us money. The people of the upper provinces were quite well aware that it would be a long time before it would be a prosperous venture and I submit that the price is not a heavy price that we have paid. There have been deficits in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, but they have not been large deficits. Some of my hon. friends on the other side of the House look surprised at that statement, but if they will add up all the deficits that have occurred on the Intercolonial Railway since it was constructed about thirty-one years ago, and strike an average, they will find that the average annual deficit was $245,434—not a very large sum of money each year when we consider what we have received from this great national asset. Take the population of Canada at six and a-half millions, it is the price of two postage stamps for every man, woman and child in the Dominion of Canada. Four cents apiece each year will give us more than the amount of the average annual deficit on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. What would be the amount, adding in the capital expenditure?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not regard the capital expenditure as a deficit, I have not made that a calculation. Of course, that would be much larger, but my hon. friend must remember, which he always seems to forget, that while we have spent $80,000,000 in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway we have a slendid investment for our money. When this road was built there were certain things expected of it. It was not expected that it would make money, but there were certain other things that were more valuable than money that were expected to result from the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. It was expected that it would bind the provinces of Canada more closely together, that it would unite the provinces into one great Dominion. It was also expected that the maritime provinces would become a profitable market for the manufactures of Ontario and Quebec. It was expected that the New England manufacturer would be driven from the field and that he would be replaced by the manufacturer of Ontario and Quebec. We also thought in the maritime provinces at that time that we might be able to sell our goods, our coal, our iron and our fish to the people of the upper provinces. That was looked forward to by the people of the maritime provinces. We expected that the ports of the maritime provinces would be used, instead of the ports of the United States, in the shipment of goods from the western provinces. All these things have come about to a certain extent. These provinces have been united together, they have been cemented as we expected they would be, and I suppose there is not a man within the hearing of my voice that would not stand up for a united Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific and you could not have had a united Canada without the construction of the Intercolonial. Is not that worth the price of two postage stamps each year to the people of Canada? I think everybody will agree that the deficit is a mere bagatelle compared with the great results that have come from the construction of the road.

Mr. EMMERSON. How much did the deficit on the canals amount to ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am not talking about the canals now. I am talking about the Intercolonial Railway on its merits. The provinces have been united and the maritime provinces have become a profitable market for the goods of the western provinces. In this connection, I had the honour, a few days ago, to move in the House for a return showing the amount of trade we had east bound and the amount of trade west bound on the Intercolonial and I got certain figures. I was not able to get them as complete as I would like to have had them, but I find that in the year 1902, 54·03 of the traffic on the Intercolonial was east bound; in 1903, 51·36 per cent of the traffic was east bound; in 1904, 48·83 per cent; in 1905, 51·20 per cent; in 1906, 44·32 per cent; in 1907, 44·44 per cent; in 1908, 44·55 per cent. A small increase has taken place within the last few years in west bound traffic, I think, owing to the shipment of large quantities of steel from Cape Breton to the west.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend mean through traffic by west bound and east bound ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I mean the total traffic going east and the total traffic going west. It will be found on pursuing this inquiry further that the Intercolonial has done even more for the provinces of Ontario and Quebec than it has done for the maritime provinces. It has done more to develop the trade of the western provinces than it has done for the east.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Unless you can quote the through traffic, that does not prove that a single ton went to Ontario.

Mr. SINCLAIR. My argument is that goods come from Ontario to the maritime provinces in very much greater quantity than we have been able to send goods to Ontario, and hence I contend that the representatives of Ontario ought to have a more friendly feeling towards the Intercolonial Railway if they truly represented the interests of their province. The New England manufacturer has been driven from the maritime provinces; all the implements, all the machinery used on the farms of the maritime provinces to-day are of Canadian manufacture and the Yankee product has disappeared. I repeat that all the goods we use in the maritime provinces of nearly every class are manufactured in Canada, and largely in Ontario and Quebec. We are somewhat disappointed in the maritime provinces that our trade with the west has not expanded in a greater degree; we are disappointed somewhat that the markets of Ontario and Quebec have not taken as much of our fish, of our coal, and of our iron as we had hoped, but nevertheless a good trade is being worked up. On the whole, all that it was expected the Intercolonial would achieve for the people of Canada has come about, and I believe we have made a good investment even though we have to pay four cents a head every year to meet the bagatelle of a deficit which accrues. Now, why is it that the Intercolonial Railway during the thirty years of its existence has not developed more traffic and made more money. There must be some good reason for it, and were I to be frank I would express the opinion that the Intercolonial Railway has not been run with that energy and enterprise which ought to have marked its management. Of course,

this remark applies with more force to the government that existed prior to 1896 than it does to the present administration. The present administration has done much to build up the Intercolonial; they have extended it into Montreal and brought it into the heart of the commercial capital of Canada so as to enable it to get a share of the traffic which comes through that great city. They have improved the Intercolonial, they have given it heavier rails, modern rolling stock, and better trains and in other ways have enabled it to become the great national asset it is. But, at the same time I fear that that energy which characterises the management of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway is not to be found in the management of the Intercolonial. That of course may be an incident of government ownership but whatever the reason it seems to be the case. For example, the Intercolonial touches the sea at only a few points: at St. John, at Halifax, at Mulgrave, and at the Sydneys.

Mr. EMMERSON. And Shediac and Chatham.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I might mention some other places.

Mr. EMMERSON. A good many.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The illustrations I have taken will suffice for my argument. The population of that part of the maritime provinces is chiefly found along the coast and a vigorous administration of the Intercolonial would have had steamers plying on the adjacent waters and collecting traffic at these ports. I have in my mind the town of Mulgrave, in my own constituency, where for many years there was no attempt made to collect traffic from the adjacent shores east and west of the point where the railway strikes the sea and where the people are located. After a while private enterprise assisted by small subsidies from the government placed boats on these waters and as a result a splendid business for the Intercolonial Railway has grown up. But, the point I make is that the Intercolonial management itself did not think of putting the steamers there and collecting the traffic. I am told that when the Reid Railway was built in Newfoundland the Reid Company put on quite a number of steamers to connect with the railway and to deliver to it the traffic from the fishing villages along the coast, without which the railway could not have been made a financial success. No attempt of that kind was made by the management of the Intercolonial to concentrate traffic at these points where the railway touches the sea. This is only one illustration among others that might be given to show that the road has not been managed with that same business ability which might be applied to it and which would probably be applied to it were it conducted as a private venture. Let me point out as an illustration of what I mean, that last year the small boats which run into Mulgrave called 'The Cann' boats carried 7,898 passengers, most of whom took the Intercolonial Railway to points of destination, and 5,708 tons of freight which constituted a very profitable business for the railway that it otherwise would not get. Then again, there has not been the energy displayed that should have been displayed in the building of branch lines. Like my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) I can point to a special instance to prove my case. I have in mind a territory between the city of Halifax and the Strait of Canso, comprising about 150 miles in my own constituency, and possessing great resources in lumber, and mines, and fish, and agriculture, and although the Intercolonial has skirted the northern side of that territory for 30 years, not even an engineer has been sent into that district to survey it, nor has an agent of the Intercolonial gone there to discover its resources. Were the Intercolonial owned by a great private corporation I feel certain that long ere this something would have been done to give railway accommodation to the 40,000 people who inhabit that territory. As did my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) I ask: Is this to go on for ever? That country has been inhabited for over 100 years; the people living there have contributed their full share of the $400,000,000 that we have paid out for transportation facilities of various kinds in this country, but they have been shut off from participation in any share of that expenditure. In view of these facts the House will not be surprised when I urge that the government should not only consider the question of securing the railways already built but that they should deal first with the question of constructing railways in those parts of the maritime provinces which have never had railway communication. I think myself that this question is more important even than the securing of the branch lines, because while the people living on the branch lines have some kind of railroad service, the people I speak of are absolutely without any. We have been paying out millions of dollars for building canals; we have been spending millions more in deepening the St. Lawrence; we are now investing millions in building another great railway across the continent, and what I am advocating tonight is but a part of the great transportation system of Canada which has been made a part of the policy of this government, as it has of previous governments. Let us not deal with this question in any narrow spirit; let us not hesitate to embark on any

expenditure that may be necessary to perfect the Intercolonial system by building tributary lines which will develop the country through which they pass and by acquiring such branch lines as may prove to be feeders to the traffic of that system. If we do this, we will be developing the Intercolonial and making it what it is destined to be, a great national asset; we will be carrying out the policy that the people of this country endorsed with so much enthusiasm on the 26th of October last: the policy of keeping Canadian trade in Canadian channels and providing transportation facilities by which that trade can find an outlet to the sea by way of Canadian ports.

Mr. JUDSON BURPEE BLACK (Hants). It is getting late, it is nearly midnight, but I have hopes that the House will listen to a word or two from me all the more readily because I speak rarely, and that I do not speak at all unless I think I have something to say. This question of taking over branch lines is a very important question in the constituency which I represent. It is a question that is affecting almost every man in the county of Hants. I may say that it is a very important question all through western Nova Scotia. I do not propose to attempt to make a speech upon this question. I rose more for the purpose of making an appendix to this report which has been handed to me to-day, although I have no mandate from the Minister of Railways to make an appendix. I may say that I agree with a great deal that has been said by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). I endorse his policy of taking over all these branch lines. I would endorse what he probably would not endorse—the policy of giving running powers over the Intercolonial from Moncton to Halifax to the Canadian Pacific, the Canadian Northern Railway, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and any other railway that will bring traffic into Nova Scotia. Before the dissolution of parliament last year, I understood that the government were in sympathy with the proposal to take over the branch lines of the Intercolonial, and a commission was appointed to examine those lines and to report upon them. I found, after the report had been made, that the commission had not examined the Dominion Atlantic Railway. I may say that I live in the ancient town of Windsor on that line of railway, I found that the commission had not reported on it, although they had been ordered to do so, I learned that when they went to the manager of the railway and he demanded a sum of money—I do not think it was an unreasonable sum—for transporting them over his railway, a dispute arose, and the commission declined to examine his road at all. I was afterwards told, although I do not think it was said in earnest, that the Dominion Atlantic Railway was not a branch of the Intercolonial. Now, if a branch means a shorter road going into a larger one, the Dominion Atlantic is not only a branch in the true sense, but it is more than an ordinary branch, because it empties its traffic into the Intercolonial by two mouths—first, by what is known as the Windsor branch of the Intercolonial, which is leased, I may say under the most unbusinesslike contract that any government ever gave to a private company. I am glad to say that it was not the work of this government, but the work of the Conservative government, and I only hope that this government in 1914 will cancel that lease as promptly as it matures.

I was saying that the Dominion Atlantic empties its traffic into the Intercolonial by two mouths: the Windsor branch extending from Windsor to Windsor Junction, and the Midland Branch extending from Windsor to Truro. Would it be of advantage to the Intercolonial to purchase this road? I will reply in the language of the report of the engineer of maintenance, who says: 'The more branch lines the Intercolonial can gather, the better it will be for the Intercolonial; the more grist it will bring to their mill'—that is the expression. I know of no branch line from Montreal to Halifax that will bring more grist to the mill of the Intercolonial than the Dominion Atlantic. It runs through one of the most magnificent countries in Canada, and one of the richest agricultural districts, populated by an intelligent people, and the road, even managed as it is, is doing a most thriving business. This road I may say, is owned by a private company, a foreign company. I hope nobody will misunderstand me: when I say foreign I mean out of Canada. It is owned by a company in London who care nothing for Nova Scotia or the country it runs through except to get all the money possible out of everybody who uses the railway. That is patent to every one who knows the management of the railway, and I have known it ever since it was built. This road is 298 miles long by all its tracks. It runs from the town of Yarmouth in the west end of Nova Scotia to Halifax. It originally ran from the town of Annapolis to the town of Windsor. It afterwards became possessed of a branch line running from Windsor to the Intercolonial, a distance of forty-six miles. It also became possessed of the Western Counties Railway running from Digby to Yarmouth, and also of what was called the missing link between Digby and Annapolis, twenty miles in length, built I believe wholly by the government of Canada. The capital invested in the Dominion Atlantic Railway is nearly $8,000,000. According to the report of 1907, its passenger

earnings for that year were $341,981. Its passenger and miscellaneous earnings amounted to $380,157; its freight earnings amounted to $398,413. Its total earnings were $778,571, and its total operating expenses $569,985, showing net earnings of $208,586. It carried 334,805 passengers and 362,497 tons of freight. This is a railway already doing a most profitable business, and it would be one of the most important feeders of the Intercolonial. It would be of great advantage to the Intercolonial to have that road, and it would be of very great advantage to the people of the country through which the road runs. It might be assumed that at the present time all the traffic over that road goes to the Intercolonial, but that is not the case. No traffic, either freight or passenger, that it can divert from the Intercolonial is given to it. The timetables are so arranged that passengers can be accommodated off the Dominion Atlantic Railway on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and so that it is very inconvenient for them to get from the Dominion Atlantic to the Intercolonial Railway. Trouble arises between the two roads over the freight; there is friction between them constantly, the Dominion Atlantic working all the time in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The great disadvantages under which the people in the counties of Yarmouth, Digby, Kings, Annapolis and Hants are resting in connection with this road are that they are obliged to pay two freights or two express charges on everything that goes out of Nova Scotia to New Brunswick or to Ontario. Our merchants and manufacturers are handicapped and discouraged. We have all the advantages there necessary for a manufacturing country. We have magnificent water-powers along the line of that railway, we have coal near at hand, we have everything that would go to establish and to make profitable manufacturers if we were not handicapped and discouraged as we are by this privately owned railway. As it is we are operating along that road, cotton mills, duck mills, foundries, and furniture factories, and we are sending our manufactures up through Ontario into the prairie provinces; we have sent our cotton clear out to China. But the manufacturers are discouraged and are not prospering as they should. Our agriculturists are not prospering as they should. Every farmer and every fruit grower is handicapped and as I said before we have one of the best agricultural counties in Canada.

I may surprise some people who think we are a people exclusively engaged in fishing off the rocks when I say that along the line of the Dominion Atlantic Railway we have river bottoms that have raised their annual crop of hay without one pound of fertilizer for over 200 years since the early days when the French threw up their dykes and reclaimed those river bottoms from the encroaching tide. We have everything there requisite to make a prosperous and happy country if we were not so badly handicapped in matters of transportation. Our factories would grow, our agricultural products would increase if there were not such a discouragement every day to the farmer and to the manufacturer, by that privately owned railway. We exported last year over that railway to London and Liverpool $1,000,000 worth of apples alone, and there are new orchards growing there that in ten years will be sending $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 worth of apples to the foreign markets. All I ask of the government, all I ask of the Minister of Railways, is that the Dominion Atlantic Railway shall be placed in the same category as the other branch lines. It ought to be treated with superior consideration, but I shall only ask that it shall have the same examination and consideration and receive as much support as its length, as its business and as the people of the country traversed by it deserve.

Mr. D. H. McALISTER (Kings and Albert). Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be good judgment for me at this late hour to attempt to say many words on this subject. It would be unfortunate for the other members of the House, physically and mentally, if this debate should be continued longer to-night; but I feel it my duty, I do not think I could go home and sleep well if I did not rise in my place even if I should say nothing more than 'Amen.' I feel that I particularly am justified in speaking to-night as I have in my constituency four branch lines. There is probably not another member who can say that. I declare from the bottom of my heart and not in any partisan spirit that I believe it would be a benefit to the Intercolonial Railway if it should take over the branch lines in Kings and Albert. I know that the branch line from Salisbury to Harvey runs through one of the most progressive agricultural district in New Brunswick, and if taken over by the Intercolonial Railway would be a paying proposition and would not bring a yearly deficit to the Intercolonial Railway. Another branch, the Elgin & Havelock, would certainly not produce a deficit. We have another branch called the St. Martin's and Hampton branch, which terminates in one of the most elegant summer resorts, the village of St. Martins. I would not be so sure about the old Central or the New Brunswick Coal and Railway Company. I am ready and willing to do all in my power to secure the adoption of the principle of this resolution. I am satisfied that if this resolution had not been talked of in my constituency and if my constituents did not feel that I would support it enthusiastically, they would not

have returned me to this House. I am safe in saying that it was the means of my securing the majority which I did in Albert county.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester). Mr. Speaker, I would not undertake at this late hour to follow the notes I intended to use this evening, but I believe I would be recreant to my duty if I did not rise before the conclusion of the debate to express my sentiment of admiration for the really excellent speech delivered this evening by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). He has spoken with eloquence of facts relating to the history of the Intercolonial Railway since its inception before confederation. He has shown by facts and figures which he has laid before the House that he was speaking on a subject on which he was well informed and the information he has given to the House and to the people through this House, will be of great value. I have admired especially the broad Canadian tone of his speech; he dealt with this great question of the Intercolonial Railway from the broad standpoint of Canadian interests. He reminded me of the speech delivered in this House last session by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), when he said he would deal with the Intercolonial Railway not from a sectional standpoint, not from the point of view of the maritime provinces, but from the point of view of Canada at large; and I am sure that the words of the Minister of Railways and Canals, coming as he does from the province of Ontario, have contributed largely to create or at least to strengthen the more favourable current of opinion which seems to permeate the public mind of that province.

It has been to the disadvantage of the Intercolonial, no doubt, that, owing to circumstances beyond the control of ministers or governments, the country could not expect great financial returns from the operations of the Intercolonial up to this time. As has been established by my predecessors in this debate, the fathers of confederation, and the great engineers who located the Intercolonial, saw that the advantage of this railway was, not in its possibilities of commercial returns, but in the fact that it would join together the eastern and the western provinces and would assist in building up Canada as a great nation. And to-day we find a realization of what Joseph Howe said years ago, that the great Atlantic ports of the maritime provinces were not there for the benefit of these provinces alone but to assist in the future greatness of all the British possessions in North America. We have the testimony of Sir Sandford Fleming, the great British engineer, who himself located the Intercolonial, recommending the line which was afterwards adopted by the parliament of Canada, that for many years we could not expect the Intercolonial to earn even its operating expenses, that the population of the eastern provinces was not dense enough to command financial returns, that it is not to be regarded from the commercial point of view but from the patriotic point of view, in its effect in building up the nation of which we are so proud and which we expect to see one of the greatest nations in the world before the end of the twentieth century. Though for years deficits have been accumulating, we should not lose sight of the national advantage of the railway and its important effect in the development of the country. Had the people and parliament of Canada early taken the stand taken by my hon. friend from Westmoreland to-night in this House, no doubt the deficits on the Intercolonial would have been a thing of the past, surpluses would be the rule and the road would extend into many parts of the country which now it does not serve. But the parliament of Canada has not always taken a fair view of these deficits.

Now, undoubtedly, the time has come when the financial aspect of the Intercolonial is about to change. The railway magnates who are looking into the matter see that in the Intercolonial there is an estate which will undoubtedly bring in good financial returns in a very short time. I do not think that the deficits are due to any failure of administration on the part of the government—and in saying that I refer to former governments as well as to the present. These deficits necessarily followed from the condition of things. But better conditions will come with the time of greater expansion. Conditions have changed. The maritime provinces are part of a great nation. They are on the threshold of an agricultural, commercial and industrial revival which will bring them to the prominent position which they are destined to occupy in this Dominion. The maritime provinces have now reached the threshold of an agricultural revival which will keep on the soil every child born under their blest heavens. Greater production will mean more wealth for the average individual, and greater comfort on the part of the people will mean more general travel and greater activity of commerce in every direction. Within five or six years, you will have the Intercolonial in a paying position, like any other great railway, whether managed by a government or by a corporation. We hear talk of a commission What does a commission mean? It is the combined wisdom of four or five men. I wonder why the Minister of Railways and Canals, the Deputy Minister of Railways, and three other men cannot form as good a body of management as any other that could be created. I have faith in the future of the Intercolonial, and I say it will be suicide for any government, whether Liberal or Conserva-

tive, to allow the people of Canada to think that they would entertain the idea of giving over to a private corporation this Intercolonial Railway for which we have sacrificed so much and which has made such good returns to the people of Canada.

I said that the maritime provinces are experiencing a new movement in commerce, industry and agriculture. Had we followed, in the first year of confederation, the advice of that great engineer, Sir Sanford Fleming, and developed at once the great advantages of the localities through which the Intercolonial Railway was built, we might from the very first have avoided these deficits which have confronted us from year to year. Every foot of our land contains resources bound to be developed at some time or other. Those resources, which for years have been appealing to human intelligence and activity, are at last being developed, and we are finding out that every section of country through which the Intercolonial passes is one which will amply repay its exploitation. I do not wish to detain the House by reading quotations, especially as a couple of years ago I had occasion to express my views on this very question and urged on the government the taking over of those branches, which were not in the hands of people owning sufficient capital to operate them in a profitable manner and as they could be operated as parts of the trunk line. Had we listened to the advice given by Sir Sanford Fleming and established a fast mail and passenger service from the coast of Ireland to St. John's, Newfoundland, and thence to the north shore of New Brunswick over the Intercolonial Railway, where the seaports are open until the 15th of January, I have no doubt that we would have been spared all these deficits which have been accumulating from year to year. But I am not without hope that this great engineer, although now very old, will still live long enough to see the realization of his projects of forty years ago.

It has been said that a bad choice was made in selecting the route of the Intercolonial Railway. No doubt had it not been for the unfortunate Ashburton Treaty, which deprived us of a portion of our territory, another route would have been chosen. However, that was out of the question. In selecting the north shore the fathers of confederation wanted to favour the development of the Matapedia valley and the Gaspesia district. Had the government in 1882 or 1883, instead of paying a large subsidy to a company to build a railway from Matapedia station to Gaspé basin, built the railway themselves, they would have saved the people of that district all the trouble and losses they have had to suffer at the hands of a company unable to meet its engagements, and to-day that district would be in a flourishing condition.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Postmaster General that if, instead of giving bonuses to the railway from Matapedia to Gaspé Basin, the government had built the road themselves the people of that district, represented by the Postmaster General, would have been spared all the misfortunes which they have had to suffer owing to the inability of the companies to meet their engagements. The same condition applies to the north shore of New Brunswick. Notwithstanding all the mistakes of the past I claim that to-day the best policy is one of expansion and progress. Such a policy has been extended by the government to the whole country except in so far as the Intercolonial Railway is concerned, and I hope that the government will adopt that policy and display the same activity and energy with respect to the districts traversed by the Intercolonial Railway and give them the service they require. Such a policy would stimulate the creation of industries large and small and create a trade for the Intercolonial Railway which will place it in a magnificent position, commercially, financially and patriotically. We have, on this portion of the north shore of New Brunswick, unknown perhaps to many of the Canadian people, certainly unknown to the people of the west, not sufficiently known yet by a great many hon. members coming from the province of Ontario and even by some of my good neighbours from the province of Quebec, resources of the most valuable character, the development of which will, in a few years, compare favourably with that which has taken place in any portion of this country. In addition to the activity of the people in that region resulting in bringing from the bottom of the sea millions of dollars worth of fish products we have immense resources in iron ore, the very best, I will not say in Canada, but on the continent of America. We have at Bathurst to-day an English syndicate joined with a Canadian syndicate, who are in possession of the greatest iron ore deposit on the continent of America, who, in a few weeks, perhaps in a few days, will commence the building of a railway from the mines to the Intercolonial at Bathurst, who will make a complete investigation of the mine and who will ship their product to different points along the Intercolonial Railway system which will not only be of immense benefit to the Intercolonial Railway but which will afford our population the means of living in comfort, as they should live in a great country like this. We should have comfort, sir, we should have a population which can find employment at home instead of going away every year to seek work. The enterprise of the people will be stimulated

because immense industries will be established in connection with these ore deposits which will certainly be the equal of any other similar industries in Canada.

I claim, therefore, that the time has come when the government of Canada must devote its best thought and energy to the benefit of the people along the Intercolonial Railway, keeping in mind always that the Intercolonial is not operated for the benefit of the maritime provinces alone, but that it is operated for the direct benefit of the province of Ontario. While the construction of that road has brought comfort and a large measure of prosperity to the people of eastern Canada it has also brought riches and wealth to the farmers and manufacturers of Ontario. Therefore, I claim that the government must give its best thought to the question of improving the service of this great railway and we should expect from western Canada and from the province of Ontario that favourable consideration to which I think this project is entitled. The Intercolonial Railway has been looked upon more favourably recently than in years gone by. As my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) has said, we do not expect the government to rush into the acquisition of these branch lines, but as soon as the financial conditions permit we say that it would be a wise policy to undertake. But first of all the government must look into the conditions with respect to these branches. I am prepared to admit that perhaps some of them would not appeal at first sight to the judgment of a railway expert. If I remember aright the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, at the last session of parliament, said that if he were the president of a corporation having control of the Intercolonial Railway, he would first of all try to take in such branches as, in his judgment, it would be to the advantage of the Intercolonial to secure. Let him adopt this policy to-day or as soon as the financial condition of the country will permit. I have in my county not four branches, as my good friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. McAlister) has; I have only one branch, but permit me to say that it is certainly the very best branch of any connected with the Intercolonial—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TURGEON. I am serious when I say so, Mr. Speaker, because it is well known that we have from Bathurst to Caraquet, Shippegan and Tracadie, a population of over 20,000 souls and it is among that population that we find the Gloucester fishermen who annually bring, upon the coast of that district, traffic to the Intercolonial Railway in the form of $1,500,000 worth of fish, taken from the bottom of the sea to be added to the other sources of the lumber industry, of the grindstone quarries and of the iron mining industry which is bound to be one of the greatest industries in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N.B.). At this late hour I shall not intrude for long on the patience of the House. Let me first of all extend my very hearty congratulations to the mover of this resolution (Mr. Emmerson) who supported his proposition by such a very logical and very eloquent speech. It gives me very great pleasure to endorse everything the hon. gentleman has said on this subject with which he is so familiar. In his opening remarks he carried us back to the days when the people of the maritime provinces were dealing with the New England states, and I can recollect very well that when I started housekeeping myself in the town of Chatham my furniture was bought in the city of Boston and brought around by schooner. Compare the conditions of trade in those days with the conditions of to-day and what a vast difference you will find. Instead of the merchandise which we use coming from the New England states it comes from Ontario and Quebec, to the great advantages of the industries in these manufacturing provinces. I agree also with what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) said, that if there be low rates on the Intercolonial Railway, it is not only the consuming population of the maritime provinces that enjoys the benefit, but that benefit is shared in by the producers of Ontario, so that there is a mutual advantage. I wish to place myself on record as being in favour of this resolution, and I endorse very strongly the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) who was not only in favour of taking over and operating the branch lines but who was in favour of developing those parts of the maritime provinces which have no railways and which if they had would contribute greatly to the traffic on the Intercolonial. I want specially to point out that there are two sections in my county which have been settled for 100 years and which would be splendid freight producing sections but which are still without any railway facilities whatever. I ask the Minister of Railways to bear in mind the petition that has been in his department for some time asking the government to favourably consider the extending of a branch line from a point near the town of Newcastle to Tabusintac. It is well known to every one who is acquainted with the Miramichi river that this is a very rich part of the country and that a very valuable catch of fish is taken at the lower end of the river, which is at present from 15 to 20 miles from any railway point. I wish also to draw the attention of the minister to another petition which has been in his

department for a long time, asking for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from Indiantown to Red Bank, a distance of 8 miles across the peninsula, between the two branches of the main river where there is at present a large saw-mill and that portion of my county is a rich agricultural district. That district has also been settled for the last 100 years and they are still without railway facilities. I would point out that when you have these branch lines operated by the Intercolonial you can get the long haul on the freight. I might mention that there are 200 carloads of fish originating at the stations of Chatham and Loggieville, and when the Canada Eastern was owned by a private corporation this freight was hauled to Fredericton and then delivered to the Canadian Pacific Railway. But now, the Intercolonial Railway instead of carrying that freight at 10 cents per 100 pounds from Chatham to Fredericton, as was the case with the private corporation, they charge 13 cents per 100 for the same mileage and they have such control over the freight that if you do not give them the long haul they charge practically a local rate for the short haul. The consequence is that the freight originating at Chatham and Loggieville now goes round the long haul on the Intercolonial Railway instead of going to Fredericton and thence over the Canadian Pacific Railway. This simply illustrates that every branch railway has a great deal to do with the routing of the freight that originates on it. For example, on the Kent Northern Railway the freight that originates at Rexton and Richibucto will go to Kent Junction and thence to St. John whence it is handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, whereas if that branch was owned by the Intercolonial Railway and they could route the traffic originating on it they could divert it by way of Montreal and get the long haul. I heartily endorse what has been said by the mover of the resolution and I hope the day is not far distant when the financial conditions of the country will enable us to absorb and properly equip and maintain the branch lines as a portion of the Intercolonial, and to build such other branch lines not now in existence as will develop the traffic of that country and encourage industry and enterprise there.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). As the hour is late I rise simply for the purpose of putting myself on record as approving of the statement contained in the resolution. As I understand that resolution it does not commit the government in any way to the purchase of these branch lines; it simply means that where it is good business policy, where it is in the best interests of the country and the Intercolonial Railway to acquire these lines, the government should have the endorsation of parliament in pursuing such a course. And while I endorse the policy of acquiring the branch lines I think the more important policy is to extend the Intercolonial Railway to districts where the conditions will justify such extension. I have in my mind a case in point; I have photographs which I intend to show the Minister of Railways when the opportunity arises, and I think I can convince him that if we have not a Cobalt we have something nearly approaching it. I will, when the opportunity comes, press on the minister the advisability of building a branch line from Merigomish to Antigonish via Arisaig and thence to Country Harbour. Possibly I shall take the opportunity of bringing this matter up when the House is in committee of supply.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the very valuable discussion that has taken place to-night has been of interest to every member of the House, not only to those who come from the maritime provinces, but equally so to us who live in other parts of the Dominion. I would feel a little diffidence, even if I had the time, about discussing this question after the very eloquent and able address which has been delivered by my hon. friend from Westmoreland. He has given to this question a great deal of study. Indeed, sir, he has given to the greater question of transportation a study perhaps not equalled by that of any other man in this House; and the grasp of the situation which he has shown to-night proves that he has not rushed to his conclusions but has reached them after the most careful and I believe honest and candid consideration. Such discussions in this House must be of interest to all Canada. Possibly sometimes they do not accomplish the object which we are seeking at the moment; but they do diffuse a large amount of information which leads the people to take a broader view of the questions which interest us all. I was particularly struck with the broad view my hon. friend took of the situation. While he did point out what conclusions could be drawn if we took the sectional view, he discouraged this, and spoke from the broader view of carrying all the products of the country from the point where they are produced to the point where they are consumed, which is of general interest to all Canada, and does not pertain to any particular section of the country. I did not rise to go into this question to-night. It is not a question that can be brushed aside lightly, but is one of great interest to the west as well as to the east. With the permission of my hon. friend, I will not make a statement on behalf of the government to-night, but when I make the speech on the Intercolonial which is customary on going into Supply,

I will make a statement as to the position of the government on this question and on all other questions relating to the Intercolonial Railway, I will therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What business will the government take up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. The House will go into Supply, and the Minister of Militia will make a statement in connection with his estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 9, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved that the name of Mr. Boyce be taken off the Committee on Mines and Minerals and added to the Committee on Forests, Waterways and Watercourses, and that the name of Mr. George Gordon be taken off the Committee on Forests, Waterways and Watercourses and added to the Committee on Mines and Minerals.

Motion agreed to.

ADULTERATION ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. A. SEXSMITH (East Peterboro) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 100) to amend the Adulteration Act. He said: The object is to protect the farmers and others against the sale of comparatively worthless foods which are put on the markets. They have no means of detecting the difference between these foods and others of excellent value. When the Bill comes up for second reading, I shall explain the details and hope to make it clear that it is very essential.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE—AMENDMENT.

Mr. T. J. STEWART (West Hamilton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 101) to amend the Criminal Code. He said: The object of the Bill is to reach an undesirable class who are travelling through our country and are a source of great danger and annoyance. It is against the law for a man to carry undesirable weapons of any kind, but no means are provided to ascertain whether he is doing so or not. The amendment I ask is to provide that a person suspected of carrying concealed weapons may be searched.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). Before the orders of the day are called I desire to ask the Minister of Public Works again when we may expect the return with reference to the riding of Bonaventure. The order was made on February 1, and on one or two occasions since I have had more or less promising assurances, but nothing has come of them. We want these returns for use during the session; and when hon. gentlemen talk of prolonging the session, I think there is no more effective way of prolonging it than by this extreme delay in bringing down important returns. We are hampered and delayed in the work of the House. There must be a great deal of matter to be returned if it requires six or seven weeks to prepare it. It is quite time that this return was made. I can do without it if necessary but I must say I think it is time this return was ready.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have spoken to my deputy several times, asking why the returns have not been brought down. He informs me they are being attended to as rapidly as possible. I regret that in my department we have to use the ordinary staff, as we have no room to get in temporary clerks during the session, and under the law we cannot pay clerks for working after hours. We have to do the best we can. I spoke yesterday about the returns and I will see they are brought down as soon as possible. This remark applies to other returns as well.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope that remark includes returns which were ordered on my own motion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. There are some of those that should not take much time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Except that they have to take their turn.

Mr. FOSTER. That means the turn of the House and there are 220 members here.

MARINE DEPARTMENTAL INVESTIGATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called I beg to ask the Prime Minister when he expects to be able

to announce to the House what action, if any, the government propose to take upon the report of Mr. Justice Cassels. The Prime Minister will remember that up to the present time there has been no information whatever given to the House upon this subject. I am not pressing for an answer to-day, but am merely suggesting the expedience of giving early information to the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The matter has been engaging the attention of council and I think some time next week we will be able to announce the final conclusion.

LEGISLATION RE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In consequence of a paragraph in the press yesterday, I beg to ask whether it is the intention of the government to bring down any legislation with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific at this session, and, if so, at what time we may expect the announcement of that legislation?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Any legislation of that nature that may be contemplated will be put upon the Order Paper almost immediately.

SUPPLY—SOUTH AFRICAN BOUNTY ACT.

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

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of the Interior to one feature of the South African Bounty Act. The Act provides that a land grant shall be made to the volunteer or in the event of his death between the date of his enlistment and a certain other date, to his legal representative. I have been inquiring in the department as to the issue of certain land warrants and there seems to be some confusion in the matter. I think that probably the regulations could be improved. The first intimation sent out to the parties making the application, as I understand it, is that there must be either probate or administration in the case of deceased persons. In the majority of instances these persons have no estate, they are generally young men and have absolutely no estate and in many instances they have made no will. In Ontario there is a provision of course for administration, but in the province of Quebec I am told there is no provision, no law by which there can be, in the ordinary sense, administration of the estate. In the case of a vacant possession, where there are no heirs at all, I am told a person called a curator may be appointed who will take charge of the estate. In the case of ordinary heirs who are of age, they take charge of the estate themselves, and in the case of infants a tutor is appointed, but there is no such thing as administration in the ordinary way. I was speaking of a case that comes from Montreal the other day, and I was informed by an officer in the department that that condition arises in reference to administration in the province of Quebec. He had informed the party there would have to be administration but found in the meantime there could be no administration.

The point to which I wish to call the minister's attention is that where a person under twenty-one years of age who was killed in South Africa, had no will and no estate, it seems to be an unnecessary expense to put the parties to that they should have to apply, say in Ontario, for administration in a case of that kind. In fact there is a good deal of difficulty about getting administration, because as a matter of fact there could only be administration of an estate and there is no estate to be administered. Of course we can get around it by saying he had his clothing or something of that kind, but practically there is no estate. My suggestion is that in cases of that kind, where a person who would be entitled to a grant died before the Act was passed and so the land that he was to get did not even tentatively devolve upon him, the grant ought to be administered from first to last in the department. That an affidavit should be filed as to the parties entitled to that estate and the grant should be made to those parties or as would happen in the majority of cases that they would all transfer their rights to one person, four or five brothers would release their rights to another brother, or a father or mother and let the grant be made to that person. It seems to me to be absolutely unnecessary to put the parties to the expense of getting administration where they could administer the grant themselves. I was told by a gentleman in charge that in one instance a mother and son came in to the department and represented that they were the only parties entitled to participate in the grant, but it afterwards transpired that there was a son, another brother, living in the United States. That, however, would be easily liable to occur if administration was demanded, they would just as easily deceive the Surrogate Court judge as the departmental officer. What I urge upon the minister for the purpose of getting directly at the matter and avoiding expense, is that where the person dies before the passage of the Act and the Act therefore gives it not to him but to his legal representatives, where these legal representatives are of the full age of twenty-

one years the matter should be dealt with without their being called on to obtain administration. I have no doubt the minister has been endeavouring to get it into the best shape possible and doubtless he has had some difficulty in working it out. I thought it desirable to bring it up in the House so that if anything should arise by which there might be a case of making a false affidavit or anything of that kind the department could not be blamed if they adopted a suggestion of that kind made in the House.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very glad the hon. member has brought this matter to the attention of the House. Although the instances to which he alludes are not numerous still they exist and have to be dealt with. It is true that for the protection of the department it is our rule to require that the responsibility of deciding who are the heirs shall rest upon the local courts or the legal authorities rather than upon ourselves. I think it is well for all parties concerned that, within reasonable limits, we should continue to take that view. At the same time, no doubt, there are some cases such as my hon. friend has mentioned, where to insist upon that view is really a hardship. I would not wish my hon. friend or the House to think that it is the desire of the government to impose any hardship, or to allow anything that can be avoided to stand in the way of those who are entitled getting the fullest possible benefit. I am glad the hon. member has seen fit to mention this matter in the House, so that the House may be aware of the difficulties that have to be met; and that when we think it is in the best interest of those who are entitled that we should administer directly, we may have the support of the House in doing so, or in doing the best we can under the circumstances.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). I am glad my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has referred to this matter. I had occasion a short tim ago to present an application to the Department of the Interior of a somewhat similar character to that which the hon. gentleman has referred. A young man went away from my county and joined the forces to go to South Africa. Unfortunately he was taken ill and died there, and is buried in South Africa. He left a father and mother, and five brothers and sisters. On making application I was informed that letters of administration would have to be taken out. The father has since died and the remaining relatives are living, all of age. It seems to me that if the brothers, sisters and mother should all assign to one member of the family and that member of the family should be the one to make application, the department would have no difficulty, no trouble, and no risk in dealing with him. If necessary, a statutory declaration could be made by some one to the effect that these were all the members of the family. I think it a pity that the department should insist upon putting the relatives of these veterans to the cost and trouble of procuring letters of administration. It all costs money, and the indemnity that is granted to the veterans is not so very great after all, and if you reduce the value of it by insisting on letters of administration, you are doing what, to say the least of it, is absolutely unnecessary. If the government chooses to make a gift to the relatives of a veteran who has sacrificed his life in the interest of the empire, I say give it to him, but don't make it any more expensive for his relatives to get it than is necessary. I hope the minister will revise what I understand is a rule of the department to insist upon letters of administration in every instance, and that where matters are made clear and the evidence can be furnished without doubt, he will not insist upon letters of administration where there is no will. Sometimes it is difficult. A young man goes out perhaps and leaves no estate behind him, nothing on which to base an application for letters of administration. The grant of land coming to the heirs cannot be used as a basis of application for letters of administration, consequently there are difficulties in the way. I think the minister should make the rule flexible, and deal with each case on its merits, instead of laying down an absolute rule to govern all cases.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City.) I would like to support the remarks of the hon. member for Simcoe who brought this matter up. It has been my fortune during the last week or so to take six or seven cases to the Department of the Minister of the Interior, where the legal representatives were called upon to take certain action in order to obtain the warrants. One of the worst features about the cases to which I refer was the fact that the parties who were endeavouring to get these applications put through, were left from the month of October last I think until within eight or ten days ago without any knowledge coming to them as to what the department required them to do in order to establish their claims. After I saw the deputy minister, I may say, there was no further trouble and word was sent to these people that letters of administration would have to be taken out. As has been stated this afternoon, many of these men are not in a position to take out letters of administration. I understand that in the city of St. John it costs at least $40 to take out letters of administration, and that applicants have to pay

that amount in order to fulfil the requirements of the Department of the Interior. I am not a lawyer, and therefore I cannot make any suggestion as to what course should be adopted. But the minister has a legal staff in his department, and I think he would be doing only right and dealing justly by these men, if he would make such regulations as would relieve them from the expense of $40 in order to go through a probate court and get out letters of administration. I think he would be doing justice in that way, and make it much easier for a deserving class to get what they are entitled to.

Mr. H. GUTHRIE (South Wellington). There is another thing I would like to draw the attention of the minister to in regard to the regulations which have been isued under the Volunteer Bounty Act. I do not refer to a deceased volunteer, but to volunteers who were so seriously wounded in the South African war that they are unable to comply with the homestead requirements which are necessary under the present Act and the present regulations. I have in mind the case of two volunteers who reside in the constituency I have the honour to represent, both of whom were seriously injured in Hart's river, one, Sergeant Wilkinson, losing his right arm and his left eye, and the other, Corporal Minchin, having been shot through the lung and otherwise seriously injured. Both of these men are to-day physically incapable of performing homestead duties. Now, of course, it may be said that they have the option of selling their warrant, or of taking scrip. No doubt they have, but if it becomes known that these two men, or men similarly situated cannot perform their homestead duties, they are bound to sell, and to sell at a great sacrifice. What I would suggest is that volunteers who have been physically incapacitated through wounds or disease in South Africa should be entitled to get their land without performing homestead duties upon it. I think that it would be a very laudable and very proper thing to do, and I trust the regulations or the Act may be so amended as to permit its being done.

Mr. T. W. CROTHERS (West Elgin). There is another matter to which I think the attention of the minister should be directed. It seems to be the practice of his department in the case of a homesteader, that probate of his will or letters of administration should be issued from the judical district in which the land is situated. I have a case in point where a homesteader had fulfilled all the requirements to obtain his homestead, but he died in the province of Ontario, where he left an estate, and where he made his will.

Mr. DANIEL.

The will was probated in one of the surrogate courts in Ontario. He was notified by the department that it would be necessary to file an exemplification of the probate or the original probate itself. I think that was a mistake according to the practice of the department . However, he was notified later that it would be necessary for him to engage a solicitor at Saskatoon to prove, in the district where the land is, a will that has already been proved in the court of the province of Ontario. I cannot see any good reason why that should be required. It seems to me that the evidence of a court in the province of Ontario that a man has made a will, which will has been proved devising the land to his son, ought to be sufficient to warrant the department in issuing the patent to his son, assuming that all the settlement duties have been performed and I believe that satisfactory evidence has been submitted as to that. I do not understand why it is necessary to put the man to the expense of re-proving the will in the district where the land is. There might be some justification for it if the government of the province were issuing the title, but it is the government of the Dominion that gives him the title, and the evidence of the court in one of the provinces ought to be sufficient that the will was made and the proof of that fact ought to be sufficient to entitle the devisee to the patent for the land.

Mr. J. HERRON (Macleod). I do not wish to repeat the statements that have been so well made by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) with reference to the South African volunteers, but I wish to acquiesce in the statements that he has made. I have one or two cases in mind where men have been totally incapacitated from doing homestead duties on their land and I believe that this government would be adopting a proper course and one which would commend itself to the people generally if they would grant these men their patents without requiring them to perform their homestead duties. I believe the people of Canada would uphold the hands of the minister and the government in doing that. I would like to see a regulation adopted which would enable men incapacitated as a result of their service in South Africa to secure their homesteads without being compelled to comply with the homestead regulations of the departments.

Mr. G. H. COWAN (Vancouver City). I wish to direct the attention of the minister to the fact that the restrictions of the Volunteer Bounty Act are so numerous and so onerous that, taken alone, the name of the Act is almost a misnomer. I wish to draw the attention of the House and the

minister to the fact that the department has added to these restrictions. Take, for example, section 2 of the Volunteer Bounty Act which provides that the grant may be of Dominion lands available for entry. Turning to the Dominion Lands Act, section 3, you will find that the lands available for entry are lands in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, together with three and a half million acres in the Peace river district in the province of British Columbia as well as the land in the territories. But we find, on turning to the regulation of the department, that volunteers otherwise entitled to the benefit of the Act are not permitted to enter for lands in the Peace river district in the province of British Columbia, notwithstanding the fact that section 3 of the Dominion Lands Act, taken along with section 2 of the Volunteer Bounty Act, gives them that right. I think that the restrictions of the Volunteer Bounty Act are sufficient without the department adding further restrictions. The effect of that departmental regulation is that a volunteer a resident in British Columbia is bound to expatriate himself from British Columbia before he can get the benefit of the Act. It was surely never intended that that should be the case. It was surely intended that volunteers resident in British Columbia should be permitted to enter for Dominion lands in British Columbia. It is true that by a section of the Dominion Lands Act the forty-mile belt is not included as land available for homestead entry. It seems to me desirable that this too should be included and, at any rate, it is exceedingly undesirable that volunteers, resident in British Columbia and having their occupations there, should be obliged to give up these occupations and go beyond the bounds of their own province to get the benefit of the Act, especially when the Dominion has a large tract of three and a half million acres in the Peace district and the forty-mile belt on either side of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Again, by section 4 of the Volunteer Bounty Act, it is provided that:

> The volunteer, or his substitute, may select or enter for the land on or before the 31st December, 1910, and shall perfect his entry within six months after the 31st December, 1910.

But along come the regulations of the department and say that he shall be obliged to perfect his entry, not six months after the 31st December, 1910, but six months after entry. I think again that the department is imposing unnecessary restrictions upon the volunteer, especially in view of the fact that the intention apparently of the Act was that it should grant him a bounty. Away back in 1871 we know that the volunteers of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec who had served at that time were given a grant of land each without actual residence being required. Here the homestead duties of the volunteers are almost exactly the same as those of an entrant under the Dominion Lands Act and they are more onerous in many respects. I cannot help thinking that in view of the way this Act is being administered by the department the name of the Volunteer Bounty Act is a misnomer. It would be better for volunteers resident in British Columbia to abandon their rights under the Act and enter for homesteads under the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that in all cases where a volunteer entitled to this land grant dies, his heirs will be obliged to take out letters of administration before they can take advantage of the bounty ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is the way we are administering the Act at the present time.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, I should be inclined to agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) that the department should, by regulation or otherwise, provide for the acceptance of proof without putting the heirs to the trouble of taking out letters of administration.

Mr. S. HUGHES (Victoria). Now that this matter is up, I think it well to bring before the House a matter which has been engaging the attention of some people for a considerable time. Under the present regulations, each volunteer, in order to settle upon his land, must personally visit the land office in the locality in which he purposes selecting his location. But certain persons have purchased large numbers of these land warrants, and, as I understand it, under these same regulations, these persons can locate these lands without this formality. The purchaser of land warrants has no intention of becoming a settler himself—he is a mere speculator. But the volunteer who proposes to settle on his land himself must personally locate his land. Many of these intending settlers, in order to get in early, are going up already, and others will go within the next few weeks. Each of them will have to incur an expense of $200 or $300 in selecting the land, making the location and paying the necessary travelling expenses. I appeal to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) if it would not be better and fairer to allow the warrant to locate the land instead of the man. The Minister of the Interior, some years ago, abolished—and very properly—the old blanketing system which had worked such injury to the northwest, the system under which any person, through

an agent, could locate a homestead. That system was greatly abused. But the minister, in his desire to prevent the recurrence of that abuse, went to the other extreme and made every applicant personally go to the land office. Thus, a father who wanted to locate land for himself and his sons was unable to locate except for himself. Every one of the sons had to go to the west personally and locate his homestead. The minister did change the regulations so as to provide for such cases as this. In the case of these land grants to volunteers, a regulation should be passed, or, if necessary, an amendment to the Act should be made, so that the volunteer who holds a land warrant might be put down for his chosen location, or, if this were found to be located, he could be notified and be given an opportunity to select another. Many of these men have friends in the west, who would pick out land for them. I think the hon. ministers to whom I have referred will see the justice of the claim that the warrant should be the identification and not the person. Those familiar with affairs in the northwest know that the location of half-breed scrip was not attended with these restrictions. The speculators who held the warrant were not going to try to bring to the land office the particular half-breed in whose name the warrant was issued, and who might be living somewhere up near the Arctic circle. Any half-breed would do——

Mr. KNOWLES. Does the hon. gentleman say that that system of locating half-breed script has existed within the last two years?

Mr. S. HUGHES. I did not say so. But it did exist in previous years. If the hon. gentleman wants them, I can give him particulars.

Mr. KNOWLES. No, I merely asked a courteous question and thought I should get an answer of the same kind.

Mr. S. HUGHES. Since the present Minister of Justice has come into office, he has done his best to stamp out the iniquities that were rampant throughout the northwest—I give him every credit for that. I am glad to see that hundreds of volunteers are going upon their own lands, and I point out that it would save these men a great deal of expense if the change that I suggest were made, and would leave them with more money to buy their outfit when within the next four or five months, they go to reside on their land.

Mr. ADAM B. CROSBY (Halifax). I am glad this matter has been brought up, for I have a case in my constituency, which, perhaps, is different from any of the others. There is a widow of a South African volunteer who lost his life in South Africa. This lady has made application for a land grant. The warrant was about to issue, and the deputy Minister of the Interior—whom I had the honour of calling upon, and who was very kind in giving all the information he could—had sent out the letter containing the questions to be asked of the applicant and on the answering of which the warrant was to issue. But, between the time that letter was sent to Halifax and the time of its return, as I understand it, some new rule had been issued by which the applicant would have to administer before she could receive the warrant. When she communicated with me, I asked her to call at the probate office in Halifax. As she is without means I thought she might be able to administer there at small cost. But they told her there that, in view of the fact that her husband had left no estate in Halifax, she could not administer there, but must administer where the land was granted. As the land was not granted as a matter of fact, this would be difficult to do. I trust the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) will be able to make some provision by which this poor woman will be able to get the land due to her. I think the widow is in a much different position from any other relative, and there should be special consideration for her. I do not know whether other warrants had been previously granted in similar cases, but I understand that this new rule, as I have said, issued between the time when the communication was sent to Halifax, and the time the answer was sent back.

Mr. WM. M. MARTIN (Regina). As one of the members from the west, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the objections which have been raised by hon. members on the other side to the methods of administration of the Land Department. I was particularly interested in the point raised by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr Lennox) with regard to certain cases of hardship in connection with the administration of the land grants of deceased volunteers. Any person who is familiar with the conditions of the practice of law in the western provinces or with the conditions attending the administration of estates, would not wish to place on the government the responsibility of deciding in any particular case whether a man dies leaving heirs or not. Only a short time ago there came under my own notice the case of a man, recently married, who died in the province of Saskatchewan. Affidavits were sworn to by his widow to the effect that he died leaving her and three or four small children. Before the estate was administered, we learned by the merest chance that the man had been married in Germany previous to coming to this country, and had a grown-up family there. Similar cases must arise from time to time. The administration of estates in the western provinces is a simple matter, it does

not cost much; and why should not a man who is getting land from the government have his estate administered in the same way as he would have if he actually had the patent for the land? The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) spoke of the hardships attending certain men who were injured in the South African war. With those men I have every sympathy, as I believe has every member of the House; but I may call attention to the fact that the Act to authorize a bounty to the South African volunteers, passed in the last session of the last parliament, provides for the appointing of a substitute, and I believe the scrip at the present time is worth about $1,000.

Mr. HUGHES. It will soon be worth $2,000.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. I believe that it soon will be worth $2,000. Each of these volunteers has the right to take not only a half-section under this Act, but a half-section under the Homestead and Pre-emptions Act as amended in the last parliament; so that the South African volunteer, if he wants to become an actual settler in the west, has an opportunity to acquire a whole section of land, and in three or four years, when he gets his patent, he will be a wealthy man. I know personally some South African volunteers who have taken up their land and are at present on the highway to wealth as a result of the bounty given to them by this government. The hon. member for Vancouver also raised the question of the time given for entry to the volunteers. I believe that western sentiment is that ample time has been given to them. They are allowed up to the 31st of December, 1910. The hon. member for Vancouver would allow them to have until the middle of 1911 to complete the entry. The effect of that would be to have the land tied up for two or three years. What we want in the western provinces is men to go on the land and cultivate it, and increase the out put of wheat and thereby increase the wealth of the country.

Mr. COWAN. That is the wording of the Act.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. If that is the correct interpretation of the Act, it should not be worded in that way, for I believe the South African volunteers have been given ample time to go on the land and perform the cultivation duties.

Mr. GOODEVE. May I ask the Minister of the Interior to give the reasons for exempting the lands of the Peace River district from free entry under this Act? In the Bounty Act those lands are mentioned as being eligible, but in the regulations of the 1st of February they are exempt.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). As this question has been brought up without notice, I am not able to give all the particulars that I would otherwise be able and very glad to give. However, as far as the Peace River tract in question is concerned, the rights of the volunteers are not affected, as up to the present time there is no land surveyed in that tract upon which entry could be made. In view of the number of points that have been raised, I might be permitted to go over the ground from the point of view of the department. In regard to requiring letters of administration to be taken out, I do not wish to be understood, as I seem to have been understood, as being willing or anxious to forego that requirement. What I want to be understood as saying is that it is only in entirely exceptional cases that I would think we would be warranted in foregoing that requirement. It is not a burden that should be assumed by a department of this government, unless that burden were laid upon it expressly by order of the House, to decide whether there are heirs or not, and if so, who are and who are not heirs. That is a most serious responsibility in regard to the rights of property, which is laid upon the courts and judges of our land. The administration of estates differs in every province of the Dominion, and it would be a very serious presumption on the part of the Department of the Interior to usurp the functions of the courts in the various provinces of the Dominion in regard to the administration of estates. This grant is property; it is practically real estate, and the heirs to that real estate are entitled to all the protection that the laws of the several provinces give them.

Mr. McKENZIE. What right does the administration give over it?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman's point is that administration is concerned with personal property.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not learned in the law, but I understand that there is the administration of real estate as well as the administration of personal property. The distribution of the real estate of a deceased person is one of the most delicate, difficult and expensive proceedings under the jurisdiction of our courts, but there are still cases where it would be too serious a hardship to insist on all the formalities of the law; and in such, we may be prepared to take the responsibility of deciding to issue the grant to the one entitled to it in our best judgment. But that is done only as a last resort in extreme cases; and should we make a mistake in such cases, we ask for the best consideration of parliament. But we do not want to be understood as lightly undertaking a responsibility which has not been

laid on us by Act of parliament and which it would be the height of presumption for us to assume.

With regard to the question raised by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) as to the remission of residential duties in the case of volunteers who had suffered serious physical disabilities, I only wish to point out that, in administering this law, the Department of the Interior is bound by the terms of the Act. The Act was only passed last session, and after a great deal of consideration, parliament did not see fit to provide for the contingency suggested by my hon. friend except in the way in which it is provided as suggested by the hon. member for Regina. That is to say, provision is made for the transfer of the right of a volunteer who for reasons, whatever they may be, sees fit not to go on his land. The Act is framed so that the man who does not want to go on his land will be able to get the utmost value for his right to the scrip. That was the view of parliament last session, and in administering the Act the Department of the Interior must be bound by the authority of parliament. Parliament was moved to take the ground it did believing that while it was desirable to give reasonable consideration for the services of the men who went to South Africa, it was also desirable that settlement in the west should be thereby encouraged. The grant was essentially a bounty for the promotion of settlement in the west just as much as a recognition of services to the empire. And until parliament sees fit to reverse that policy, the Department of the Interior will have to continue as it is doing.

Regarding the point raised by the hon. member for Vancouver, while the Act gives the volunteer at least six months after a certain date in 1910 to go upon the land, there was certainly no intention that there should be any such privilege as that of tieing up the land and holding it over from settlement until 1911. That, I take the responsibility of saying, was not the intention of parliament. The intention of parliament was that the settlement conditions should be such as are required by the Dominion Lands Act; and the Dominion Lands Act requires that within six months after the date of entry settlement shall take place. We are administering the Act in that light, and I believe that we are carrying out the will of parliament in so doing. Were the Act to be administered as the hon. member for Vancouver has suggested, it would cause scandal and abuse in land speculation to which the western country would certainly not submit.

As regards the inability of volunteers to take up lands in British Columbia, it was not contemplated that there should be any land placed at their disposal except those in the prairie provinces; but if the people of British Columbia feel slighted, I do not know but that their views may be met in due time, and I can say without hesitation that if it were possible to transfer the privilege from the prairie provinces to the railway belt of British Columbia, I am quite satisfied every representative of the prairie provinces would be quite willing to have that done.

There is this to be said in connection with this volunteer scrip, and that is that taking advantage of the provisions framed for the express purpose of protecting the interests of those volunteers who, for one reason or another, were either unable or unwilling to go on the land, a very large portion of the issue has fallen into the hands of speculators. We hope that the volunteers who were entitled to all the rights and benefits to be derived under the Act have reaped due advantage from that transaction. We did our best for them in framing the Act, and if they have not reaped due advantage from it the fault is theirs and not ours. The condition is that the scrip is, as a matter of fact, very largely in the hands of men who have bought it not with the intention of settling on the land but for the purpose of speculation, and therefore the Department of the Interior being charged with the administration of this area of some two million acres of land, largely in the hands of speculators, is compelled, if the public interest in the settlement of the country is to be protected, to hold the lines very, very tight. We cannot allow the privileges in respect to the land held or taken under scrip that we have been used to allow in the case of land taken by homesteaders. I think the members from the west will bear me out when I say that it is absolutely necessary that having made the law as it is, we must insist upon the letter of the law being fulfilled, not wishing to do any injury to the men who served the empire, but desiring to protect the public interest in the settlement of the west, which is if not of paramount of equal importance to parliament and the country.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. How did it become possible for the various land agents throughout Canada to become possessed of either the nominal roll of every regiment serving in South Africa, or a list of some sort giving the name and address of each of these men? It is unfortunate that this has occurred because in a great many instances the first the volunteer knew of his being entitled to a South African grant was a letter from a land agent offering him at first $200 or $300 for his rights. That was often the first intimation received by the volunteer that he was entitled to any remuneration for his services in South Africa. It would have been much better if either the Militia or the Interior Department had

notified each veteran that he was entitled to such a grant, and to have withheld the information from the land grabbers until such time as the soldier himself had a chance to consider the proposition.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to say how the rolls of which my hon. friend speaks came into the hands of the real estate agent. I would say that in my estimation once we permitted, as we did permit and as we intended to permit, the volunteer to sell his scrip, the greater publicity given to the fact that the scrip was issued, the better for the man who had scrip to sell and wanted to sell it. There seems to me to be no disadvantage to the beneficiary of the Act in the fact the man who wanted to buy from him knew that he had scrip to sell or which he could sell. The greater the demand for the scrip the better the price the man was going to get for it. It is to be regretted that in many cases the volunteer has disposed of the scrip at much below its actual value, but I think that those who are to blame for that are rather the men who have belittled the commercial value of the scrip, as it was belittled, very definitely and specifically and persistently belittled, in the columns of many newspapers not many months ago.

I take the opportunity of saying that the South African volunteers have suffered the loss of many thousands of dollars and the scrip sharks have benefited to a corresponding degree because of the misunderstanding that was persistently and deliberately caused throughout the country as to the commercial value of this volunteer scrip. The effort was made in the terms of the Act to prevent that by providing that no transfer of right was valid until after the scrip was issued. In every point we have done our best to guard the interests of the volunteers. It is still to be regretted that in many cases they have suffered very heavy financial loss, but it is not because of any action or lack of action on the part of this government.

Mr. S. HUGHES. My experience is that a great many of the volunteers still hold their scrip, but perhaps the minister has data which would warrant him in stating that the great majority of them have sold their warrants. The great majority of my friends are still holding their warrants and I am pleased to say that a majority of that majority are going to settle on the land.

Mr. OLIVER. When I said a large proportion, I was speaking without the book. I have taken for granted from remarks I have heard that a large proportion had been sold. I hope it is not so, and would be pleased to know it is not. But there has been a great deal of talk about purchase of scrip, and a low price at which it was being disposed of made me feel very strongly that a great many volunteers were not getting the benefit we hoped they would get from the Act.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I would ask the attention of the Minister of Militia (Sir F. Borden) to a case in my constituency. A young Canadian medical officer went to London, England, enlisted in the British forces and served during his term about one year in South Africa. Part of the time he was on hospital duty and part of the time he was at the front, for about eight months treking the veldt and enduring all the hardships and dangers of the campaign in South Africa. It seems to me remarkable that nurses who never saw a bullet fired and many men who never saw South Africa are entitled to a warrant, a gift of this land, and this officer, a young Canadian officer in the medical corps, is deprived of his rights. I would strongly press on the favourable consideration of the minister the case of those who are commonly called civil surgeons. This young man was really subject and liable to all the orders of the ordinary volunteer and he was exposed to all the hardships of the campaign. If there was ever a man who deserved the scrip it is surely a man of this description. I understand the Law Department have decided against the claim of men of this class, and hold that they are not entitled to grants of land. I think this is rather a harsh ruling, and the minister might amend the law and regulations in respect to such cases, and allow this young man, who is certainly very deserving, a grant of land.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If my hon. friend will bring the particular case to my notice, I will have it looked into. I do not remember the case.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. As I understand it, the South African civil surgeons were under military rule the same as regimental and army medical corps men, and in many instances were attached to regiments as regimental surgeons, though ranking simply as civil surgeons. I think it is right that a man who has lived in Canada and was domiciled here before the war, and serves the empire, either in England or South Africa, should be entitled to the grant, and more especially if he has returned to Canada.

Mr. HUGHES. Every civil surgeon in any column with which I had anything to do in South Africa, was on the roll. I do not see how the case presented by the hon. member for North Ontario can have arisen.

Mr. CROTHERS. The Minister of the Interior, in answering the multitude of questions submitted to him on this matter ,overlooked one that I raised. It seems that in the

case of a South African veteran, the minister accepts the finding of a court in any province as to the person entitled to the certificate. Why should that not be the case with a homesteader? If the minister accepts the finding of a court in any province as to the person entitled to the patent in the case of a veteran, why should that not be the case when the duties have been performed by the homesteader, or by his successor ?

Mr. OLIVER. In the one case, as I understand it—of course my hon. friend knows that I am skating on rather thin ice in undertaking to deal with the question without reference—in the case of South African script, it is not land, it is only a right to land, a right which has not yet been translated into land. But the right exists and accrues wherever the domicile was of the person who holds that right. In the case of land, the right accrues where the land is situated, that is to say, in the case of a homestead the right must necessarily exist where the homestead is, and therefore must be subject to the laws of that province.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Where will the probate be taken out? Does the minister require the probate to be issued in the province where the land is subsequently found to be situated? How can you tell in what province the probate should be taken?

Mr. OLIVER. We ask the probate to be taken out in the province in which the volunteer was domiciled, in the case of scrip ; but in the case of homestead, the probate must be taken out in the province in which the land is situated.

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I desire, Mr. Speaker, to draw your attention to a memorial that I had the honour to present to this House last Friday from the legislature of the province of Manitoba in regard to an extension of its boundaries. That memorial was rejected by yourself yesterday on the ground that it contained a paragraph referring to financial conditions, which, under the procedure of parliament, cannot be received by this House unless it is accompanied by the consent of His Excellency the Governor General. On this occasion I desire to draw the attention of the House to another memorial I had the honour to present on the same subject during the last session of parliament. I will refer to the latter part of that memorial, which concludes as follows:

Your memorialists therefore consent, agree and pray that the boundaries of the province of Manitoba be enlarged or extended so as to embrace and include the following territory, that is to say:

Then follows a description of the area of land which the province is desirous of securing. In addition, the memorial of last year proceeds as follows, regarding the financial considerations and the specific terms:

That supplementary and in addition to the prevailing provisions as to the annual allowance of the province by the Dominion for cost of government, and a per capita allowance of eighty cents per head of population, there be inserted in any Act of the parliament of Canada extending the boundaries of the province as above set forth, the following provisions respecting capital account and in lieu of lands, such provisions being in every respect similar to and identical with those respecting said matters as are contained in certain Acts of the parliament of Canada passed in the year 1905, creating the new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta; and this House declares its willingness to agree to and approve of and does hereby and herein agree and approve of an extension by the parliament of Canada of the boundaries of the province in the manner and to the extent aforesaid, upon the said following terms and financial conditions (which terms and financial conditions are similar in all respects, as to the matters herein referred to, as were extended to each of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and agreed upon between those provinces and the government of Canada, and as are contained in the said Acts creating those provinces as aforesaid), being, to wit, as follows, that is to say:

Inasmuch as the province of Manitoba is not in debt, it shall be entitled to be paid and to receive from the government of Canada by half-yearly payments in advance an annual sum of four hundred and five thousand three hundred and seventy-five dollars, being the equivalent of interest at the rate of five per cent per annum on the sum of eight million one hundred and seven thousand five hundred dollars.

Inasmuch as the said province will not have the public land as a source of revenue, there shall be paid by Canada to the province, by half-yearly payments in advance, an annual sum based upon the population of the province as from time to time ascertained by the quinquennial census thereof, as follows:—

The population of the said province being assumed to be at present two hundred and fifty thousand, the sum payable until such population reaches four hundred thousand shall be three hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars;

Thereafter, until such population reaches eight hundred thousand, the sum payable shall be five hundred and sixty-two thousand five hundred dollars;

Thereafter, until such population reaches one million two hundred thousand, the sum payable shall be seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars;

And thereafter the sum payable shall be one million one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars.

As an additional allowance in lieu of the public lands, there shall be paid by Canada

to the province, annually by half-yearly payments in advance, for five years from the time this Act comes into force, to provide for the construction of necessary public buildings, the sum of ninety-three thousand seven hundred and fifty dollars.

For all the purposes aforesaid and such other or others as shall be warranted upon the statement of facts herein presented, this House prays for substantial relief and justice from the parliament of Canada, and desires to observe that any less arrangement than above set forth respecting said matters would be considered by your memorialists inequitable and unjust and firmly rests its claims upon an equality of treatment, in so far as area and financial conditions are concerned, with our sister provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

This was the memorial I presented last year on behalf of the legislature of the province of Manitoba. I find on looking up the votes and proceedings last session, a petition of the legislature of the province of Manitoba praying that the boundaries of the province be extended, was read and received on the 3rd day of February, 1908. No exception was taken to that memorial on the ground that it was unconstitutional, although it went specificially into details concerning the financial conditions of the province. That being a precedent, and having that in view, the legislislature of the province of Manitoba, by a joint committee constituted of members of both sides of politics, a few weeks ago formulated a memorial and sent it down here through the clerk of the legislative assembly to myself, to be presented, and I did present it last Friday. That committee was a joint committee of the House, and the memorial passed the legislature unanimously. I hold in my hand the memorial which I presented, and the concluding paragraph is the one which was taken exception to yesterday when this petition was thrown out. It reads as follows:

Wherefore your memorialists respectfully request that further consideration be given to their contention as regards the territory above mentioned——

This enumerates certain territory not included in the resolution that the right hon. Prime Minister introduced into this House last session.

—and pray that your hon. House may be pleased to grant to the province of Manitoba, financial terms at least equal to those allowed to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

You will see that the terms are very general in that they refer to no financial consideration in detail in the memorial which was rejected yesterday; whereas the memorial presented last session entered specifically in detail into all the financial conditions and notwithstanding that fact it was not rejected. I understand that the rule which was invoked was a rule which has been well recognized in this House that no resolution can be introduced unless it has received the assent of His Excellency the Governor General. Bourinot says:

By the 54th sec. of the British North America Act, 1867, which is copied from the clause in the Act of 1840, it is expressly declared:

It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address, or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended by a message of the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or Bill is proposed.

I quite recognize that even after the receiving of this petition it is absolutely necessary, before it can be acted upon, or before a Bill shall be introduced, that a resolution shall be presented in accordance with the terms of the clause that I have just read, and that it shall receive the assent of the Governor General. I fully expected that procedure would be followed. But, with regard to accepting a petition, Bourinot, at page 349, states what the practice has been since confederation, as follows:

In the first session of the parliament of Canada the House of Commons initiated the practice of refusing to receive any petition for a grant of money out of the public revenues unless it has been first recommended by the Crown.

That refers, of course, to the petitions that are presented to this House. Bourinot further states:

But whilst petitions that directly ask for any public aid or for any measures directly involving an appropriation of public money, are now never received, the House does not reject those which simply ask for legislation, or for such measures as the House may think it expedient to take.

As long as they are couched in general terms it has been the practice to receive such petitions, and I think that the memorial presented yesterday is couched in terms sufficiently general to come in under that rule. Certainly if this memorial is out of order by reason of the practice that has been in vogue since the first session after confederation then most assuredly the memorial which was presented here last year was not in order either. But what I particularly wish to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to is this: It is very important that this petition should be received inasmuch as the legislature of the province of Manitoba are about to prorogue their session. They have set forth their views in this petition. Before any Bill

can be assented to by this parliament with regard to the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba it must receive the assent of the legislature, but the legislature will have adjourned in a few days and the only way that they can formulate their views or let this parliament know what their views are is by petition. If they send their petition down here and if this petition is rejected there will be no other way unless by a conference between the executives of the Dominion and the province during the recess in order to find out the views and feelings of the executive of the province of Manitoba. If this petition is rejected we will only have the matter delayed another year unless a conference is held in the meantime. I would ask the Prime Minister if he thinks, in view of the general terms in which this memorial is drawn, in view of the rule laid down by Bourinot, it should now be rejected especially when we remember that the same exception was not taken to last year's memorial. Last year's memorial did enter into specific details as to the per capita payment, the debt of the province, land, and so on, while there are no such references at all in the memorial that I presented the other day. It simply states that they would be pleased to see Manitoba granted financial terms equal at least to those granted to Saskatchewan and Alberta. I would therefore ask you, Mr. Speaker, for a reconsideration of your decision of yesterday, and ask the Prime Minister if he does not think it a very moderate demand at the present time in view of the circumstances which I have just related.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend (Mr. Roche) and the House will be disposed, I am sure, to agree that it is better under all circumstances to adhere strictly to the rules of the House. The rules we have are the result of the experience of a great many centuries and it has been found that it is always better, as far as possible, to strictly adhere to what the rule is. The action, or non-action of last year cannot very well be held to be a precedent. The attention of the House was not called to the tenor of the provision or to its prayer, and therefore it passed unnoticed. I have no doubt that if the attention of the House had been called to that petition the ruling of the Speaker would have been exactly the same as your ruling, Mr. Speaker, this year. I do not think, however, Mr. Speaker, that any injury is to accrue to the province of Manitoba even if this petition is not accepted at this time. Last year the legislature of Manitoba sent a petition to the three branches of parliament, one to the House, one to the Senate, and one to His Excellency the Governor General. I presume that the same course will be followed this year, that His Excellency the Governor General will receive the petition and that it can then be brought to the attention of parliament as last year's petition was brought down, although a similar petition had been presented to parliament. Moreover, the petition of the legislature of Manitoba is in contradiction of the terms which were acceded to last year as a basis for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. The House of Commons laid down a certain basis upon which it would consent to treat with the legislature of Manitoba for the extension of the boundaries of the province. I regret to say that the legislature reconsidered the matter and did not see its way to accept the offer made by parliament. Though there is at this moment a clash between the will of parliament as it was expressed last year and of the legislature of Manitoba as expressed in this petition I am not without hope that it will be possible to reach a conclusion upon this matter. I may say that I have information that on Friday of this week a delegation representing the executive of the province of Manitoba will be in Ottawa to discuss this question with the advisers of His Excellency.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The rule to which attention has been called this afternoon and which is laid down in the British North America Act is designed for the purpose of preventing private members of parliament introducing Bills or resolutions favouring the expenditure of public moneys. A measure of that kind can only be introduced into this House with the assent of the Crown and for obvious reasons. That which is a part of the British North America Act and a part of our constitution, is, in Great Britain, merely a standing resolution of the House of Commons. The same principle which led to the introduction of that rule, led, I presume, to the similar rule with regard to petitions. I do not imagine that it makes any very great practical difference, so far as Manitoba is concerned, or so far as this parliament is concerned, whether this petition is formally received or not. But it does seem rather discourteous to the legislature of Manitoba that, after we had accepted, last year, a memorial from that legislature contravening to a greater extent than the present one the rule which has been referred to, we should reject the memorial of this year. That is the only observation I have to make on that particular feature of the case. So far as its practical importance is concerned, I do not think it has any great bearing on what would ensue. I would not be inclined to concur in the concluding observation of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that this memorial should not be received because of a resolution which passed the

last parliament. That resolution is not binding on this parliament; in fact, it was not binding on the last parliament, because it would have been competent for the government of the day to introduce a measure differing from that resolution in many respects. It was a mere academic resolution looking forward to negotiations between the government at Ottawa and the government of Manitoba with a view to the settlement of this question. Therefore, I would not concur in the view expressed by the Prime Minister. I regard it as important, however, that the provision of the British North America Act to which I have alluded, and the other principle deduced from the same salutary regard for the public revenue should be observed in every respect.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I called attention, some time ago, to the fact that the Civil Service Commissioners had not, as provided by the law passed last year and brought into force on September 1, sent in any report. The first minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) promised to look into the matter, but I have not since heard from him on the subject. It seems to me that, as the law is imperative that the report to the end of the calendar year should be laid before parliament, the fact that the Civil Service Commissioners have been in office only part of a year does not make inapplicable the express provision of the law. But, and even if the amending law passed last year is not applicable, we still have section 107 of the Civil Service Act itself which was not repealed and still remains in force. This section provides:

> The Secretary of State shall lay before parliament within fifteen days after the commencement of each session, a report of the proceedings of the board under this Act during the preceding year, which report shall include a copy of the examination papers, a statement of all examinations held and of the number of candidates at each, and the names of the successful candidates, and the rules and regualtions made during the year under the provisions of this Act respecting appointments, promotions, examinations, and all other matters appertaining to the Civil Service.

But this report has not been laid on the table. I think that both these Acts look to the laying of a report on the table, and I do not see how we can get away from these express provisions.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). When my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) called my attention to this matter, I told him that I would consult with the Civil Service Commissioners. Both these gentlemen informed me that, according to their reading of this Act, they were not held to bring in a report this year. But when my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) called my attention to it, I thought I would consult the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), who had charge of the Bill of last year. But that hon. gentleman was away, and the matter escaped my attention.

Mr. FOSTER. But in connection with the old Act?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think there is something in that.

AMERICAN IMMIGRATION OFFICERS AND THEIR TREATMENT OF CANADIANS.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand). I am sorry that the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) is not in his place, because I desire to call attention to a matter which, as I understand it, falls within his department. Yesterday, I was on the Grand Trunk train going to Buffalo. An American immigration officer passed through the train asking everybody—as he always does—whether they were Canadian or American citizens, where they were going and so on. He put these questions to a young lady on the train, a girl of fourteen or fifteen. She told him she was a Canadian and on her way to visit her married sister in Buffalo. The officer asked her how long she expected to remain, and she said perhaps a week, or possibly a month. He said, 'I think you had better come off with me.' So, he had the young lady take up her grip and wraps and took her off the train for the purpose of detaining her and deporting her back to Canada. A gentleman happened to be on the train from the town of Dunnville, in which this young lady resides and where her father is a prosperous merchant and a good citizen. He followed the officer and the young lady and interceded for her, telling the officer that he knew the young lady's father and knew that she was going to visit her sister just as she had said, and thus there was no reason for deporting her. After some persuasion, the officer allowed the young lady to continue on her journey. I call attention to this case and would ask the government to correspond with the American authorities so that incidents of this kind may not take place, as I believe they do take place almost daily on every line on which Canadians cross to the United States. I do not believe the American government want their officers to act in this way toward any Canadian citizen, and especially to a young lady. In the case I have referred to, the young lady told the simple truth—that she was going to pay a visit and did not know how long she would remain. I think the American government should be communicated with and should instruct

its officers not to act quite so harshly in the case of Canadians crossing to the United States.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). About twelve months ago and before that, complaints of this nature came to us very frequently. Representations were made to the American authorities, and these representations were received in a very courteous manner, and we agreed on both sides that if complaints of this nature were made they would be investigated by the officers of the two governments. Of late months, no such complaints have come to my notice. I should be glad if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lalor) would give the name of the young lady or other particulars on which the Secretary of State can call attention to the case.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). While we are on this subject, I desire to ask a question. Are American officers allowed to come on the Canadian side and do the sort of business described by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor)? A few months ago, I was on the Niagara Falls train, and, while we were still on the Canadian side, these officers came through the train questioning the passengers. They spoke to one young man and were going to turn him back. I promptly interposed and said that if, on the strength of a Yankee badge, they interfered with any person on Canadian soil, we would have an inquiry about it. I told them they were quite within their right in doing this on the other side of the line, but I disputed their right to act in this manner on the Canadian side. I do not know whether my words had any effect, but the officers allowed the young man to pass. I would like to know if these officers are allowed to act in this way on the Canadian side of the line?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I know that there is a customs officer on the other side and a customs officer on this side—

Mr. S. HUGHES. These are not customs officers, the United States customs' officers are invariably very courteous and gentlemanly.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I wish to mention a circumstance that occurs every day on the train going from Winnipeg west which passes through the town of Morden, some twelve or fifteen miles from the boundary. It has always occurred to me as singular that an American officer should go through a train which does not touch the boundary at any time, and ask the passengers, both male and female, where they are going. I have been many times asked the same question that the hon. gentleman has asked to-day, if American officers have a right to interfere with our people until they have reached the boundary and intend crossing the boundary.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid that the Prime Minister has not heard very much lately about this practice, because it is so common. Years ago, when it first commenced, it was so new and the outrage so apparent that much was said about it. Representations have been made from time to time, but nothing has really occurred in the way of amelioration. Just the other day I had a letter from a friend, who detailed a circumstance just like the one we have heard of to-day, that occurred on the border in the western portion of the province of Ontario, and he asked me if anything could be done. Outrages of this kind jar upon the self-respect of any people, and Canada is large enough, and has made its character sufficiently good on this continent, not to be subject to that kind of discrimination. What could be worse in a case of that kind than the action of a man in taking away from the train, a young and unprotected girl, a respected citizen of Canada, and taking her out from her journey, without any protector, and in the end, I suppose, deporting her. Surely a white man or woman who is a Canadian has a right to some privileges on this continent. I call that a kind of conduct outrageous, whether at the hands of the United States or any other country.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply.

Department of Militia and Defence—salaries, $111,690.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I think it would be convenient that the few observations of a general character, which I have to make, should be made on this item, rather than on each item separately. If the committee will agree in that view, I will proceed to make a statement with regard to the militia.

The reason for the existence of the militia in this country is well understood. The principal object is perhaps the upholding of the civil power in the different provinces of the Dominion. There is also the necessity for maintaining an armed force for repelling invasion, in case any attempt of that kind should unhappily be made. The problem in this country is somewhat difficult and exceedingly expensive, relatively to smaller countries, because of the very great extent of Canada and the wide separation of the different centres of population, of industry and of provincial authority from each other. Sometimes comparisons or contrasts have been made, in regard to military forces or organizations and expenditure, between Canada and Switzerland. We have been told that Switzerland supports a citizen army of some 200,000 men for a very small amount of

money; while Canada expends a large sum of money to maintain something less than 60,000. If we reflect that the greatest distance across Switzerland is 150 miles, while the distance from the extreme east to the extreme west of Canada is something like 4,000 miles, and the distance from the international boundary northward in our settled districts is over 500 miles, or if we include the Yukon, about 2,000 miles; we will see that the conditions in Canada are very different from those of Switzerland. I need not mention another reason which obviously affects the cost, namely, that in Switzerland there is compulsory service, while in Canada there is not. An armed force is necessarily an expensive thing, whether it be a regular standing army or a citizen army like our own; and unfortunately the balance is always on the wrong side. The credit side of the account does not appear in dollars and cents; at any rate. But if we reflect for a moment on what the Canadian militia have done, even since the time of confederation, to go no further back—the work done at the time of the Fenian raid, the work done in the two Northwest rebellions, the aid which has been given on many occasions to the civil power in putting down riots, and last but not least, the work which Canada did for the empire in South Africa—we shall all agree, I think, that the balance does not stand so far on the wrong side. In the work of aiding the civil power alone, I feel confident, from what I know, that during my administration, more actual cash has been saved to the Dominion twice over, than the whole expenditure upon the militia during the last ten years.

We are all agreed that the first duty of a young country is to take up the work—as has been done in Canada from the time of confederation down to the present—of developing its great resources, of which we have so many and are so proud. In my judgment this policy of developing the resources of a country, which was inaugurated many years ago, is one which may fairly be considered as of the greatest importance, not only to ourselves but to the empire. At the same time we must not forget our responsibilities; and the greater the benefits we have received from a kind Providence, the greater are our responsibilities in defending, as well as developing, them. We hear a good deal said on the question of imperial defence. It is not necessary that I should discuss that question now, but there is unquestionably a duty imposed upon every independent people, the duty of taking steps to defend their own homes and firesides. And in this connection, if we are to speak of imperial defence at all, the very best way in which each part of the empire can contribute towards the defence of the empire, is to make itself strong. That would make much easier the task of the mother country, the great centre of the empire, which is charged first with the duty of defending, and which task she has so patiently and efficiently accomplished for so many years. Local defence then is our first duty, and that is a duty with which all the successive governments of Canada have undertaken to deal. The country has grown and developed very much in the last few years, and of course the expense involved in carrying out any efficient plan of home defence is much greater than it was a few years ago.

In this connection, I would like to say a word as to a matter in which I am sure the members of the committee are interested and which has been discussed to some extent in the newspapers. I refer to the question of establishing an imperial general staff—a general staff for the whole of the empire, including this Dominion. The other day the papers were moved for in this connection, and despatches from the imperial government and the answers by this government were brought down, and I hope at an early date will be printed. The question of the establishment of an imperial general staff was under discussion at the imperial conference which took place in London in 1907, and I think I cannot do better, by way of introduction, than read the resolution which was passed unanimously at the conference of the premiers of the self-governing colonies, with the Colonial Secretary in the chair:

General Staff for the Service of the Empire.

That this conference welcomes and cordially approves the exposition of general principles embodied in the statement of the Secretary of State for War, and, without wishing to commit any of the governments represented, recognizes and affirms the need of developing for the service of the empire a general staff, selected from the forces of the empire as a whole, which shall study military science in all its branches, shall collect and disseminate to the various governments military information and intelligence, shall undertake the preparation of schemes of defence on a common principle, and, without in the least interfering in questions connected with command and administration, shall, at the request of the respective governments, advise as to the training, education, and war organization of the military forces of the Crown in every part of the empire.

I have in my hand a copy of a despatch sent to this government on this subject within the last few weeks, which I would like to read because I am sure its language is much clearer than any words of mine would be and more authoritative. I would ask, therefore, that the committee allow me to read some extracts from a despatch sent from the War Office, through the Colonial Secretary and the Governor General, to this government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is one of the papers laid on the table?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, this is a covering letter from Sir E. W. D. Ward. Permanent Under-Secretary of State for War, to the Secretary of State. He said:

The army council are well aware that the self-governing Dominions can give no guarantee that contingents of any given strength or composition will be forthcoming for service in any part of the empire in the event of a great war. At the same time, they fully realize that the feeling of loyalty and affection towards the mother country entertained by the oversea Dominions will operate as powerfully in the hour of trial as they did during the recent war in South Africa. But the lack of definite and timely provision for an emergency deprives military forces of much of their potential value, while adequate preparation has been proved in all recent campaigns to be a paramount factor in securing a rapid and successful decision. For these reasons, although the oversea Dominions may be unable to undertake definite responsibility for anything beyond local defence, it would still be well, in organizing for such defence, to consider the necessities incidental to a situation in which the Dominions beyond the seas desired to give effective military service in association with the troops of the mother country. Such a contingency has been kept in view in the accompanying paper.

In concluding the main portion of the resolution which I have read, the paper proceeds, speaking of the objects of the general staff:

To study military science in all its branches; to collect and disseminate to the various governments military information and intelligence; to undertake the preparation of schemes of defence on a common principle, and (without in the least interfering in questions connected with command and administration) at the request of the respective governments, to advise as to the training, education, and war organization of the military forces of the Crown in every part of the empire.

Again:

In the first place, it must be recognized that we are now practically only at the beginning of the creation of military forces, on an important scale, in the oversea Dominions. The empire has now reached a stage when its sons in the oversea Dominions have begun to feel themselves sufficiently strong to undertake more responsibility for the defence of their own homes, and to look on this not only as a duty which they are willing to perform, but as a right.

And again, in part II., under the heading:

'The most suitable and efficient organization for an imperial general staff.'

We find:

It follows that, in the first place, we require a central guiding body to consider and draw up plans for the defence of the empire as a whole, to study and formulate broad principles of general application, and to collect and disseminate general information. In the second place, we require local branches to study local needs and local possibilities, and to supervise the application of broad general principles under local conditions. But, as has already been said, the imperial general staff must be an entity; therefore, these local branches must form parts of one whole, springing from the central body.

Thus, both in peace and war the general staff must be regarded as a large organization, consisting of a central body, with branches stretching out to all the various units of an army. If it is to carry out the duties allotted to it efficiently and to act as the guiding and directing spirit—the 'brain'—of the whole army, it is evident not only that all its members must be highly educated and trained, but that its work must be carried out on common principles in all parts of the empire. It is, therefore, a necessity that the imperial general staff should have one recognized head to ensure uniformity of method and purpose. That head can only be the chief of the general staff in London, who must become the chief of the imperial general staff, if we are to have a really efficient organization.

Under the more or less direct supervision of the chief of the imperial general staff, the general staff organization for the empire should be built up gradually on the following lines:—

1. The central body having its headquarters in London, and working directly under the chief of the imperial staff.

2. Local sections in the United Kingdom, in each of our regular garrisons abroad, in each self-governing Dominion, and in India. These local sections, except in the case of the smaller foreign garrisons, might be subdivided into the local headquarters, and the staff with local troops. Each section should have a chief at its head; and it would deal with questions connected with (1) local defence, and (2) the training of troops on lines similar to those now followed for the United Kingdom by the training directorate at the War Office.

In this organization, as applied to the self-governing Dominions, each chief of a local section of the general staff would be the adviser of his own government as well as the head of all general staff officers in his section whether at his headquarters or with the troops. A possible difficulty to be solved, as regards this organization, is the establishment of the proper relationship between the chief of the imperial general staff and the chiefs of local sections of the general staff in the several Dominions. It has already been pointed out that in all purely military questions guidance should come from the former. But it may be held that such guidance is incompatible with full control of the local chief by his own government, and this full control must be accepted from the outset. The solution of this difficulty would appear to be that, while the chiefs of the local sections of the general staff keep in close communication with the chief of the imperial general staff, they cannot receive orders from him. He will keep them informed as to what are considered the correct general principles; and they will advise their governments as to the best method of applying these principles to local conditions, and as to the risk of departing from them. When their advice is not accepted, it will be their duty to carry out whatever their respective governments may order.

And so on. It will be observed that in that despatch one of the cardinal principles is local autonomy, the absolute, local control of the local sections; for instance. the local chief of the section in Canada will be absolutely under the control of the government and of the minister in Canada. That staff itself has no control, it has no power to command, it is purely and absolutely an advisory body. Before quoting from the reply to that despatch I wish to read a few words from the recommendation to council made by myself and the order in council based thereon. My memorandum reads:

The undersigned, after full and careful consideration of the important question referred to him, is of the opinion that Your Excellency's government may safely assent to the general principles proposed for adoption in the memorandum by the general staff, and recommends that, as requested in the above quoted colonial office letter, a cable message conveying that assent he addressed to the colonial office.

That cablegram was as follows:

Your despatch, Canada 30, of January 15th. My ministers fully accept the principles set forth in memorandum by general staff. Despatch will follow explaining precise position of the Dominion government.

My memorandum proceeds:

With regard to the despatch itself, the Minister of Militia recommends that it should state, that Your Excellency's government is prepared to give full assent to the general principles laid down, both in the letter of the War Office and in the memorandum prepared by the general staff, and they do it all the more cordially in that they observe that, in the body of the memorandum itself, the great principle of complete local control, by the responsible minister concerned, of the officers of the local section of the imperial general staff is fully safeguarded.

And again:

This important question appears to be adequately provided for in the latter portion of the penultimate paragraph of page 8 of the present memorandum, in which it is stated that the full control of the chief of the local section of the general staff by his own government must be accepted from the outset.

And again:

The undersigned is cordially in agreement with the proposal, but he is of opinion that, in order to avoid possible misunderstanding by the chief of the Canadian section, of the views or intentions of the Dominion government, and consequent misrepresentation of those views to the chief of the Imperial general staff, it would be advisable to lay down definitely that all communications passing between the chief of the Canadian section and the chief of the Imperial general staff, other than those on purely routine or ephemeral questions, must be submitted to the Minister of Militia for his concurrence before being despatched.

One more extract:

Finally, the memorandum lays stress upon the advantages to be gained by the free interchange of officers between the various branches of the Imperial general staff in the different parts of the empire, and especially upon the great benefit which would result from periodical conferences of the Imperial general staff, attended by representatives from all parts of the empire, and held under the presidency of the chief of the Imperial general staff in London. The advantages indeed are obvious. The following extract from the memorandum by the Canadian ministers concerning defence, of August, 1902, already referred to, states fully the policy which then commended itself, not only to the government of Canada, but to the Dominion at large:—

In conclusion—

These are the words of the memorial of 1902; that was a memorial which the ministers then in London placed in the hands of the Colonial Conference in 1902, just before its conclusion.

In conclusion the ministers repeat that, while the Canadian government are obliged to dissent from the measures proposed—

That was that a contribution in money should be granted by Canada, and that a certain force should be set apart and maintained in Canada for service abroad in the empire.

—they fully appreciate the obligation of the Dominion to make expenditures for the purposes of defence in proportion to the increasing population and wealth of the country. They are willing that these expenditures shall be so directed as to relieve the taxpayer of the mother country from some of the burdens which she now bears; and they have the strongest desire to carry out their defence schemes in co-operation with the Imperial authorities, and under the advice of experienced Imperial officers, so far as this is consistent with the principle of local self government, which has proved so great a factor in the promotion of Imperial unity.

So it will be seen, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, that the principle of local autonomy and local self government is not in any way interfered with by the organization of this general staff. The object in the organization of a general staff is that each portion of the Dominions beyond the seas, that all portions of the empire, should be in touch with the great central power at London. Applying to ourselves the operation of this provision for a general staff, we can easily see what an advantage it would be to us who have undertaken seriously, I think now, the task of home or local defence, in the event of there being any serious trouble, any serious attempt to attack Canada on her own soil—we can easily see, I repeat, what an immense advantage it would be for us to be in touch, in the way indicated, with the mother

country. Local defence schemes will be studied, and will be as well understood in the mother country as they are here; and what an immense advantage it would be, in the event of any serious trouble, for the armies of the mother country to co-operate with our own forces in Canada, on Canadian territory; what an immense advantage it would be to the officers who have studied all these conditions to have complete co-operation between the forces of Canada and the forces of the mother country. So much then for the imperial general staff.

There is one other general observation I would like to make before proceeding to the discussion of the estimates now before the House, and that is the question of physical training in the schools. On several occasions in this House I have had the honour to bring up this matter, and to say that I hope the time will come when, in all the schools of Canada, there will be undertaken by the respective provincial governments, which of course control education, a uniform system of physical training for younger children, of elementary drill for the older ones, and of rifle shooting for those still older. I am happy to say that this policy, if it may be dignified by that name, has been very generally discussed throughout the Dominion; and so far as I have observed, all the best newspapers which more correctly indicate the trend of public opinion, have favoured this idea almost without exception. I have on one or two occasions quoted from newspapers, but I will not detain the committee by such quotations at present. But there are one or two observations which have been made by no less an authority than Mr. Goldwin Smith, whom no one will charge with any particular fondness for militarism, and which I think I might properly give to the committee. Mr. Goldwin Smith, so late as February 2, 1907, writing a letter I think to the president of Cornell University, used the following language:

I cannot help expressing my pleasure on finding that military drill is not to be abolished at Cornell. Military training is and always is likely to be indispensable to those who are charged with the defence of public order and the defence of the commonwealth. I always advocated it at Oxford. In our case it was the sinister attitude of the French Emperor that produced a national call to arms. In your case, there is no special call, but there is a general and permanent necessity. You are receiving a vast inflow of alien immigration, some of them from questionable sources. Apparently you feel unable to close your gates. Your great cities will soon be hardly American. A large and increasing number of immigrants now bring with them from the scenes of political and social conflict in Europe, tendencies adverse to the principles of American civilization. At more than one point there have been disturbances arising from that source. It is surely to be desired that at a critical moment calling for military action in defence of the public order the republic should feel safe under the protection not only, of paid soldiery, but of her loyal citizens at large.

I also have here an article written by President Hadley, of Yale, a very noted man and educationalist, from which I will read just a few words:

The man who would fully prepare himself for public service must not only do his duty in time of peace, but must be ready for the possible exigencies of war. The fact that for forty years we have not had a war which has seriously strained the powers of the nation should not blind us to the need of preparing to meet the dangers of international conflict from without and the still greater dangers of anarchy and lawlessness from within. If in the places where you settle there is any militia organization really worthy of the name, identify yourselves with it.

This is an address to the young men of the college.

If there is not, try to establish one. It may be that you will not be called upon for anything heroic in the way of military service. I certainly hope you will not. But if you are ready to meet the danger in advance you will lessen the liability of its coming; and if it does come you will have prepared yourselves for the performance of the most vital of all public duties—the duty of protecting your country against imminent destruction.

Now, something has been done in this regard. An order in council, after correspondence had taken place with many of the premiers of the different provinces, and after I had seen, I think, all of them but two, was passed carrying into effect an agreement which had been entered into between the Militia Department, acting for this government, and the province of Nova Scotia. I will not detain the committee by reading that; but, in a general way the basis of the agreement is this: The Dominion government, through the Department of Militia and Defence, shall undertake from its permanent force to supply instructors who will go to the normal schools and to the different institutions in the various provinces where teachers are taught.

Mr. HUGHES. Why not take expert men from the ranks of the ordinary militia?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There would be no objection to that except that we have a permanent force now. We are paying them and it seemed to me that the proper thing was to use that permanent force as instructors ; in fact, it would be a very useful thing for the men of the permanent force themselves. A special teaching body will be established. It will be something

for the men to look forward to, because, of course, they will receive, later on, a higher rate of pay and their position will be more important. On the other hand, the province will undertake to make it obligatory upon the teachers to receive this instruction, and, as a matter of fact, upon all teachers, to pass an examination and become qualified in physical training, which will apply to both sexes, and in elementary training in the use of the rifle which, of course, will only apply to the men.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you not think the women can shoot straight?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, there is no reason why not, but it is not so much in their line. The lady teachers will teach the physical training in the school, and it is just as important that the young girls in the schools should be taught physical training as the boys. If we are going to build up a strong nation, we want healthy and strong girls and women just as much as healthy boys and men.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it not the intention that the lady teachers shall teach the rudiments of military drill? They do it in England, even in the Quaker schools.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, under the age of 12. After the age of 12 or 13, of course, the boys will be advanced to the higher grades in the schools and will come under the control of the male teachers. As far as the male teachers are concerned, they are the men who teach the boys of 13 and upwards and they will be given commissions in the militia and a small bonus will be given to them according to the amount of work they do and the character of that work.

Mr. FOSTER. By proficiency they get that?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, and an inspection will be provided through the permanent force of the Militia Department. Inspectors will go through certain sections of the country set apart, visit these schools, see what is being done, make notes and report, and the bonus, such as it will be, and it will not be a very large amount, will be bestowed, as my hon. friend suggests, upon proof of efficiency and work done.

I do not know that I need detain the committee longer, because I have a good many other things to go into, but this is an extremely interesting branch of the subject, and it sems to me that there is a great opportunity herein to do important work for this country.

Private citizens are spending money in order to do something to try and remove or overcome the scourge of tuberculosis. I believe that this will afford a very excellent means of acting as a preventive measure. Tuberculosis, as we all know, can be prevented; we all know that it is very largely due to the want of proper exercise, and that if every boy and girl in the country is taught to stand and sit erect, take proper exercise, get the proper amount of fresh air, and the importance of all these things, it seems to me that the effect upon the next generation will be very advantageous indeed; to say nothing of the asset which will be built up in that way, and the means of defence, in the event of any trouble ever coming to this country which would make it necessary to resort to arms. Take the boys of 13 to-day; in five years time, under this system, every boy who is physically fit will come out of school more or less trained and, if his eyesight is good, a fairly good rifle shot. I hope that in the militia of the not very distant future, instead of having to hunt about for recruits to go to camp, of a rather undesirable character, we will be able to fill up the ranks of the active militia with the young men who have come out of school at the age of 18 or 20, allowing them to enlist for three years, have three years in camp and then go on the reserve and organize that reserve so that it may be turned out perhaps for one day each year. In the next ten years, if this scheme is taken up by the provinces, as I hope it will be, and as I have every reason to believe it will be, we will have a uniform system of physical training, of elementary drill and of rifle shooting in existence from one end of this country to the other, and we will have tens of thousands of young men who will form a tremendous asset in the matter of defence.

Mr. HUGHES. I understood the minister to speak of some of these young men being qualified as officers—

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I mean the teachers, that is, the teachers of the schools would be given commissions.

Mr. HUGHES. That's good.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In fact, that is the only means by which they could be paid. And, before leaving this subject, perhaps I should say that it is intended, so far as there is any expense, that it shall be paid out of the vote for annual drill. The amount will be small and will not require a very great addition to that vote.

Now, the present estimates show a reduction as compared with those of last year. But I find that I have been criticised almost as much—I think even rather more—because these estimates have been reduced, than I ever was for any increase that I have proposed to the House. I do not refer to my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes), though, from an observation I heard him make here not very long ago, I am some-

what in dread of the criticism he is going to make.

Mr. HUGHES. I shall not be able to stay and offer any criticism to-night.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I speak rather of the newspaper press. It seems to be a case of being condemned no matter what you do.

Mr. FOSTER. Referring to the 'Globe' now, are you?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is somewhat interested in that organ. I suppose he watches it pretty closely. I had in mind the 'Globe' among other newspapers. I had not intended to mention it specially as I did not wish to advertise it. But it has referred, in a way that I think not very creditable to its intelligence, to the present vote. It seems to imply that it would be the easiest thing in the world to make a saving of half a million or so, by striking off that amount from the permanent force, or from the headquarters' staff or from the district staff, or from some other vote than that for annual drill; and goes on, apparently without the slightest notion that a staff and a permanent force are the vital part of our militia system, and that it would be absolutely impossible to carry on our plan without such a staff and such a permanent force. The scheme of the organization of the militia is not a haphazard matter, it is a matter that has been thought out patiently and carefully, and is the result of development during the last forty years. I have inaugurated no new system, but new things have been added to make the system which already existed more nearly perfect, and I think that much has been accomplished. Yet, critics who know absolutely nothing about the subject, and who appear to me to act as if they did not want to know anything about it, for fear they would not be able to make such absurd criticisms as they do, rush in and tell the Militia Department and the expert officers, who are men of the greatest ability and experience, that they should take half a million off here or there instead of some other place. Now, the scheme of the Militia Department, as I have stated over and over again in this House, is this: We should have as a first line of defence, if necessary, 100,000 men who would be able to take the field; and, some time in the future, we should have a second line of 100,000 men. But the wiseacres of the Civil Service Commission told us of a great discovery that they had made. Why, they said, the Militia Department has enough headquarters staff and district staff, and enough permanent force for an army of 100,000. Of course we have——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

Mr. FOSTER. The Civil Service Commissioners were your own creation.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not mine. Of course, I am responsible. They made that discovery. But if they had taken the slightest trouble to read the reports laid on the table year after year, or to question any of the officers, they would have been told what the scheme of the militia was. To carry out this general plan, there is required a well defined scheme of organization. And do you suppose that it is possible to strike off half the headquarters staff one day and get it back in a year or so when there is a little more money in the treasury? Or do you think you can dismiss your permanent force, with whom you have made a solemn contract to pay, feed and clothe them for three years?—to tell them to go about their business because you want to save half a million dollars? No man who stops to inquire, or who knows what he is writing or talking about, would make such an absurd proposition. What you must do is to find out the thing that would be least injured by an economy of this kind and take the money from that. And that is precisely what has been done. I regret very much that it was necessary to make this reduction. I regret it not so much for my own estimates but because of the general business of the country and because of the check to the development of the country indicated by the falling revenue of the last year. I hope this state of affairs will not continue long, but that the normal condition of the revenue will soon be restored. But we had to face the fact that there was a falling revenue, that the revenue for next year would probably be twelve or fourteen millions—if that was the figure, I leave that to the Finance Minister—less than last year. I accept the Finance Minister as authority, and he said it was absolutely necessary that there should be an extensive pruning in our department.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the minister (Sir Frederick Borden) endorse the policy of the government in still further creating distress in the country by curtailing the government expenditure?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot discuss that question now. But the Militia Department is called upon to contribute its quota to the reduction. I felt sure that the active militia throughout the country, which is composed very largely of the bone and sinew of the country, would be willing for one year at least, to forego a portion at least of the annual drill, in order that our share of the economy which is necessary should be carried into effect. I do not think that there will be any very serious difficulty in carrying out the annual drill as we hope to do it. I believe that by training the men this year to some extent at local headquarters, which is desirable once

in a while, and which has not been done, at all events in the last thirteen years, and by restricting the annual drill to those regiments which have shown themselves zealous in the immediate past, and to which the instruction would be particularly useful, and allowing those which have not shown much interest in their annual drill in the past, to rest for another year, until the coffers are refilled, we shall save a considerable amount of the cost of transportation.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS—SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Superior and Western Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Conmee.

Bill (No. 92) respecting Patents of the Hart-Otis Car Company, Limited.—Mr. Geoffrion.

SUPPLY.

House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Mr. Chairman, at six o'clock, I was referring to the reduction of the vote for annual drill and I only wish to add one word to what I said for fear I may have given the impression that there would be no annual camps. Such an impression would be entirely wrong, as there will probably be the same number of annual camps held this year as usual, but the number to be assembled in these camps will not be as large, and a certain number of the regiments will probably train at their own regimental headquarters. In order to save time and also in order that the present position of the militia may be placed in the clearest possible way before the committee and before the country I have had a memorandum prepared which has been distributed among hon. members and which deals with the whole question of the militia and its present status. As I proceed I propose dealing especially with a few of the points which are discussed at considerable length in this memorandum. The memorandum has been prepared by the very ablest man, perhaps, in this country, or living for that matter, who can deal with such a subject. It has been read over carefully by me, together with him, on five or six occasions, and somewhat revised and changed. I think it will be found to be very instructive and I sincerely hope it will be read and studied by every hon. member of this House and that the press throughout the country will consider it to be its duty to copy it very largely. In order to shorten the statement which I have to make, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that, with the permission of the committee, this memorandum may be published in 'Hansard' as a part of my statement. It will enable me to get on more rapidly and save time by referring to the several paragraphs to which I wish to refer without reading the whole of them:

Militia and Defence.

Memorandum Respecting Estimates for 1909-10 (Including Supplementary Estimates for 1908-09 to be brought down. See Paragraph 6).

1. Like all other branches of the public service, the Department of Militia and Defence has found itself forced by circumstances to frame its estimates for 1909-10 under the limitations imposed by falling national revenue.

2. While the present financial stringency will, it is hoped, prove to be only temporary, it is, nevertheless, wise to face the possibility of its continuance. It has, therefore, appeared to the Minister of Militia to be desirable to deal somewhat more fully with the Militia Estimates in this explanatory memorandum than has hitherto been usual.

3. A point which has, perhaps, escaped the notice of a not inconsiderable number of members of parliament, and which has certainly been ignored by the critics of the Militia Department in the Press, is the fact that, since the expenditure entailed by the assumption of responsibility for the defence of Halifax and Esquimalt has been fully provided for in estimates—that is, since and including the estimates for the financial year 1907-8—there has been no increase, but on the other hand, a decrease in militia expenditure.

4. That this is the case will be clear from the subjoined table, which shows the estimates in detail, under the various heads voted by parliament, beginning with the year 1904-5 and ending with the estimate for the present financial year 1909-10. It will be remembered that the year 1904-5 saw the beginning of the present system of militia organization. The militia council was constituted in November, 1904, and the re-organization entailed by the modelling of our staff and administrative system upon that of the imperial army was not fully inaugurated until June 30, 1905.

5. In the financial year 1905-6, the Dominion assumed the responsibility for the defence of Halifax and Esquimalt, and the taking over of the fortified places from the imperial government was commenced. The transfer was practically completed in the financial year (a year of nine months only) 1906-7, and the full financial effect of that measure upon revenue, including the discharge of all liabilities to the imperial government under the agreement for that transfer, was first shown and provided for in the estimates for 1907-8.

Head of Service.	1904-5.	1905-6.	Nine months, 1906-7.	1907-8.	Voted 1908-9.	Required 1909-10.
	$	$	$	$	$	$
Annual drill	669,724	809,924	924,378	1,084,499	1,305,000	860,000
Clothing and necessaries	179,943	429,727	274,510	399,919	450,000	375,000
Contingencies	10,440	14,191	13,694	21,643	31,000	25,000
Customs dues	.....	.....	71,803	143,622	115,000	100,000
Defence of Esquimalt	109,987	179,256	.....	.....	.....	.....
Dominion arsenal	150,563	215,037	224,401	341,083	290,000	300,000
Engineer services	205,800	254,427	275,587	325,913	316,812	275,000
Grants to associations	49,100	45,825	45,240	49,278	55,000	55,000
Maintenance military properties	49,854	50,523	38,433	70,062	75,000	75,000
Pay and allowances—						
Headquarters staff	46,519	46,991	33,782	58,797	60,923	60,923
Command and district staff	45,551	73,119	64,234	77,271	83,077	83,077
Permanent force	477,571	*1,055,099	845,504	1,401,271	1,378,000	1,350,000
Active militia attached	42,552	42,593	27,913	40,127	42,000	44,000
Active militia allowances	56,760	122,864	44,235	70,239	100,000	102,000
Guards of honour, &c	8,911	5,829	4,543	6,025	6,000	6,000
Total pay and allowances	677,864	1,348,495	1,020,211	1,653,739	1,670,000	1,646,000
Printing and stationery	24,541	25,805	26,306	47,570	45,000	40,000
Provisions and supplies	165,190	463,668	274,941	424,987	430,000	400,000
Royal Military College	86,478	86,243	68,897	92,145	108,500	96,000
Salaries and wages	64,984	72,003	67,063	98,979	100,000	80,000
Topographic survey	11,246	15,518	17,760	23,716	30,000	25,000
Transport and freight	54,783	84,856	54,965	109,980	112,500	100,000
Warlike stores	74,708	174,980	124,912	†554,200	285,000	335,000
Sundry small votes	21,240	2,046	8,401	35,257	8,863	4,550
	2,636,445	4,272,524	3,331,504	5,476,583	5,427,675	4,791,550
Pay of I.G. and others	14,699	21,600	16,200	21,600	21,600	21,600
Capital Account—Arms, ammunition, &c.	1,299,964	1,299,876	975,283	1,297,905	1,300,000	1,300,000
Total	3,951,108	5,594,000	4,322,987	6,796,088	6,749,275	6,113,000

* Including $200,000 for pay of Imperial troops. † Including $250,000 stores transferred from Imperial troops.

NOTE.—The amounts shown in the last column but one as 'Voted in 1908-9,' give the totals of the several votes after amendment in accordance with the Supplementary Estimates for 1908-9 to be brought down.

These Supplementary Estimates will not increase the total estimate, but will reduce the votes for Customs dues by $85,000, Dominion Arsenal by $60,000, Engineer Services by $90,000, and Warlike Stores by $65,000, while they will increase the votes for Annual Drill by $105,000, Pay and Allowances by $170,000, Royal Military College by $12,500, and Transport by $12,500, the totals of reduction and increase balancing each other.

6. While the foregoing table gives, in detail, the estimates as voted year by year, and therefore shows the financial effect of the additional burden imposed by the transfer of Halifax and Esquimalt from Imperial to Canadian garrisons, the fact remains to be noted that the full effect of the change of administrative system commenced in 1904-5 is only now making itself felt. The system previously in force made it a matter of great difficulty to compute exactly, in the estimates for any financial year, the sum which would be required to meet the different militia expenditures for that period. The change of system has made a much closer measure of supervision and audit of expenditure possible. The effect of the change is seen in the fact that, whereas the supplementary estimates for 1906-7 amounted to $505,733.35 (9 months only) and those for 1907-8 to $1,614,404.11, the estimates for 1908-9 will only need readjustment to the extent of $300,000, which will be met,

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

not by asking for additional sums, but by readjustment of sums already voted. In the estimates for the year 1909-10, the only item in which it is thought possible that any supplementary estimates might prove unavoidable, is the item for annual drill. It is obvious that the sum required to pay for the annual drill of the active militia depends upon the precise number of men who turn out for drill. It is equally obvious that it must be the policy of the department to induce the full establishment, if possible, to train each year. It is, therefore, impracticable to calculate exactly the amount that will be required, until it is exactly seen how many men have attended drill and earned their drill pay. Hence, it is unavoidable that, on the vote for annual drill for any year, notwithstanding the adoption of every precaution against exceeding the estimate, and, although for 1909-10 certain measures are contemplated which ought to result in substan-

tial economies as compared with the system hitherto in force, yet some supplementary estimates may, after all, prove to be necessary.

7. Dealing with the estimates as shown in the table 'A' above, it will be seen that the main increases since 1904-5 have been in the following items—annual drill; clothing and necessaries; customs dues; Dominion arsenal; engineer services; military properties; headquarters and district staff; pay for the permanent force; active militia allowances; provisions and supplies; transport and freight, and warlike stores.

8. Taking these items in succession, the increase in the amount necessary for annual drill has been simply due, first, to the large increase in the numbers of the militia attending annual drill; secondly, to the grant of efficiency pay; thirdly, to the addition of four days' extra drill for the artillery. It should, however, be noted that, in the amount required to pay for annual drill for the current year (1908-9) viz:—$1,305,000—is included a charge of about $230,000 which was directly due to the bringing to Quebec, for the Tercentenary in 1908, of between 10,000 and 11,000 troops, who performed their ordinary annual drill elsewhere, and were additional to the 2,000 troops belonging to the Quebec Command which performed their annual drill at Quebec at the same time. If this $23,000 be deducted from the vote, as not really an annual drill charge, the amount chargeable for annual drill for 1908-9 will be seen to be $1,075,000.

The steady increase in the number of men trained each year is most gratifying. In 1895-6, only 19,000 men and 1,125 horses trained; in 1898, 25,296 men and 2,478 horses; in 1903-04, 32,500 men and 7,892 horses; while in 1908-09, no less than 47,500 officers and men, with 8,500 horses, were trained.

9. From the foregoing it will be seen that, supposing the same number of active militia should train in 1909-10 as trained in the present financial year, and at the same camps, there would, apparently, be a shortage on this vote of $215,000. With a view to economy, however, it is intended, in the coming drill season, to try the experiment of training certain corps of active militia, not at central camps, but at their local headquarters; more particularly those corps which have their headquarters furthest from the camp which they usually attend, and whose transport is, consequently, the most expensive. There can be no question as to the general advantage of the training of the troops which results from the assembly of the different corps in large camps. The men get the advantage of seeing other troops, of good rifle ranges and of better instruction as regards training and drill; a spirit of emulation is called forth, and more general improvement results. On the other hand, the display, from time to time, of the local regiment in its own neighbourhood tends to encourage recruiting and to develop local pride. The experiment will be tried this year of seeing how far local training may have this effect.

Certain corps, also which are, at present, in a somewhat disorganized condition, will not be allowed to train, until they have shown that they are in a condition to profit by it. And steps will, also be taken in all corps to ensure that only reliable men are taken to camp. These various measures, with other savings which are in contemplation, ought to bring the expenditure within the estimate.

10. As regards clothing and necessaries, it is obvious that, while the amount taken in this vote fluctuates to some extent from year to year, its total must be affected by the increase in the strength of the militia generally and the number of men trained.

11. The increase under the head of customs dues may be set aside, as it is merely a transfer of money from one pocket of the government to another.

12. The increase to the vote for the Dominion arsenal is due to the increased requirements for rifle ammunition, and to the fact that the arsenal now manufactures 12-pr. gun ammunition, which formerly had to be purchased in England.

13. The increase in engineer services and the maintenance of military properties is simply due to the steady increase in the number of those properties, especially rifle ranges and camp grounds, and the extra care and attention which is now bestowed upon military buildings, in carrying out repairs as soon as they become necessary, instead of the somewhat wasteful system which previously obtained, of deferring repairs until they could no longer be avoided—a system which was forced upon the department by the smallness of the number of engineer corps.

14. One of the increases in the militia estimates most criticised in certain quarters, is that for the headquarters and district staff—from about $92,000 in 1904-5 to $144,000 in the present financial year. The explanation of this fact is to be found by a reference to the conditions which obtained previous to 1905. The staff, founded on a system long since obsolete, had never been remodelled to conform to modern conditions, and was quite inadequate in numbers and training to deal with them. Successive general officers had pointed out the absolute necessity for a numerous trained staff, and over and over again had reported that, for militia troops which could only train for short periods, it was essential that the staff duties should be performed by trained officers. As the result of the weakness in numbers of the staff, regulations of all kinds had fallen into arrears, while wasteful expenditure was known to exist, but could not be controlled. It was practically impossible to deal promptly with correspondence at headquarters and in district offices, and there were numberless questions connected with training, with the equipment and the organization of the troops, which demanded settlement, but which could not even be considered.

15. The increase referred to in the headquarters and district staff has been consequent upon the need felt for reform in these respects. It was obvious that no force with such paucity of staff officers as existed before 1905 could ever take or which is far more difficult and important, be maintained in the field in the presence of an enemy, and when the removal of the imperial troops from Halifax and Esquimalt deprived us of that source of supply for staff officers on emergency, the case became urgent. The staff officers were too few to work staff duties upon any definite system, still less to work upon any system in accord with that which obtained in the Imperial army though it was evidently imperative that,

if Canadian troops were ever to serve side by side with imperial troops in a great national danger, such as one which might threaten the integrity of Canadian territory, they must be organized upon the same lines and with the same staff system. Hence, immediately upon the organization of the militia council and the staff at headquarters, the task was taken up of changing the system of staff work in commands and districts. The staff work is now performed upon a system almost identical with that pursued in the imperial army, the differences between the two systems being merely such as are due to the smallness of the Canadian force in comparison. There can be no possible question but that this extra expenditure in regard to the staff—which is maintained, be it remembered, almost entirely in the interests of the active militia as distinct from the permanent force—has been fully justified by the resulting capacity of that militia force to maintain itself in the field, if required. It is perhaps, desirable to note that, in the existing pay vote are included many charges which, in previous estimates, appeared under other votes. For example, many staff duties in camps were formerly allotted to active militia officers temporarily employed, whose pay was drawn under the head of anual drill, who did their best, but who knew little more than the troops they were supposed to instruct. Again, all pay duties and all clerical work in military district offices were performed by civilian clerks, who were paid for out of civil votes, and who have since been replaced by military men liable—as the others were not—to go into the field in case of war.

16. A point invariably forgotten by critics of the increase in the number of staff officers is that, on the occasion of any great emergency which might require the Dominion troops to take the field, the ranks of the various corps of the active militia would be at once filled up by fresh men and the units raised from the skeleton peace establishments to that required for active service.

17. Thus a battalion of infantry would be raised from about 400 to 1,000 of all ranks, a regiment of cavalry from about 320 to 600 all ranks, and so on with the other arms. The result of this is, that the existing militia cadres, instead of numbering some 57,000 only, as they do in ordinary times, would reach a total of about 100,000 men.

18. It is evident that a fairly numerous and well trained staff would be absolutely necessary if such a body of men was to be handled efficiently and that, to confine its numbers in peace-time to the bare minimum, just able to deal with the peace strengths, would be the best way to insure that everything should go wrong when the occasion arose for taking the field in full force. This is the reason that all general officers commanding in Canada for the last seventeen years have, without exception, urged the necessity of an increase to the staff.

19. The staff in 1904, exclusive of four staff lieutenants employed on survey work, numbered 39. The staff on January 1, 1909, exclusive again of 3 staff lieutenants employed on survey work, numbered 51, which included all headquarters, command and district staff officers. As the establishment of the militia, including the permanent force, rose in the interval from 47,423 to 57,718, and the assumption of the duty of maintaining Halifax and Esquimalt rendered at least three additional staff officers necessary, it will be seen that the increase of staff is very closely proportional to the increase in the militia as a whole, for whose administration it is maintained.

20. The next item of importance, in which an increase has taken place since 1904-5, is the 'pay of the permanent force,' which, from $477,571 in 1904-5, rose to $1,401,271 in 1907-8, is $1,378,000 in the current year (1908-9) and will be $1,350,000 for 1909-10.

21. This increase is entirely due to three causes—(a) The increased rates of pay granted to all warrant and non-commissioned officers and men of these corps in 1904-05, but only partly provided for in the estimates for that year. This increase had been proved by experience to be absolutely necessary if the ranks were to be kept filled. (b) The increase establishment of the permanent force, made necessary by the transfer of Halifax and Esquimalt to the Dominion and the need of providing garrisons for them.

The additional number of officers and men required for this purpose may be placed at about 1,500 with certain consequential additions to the numbers maintained at other places, in order to provide drafts, &c., which brings the total up to about 1,600 of all ranks. It may be noted that we maintain considerably smaller garrisons than did the imperial government, who expended about $1,750,000 a year on the two fortresses. (c) Increased establishments of engineers and the subsidiary corps, such as army service corps, medical corps, ordnance corps and pay corps, which are needed to meet the requirements of the increased strength of the active militia, both for instructional purposes and to promote its efficiency for war.

22. To carry out the duties imposed upon the permanent corps required a total establishment of 3,311 of all ranks for 1908-09, but it was not found possible to provide enough money in the estimates and the strength was, consequently, confined to about 3,000 of all ranks. For 1909-10, the provisional establishment is still further reduced to 2,905, showing a reduction in pay, &c., of $51,000 on 1907-08, and $28,000 on 1908-9.

23. The position of the permanent force in relation to the active militia has been much misunderstood in and outside parliament, and it is perhaps desirable, therefore, to refer somewhat more at length to its duties.

24. The permanent force exists for four purposes:—

(1) For the support of the civil power in case of internal disturbances.

(2) For the instruction of the active militia.

(3) For the garrisoning of the defended places in Canada—Halifax, Quebec, Esquimalt.

(4) For the equipment, supply, transport, &c. of the active militia when it takes the field.

25. As regards (1), this is a duty which it shares with the rest of the militia force to which it belongs, though of late, nearly the whole of this work has been thrown upon it.

26. As regards (2), the instruction of the active militia, it is evident that this duty is of the highest importance, and it is recognized to be so by the force itself. The real difficulty

is that, owing to the large area of the Dominion, the force has to be split up and sent to many separate stations, and, with the small total establishment hitherto possible, the several units have necessarily been so weak in numbers that it has been difficult for them to carry on their duties in the manner and to the extent expected of them.

27. For example, a company of infantry or a squadron of cavalry, of a total strength of less than 100 men is called upon not only to provide for the various details which make up the interior economy of, so to speak, a military household for the accommodation of officers and men of the active militia, but it is further expected so to train its members as to be able to afford to the attached militia efficient instruction in all the military duties of an infantry or cavalry regiment, respectively, including the command of such a corps—duties which that company or squadron itself has never been in a position to practise. It is perhaps hardly realized by the militia force generally, how difficult it is for an officer, who has never had command of as many as 100 men himself, to instruct another officer as to how he should command and handle, say, a regiment, which in war, would in the infantry, consist of 1,000 men, and, in the cavalry, of 600 men, and which, in peace, numbers from 300 to 400; but this is what the officer of the permanent corps is obliged to attempt.

28. The active militia has constantly been eager for additional military instruction and especially for more accessible instruction. This has been manifest from the frequent requests for provisional schools at local centres; and it is evident that it must often be difficult for a busy man, who would otherwise make an efficient officer, to spare time from his business to go to a distant centre for his military instruction. Every effort has been made by the permanent units to meet this requirement.

29. It is clear, therefore, that that portion of the permanent force which is maintained for purposes of instruction cannot be reduced if it is to fulfil its duty satisfactorily. It ought rather to be increased.

30. As regards (3), the garrisoning of the places named, it is to be remembered that, in 1905, Canada gave a pledge to the empire that she would be responsible for the defence of Halifax and Esquimalt in case of need. More than half of her whole permanent force, i.e., 1,600 out of about 3,000, is maintained for this purpose alone. The troops in these garrisons are, of course, also utilized for the instruction of the neighbouring corps of the active militia. There is no suggestion that the Dominion desires to recede from the position she then took up.

31. As regards (4), it is evident that, if the militia as a whole had to take the field, it would require a very large accession of strength to those services which equip, supply, transport and pay the troops and nurse them when sick and wounded. Of these services the Ordnance Corps, which deals with equipment, and the Army Pay Corps, which deals with pay, are not represented in the ranks of the active militia; and the active militia units of the remaining services, while they have shown themselves very efficient at their work, would be the first to admit that they are totally inadequate in numbers. To provide for this need alone, the Permanent Army Service Corps, Permanent Army Medical Corps, Canadian Ordnance Corps and Canadian Army Pay Corps ought to be maintained at full strength.

32. Besides all this, there are duties to be performed when an army takes the field, which are not required in peace, and which can only be performed by trained soldiers. Such are the military police, both mounted and foot, organization of depots and training of recruits, remount depots, batmen and so on.

33. Sufficient reasons have been adduced to show why it would be wrong to reduce the numbers of the permanent force. Outside of the additions to that force required to provide for the garrisoning of Halifax and Esquimalt, and to meet the service requirements of the active militia, no additions to it have in point of fact, been made for some years past.

34. Quite as much misapprehension exists upon the question of the actual cost of the permanent force as upon the subject of its duties. It is the habit of hostile critics, especially when writing in the public press, to quote the whole vote for pay and allowances as applicable solely to the permanent force, or to the permanent staff and permanent force, and not to the active militia at all.

35. If the vote as detailed in the table be referred to, it will be seen at once that, of the total amount of $1,646,000, no less than $152,000 is payable solely to the active militia, while an additional $144,000 represents the cost of the permanent staff, of which by far the greater part is, of course, maintained to meet the requirements of the active militia. Military districts 4, 5, 12 and 13 contain no permanent unit at all. Even where permanent units are also stationed in the same area, experienced staff officers report that at least four-fifths of the work which passes through their offices is the result of questions concerning the active militia as distinct from the permanent corps.

36. If the two sums above named be deducted from the total, it will be seen that $1,350,000 represents the total pay and allowances of the permanent corps.

37. But critics consistently ignore the fact that the permanent so-called 'departmental' services, i.e., the Permanent Army Service Corps, Permanent Army Medical Corps, Canadian Corps, Army Pay Corps, Military Staff Clerks, are maintained principally to meet the requirements of the active militia, and these corps together cost at least $350,000 per annum.

38. If these points be considered, it will be seen that, apart from the additions due to the necessity for garrisoning Halifax and Esquimalt, the increase to the permanent force has, if anything, not kept pace with that of the active militia which it has to instruct and otherwise to assist to maintain.

39. The next items of the estimate, are pay of officers and men of the active militia attached for instruction, and active militia allowances. These both show increases, in the latter case considerable ones, due to increases made two years ago in the allowances for the care of arms, drill instruction, &c.

40. The increase in the vote for provisions and supplies has been almost entirely due to, and in proportion to, the increase in the strength of the permanent force.

41. Salaries and wages show an increase due directly to the increased number of military properties, buildings and rifle ranges on charge.

42. The vote for transport and freight is one which, for many years past, has been frequently, and perhaps unavoidably, underestimated, with the result that many charges incurred during one financial year have had to be defrayed out of the vote for the next, though this has been partly due, no doubt to the fact that the great carrier companies often delay sending in their bills for services rendered until after the votes for the financial year concerned have lapsed.

43. It is now hoped that arrears have been cleared off and that the same difficulties will not seriously recur. At the same time, the increase in the vote has been due to increased transport, both for equipment, stores, &c., issued to active militia corps, and for the permanent garrisons.

44. The last increase in the votes chargeable to revenue is that for warlike stores, and this is practically entirely due to the transfer of Halifax and Esquimalt and the increase in the numbers of the active militia. It would obviously be absurd to maintain troops without providing for their equipment with proper arms and munitions of war.

45. Nor should it be forgotten, in considering the increases to which reference has been made, that nearly every case has been affected, in a greater or less degree, by the general rise in the wages paid to labour and in the cost of commodities throughout the Dominion.

46. A word may here profitably be said in regard to the vote on capital account. This vote is rendered necessary by the re-armament of the force with new and up-to-date guns and rifles—a re-armament which could not longer be deferred—by the purchase of rifles, ranges and grounds for camps, and by the necessity for providing a reserve of clothing, saddlery, equipment, &c., for the outfit of the additional troops which on an emergency would have to be mobilized.

47. Re-armament is costly, but absolutely necessary. It is now in progress and it should be completed and the transition stage passed as rapidly as possible, but it is not likely that this portion of the vote can be dispensed with for several years to come.

48. It is believed that it will be agreeable to the House if this memorandum concludes with a short summing up of our military position as it presents itself to the government.

49. It will be within the recollection of the House that it has been, on several occasions, stated that, in the opinion of the government, the standard of defence at which we should aim should be the power of placing in the field a force of 100,000 men, properly organized and equipped, in first line, while behind it we had the necessary equipment and machinery for raising an additional force of 100,000 men in second line. That standard has apparently met with the approval of the House, and has, at any rate, never been openly questioned.

50. It will probably be of interest to the House if a short explanation be given as to how this force of 100,000 men in first line is to be composed, how it is to be organized and how far it satisfies the conditions which an armed force should fulfil.

51. Deducting from the total those troops who would be required to garrison places like Quebec, Halifax and Esquimalt, to hold certain important points, and to perform other special duties, there remains for the active defence of the country in the field a total force of about 90,000 men, of whom at present some 80,000 belong to Canada east of the great lakes, and 10,000 belong to the west.

52. In accordance with the agreement accepted by the representatives of all the self-governing Dominions at the Imperial Conference of 1907—that all forces of the empire should be organized as far as possible upon the same system, these 90,000 troops have been organized into divisions and brigades, which, subject to the modifications imposed by Canadian conditions, resemble closely similar organizations in the imperial army.

53. It will be well perhaps to recall to mind the fact that the organization of an army has two main objects, first, to enable the whole body, equipped with the proper proportion of each arm, cavalry, artillery and infantry, to work in unison in carrying out the orders of the commander, and secondly, to enable it to be fed, moved where required, supplied with munitions of war, medically treated, and paid, in such manner as to maintain its efficiency as a fighting force at the highest point—this second object being, of the two, the more difficult to attain.

54. In the west, the development of the force has been so rapid that its organization has not yet been fully worked out.

55. But in the east, the 80,000 troops which compose the field force have been organized in six divisions and three cavalry brigades.

56. A force of about that strength thus organized ought to consist of some 60,000 infantry, 7,000 cavalry, 15,000 artilery, and 3,000 engineers, or in other words, it ought to have 64 battalions of infantry, 12 regiments of cavalry, 69 batteries of artillery, with 276 guns, and 18 companies of engineers—in addition to the requisite number of Army Service Corps and Army Medical Corps units. Unfortunately, though we have the proper number of infantry and cavalry units, we are only at present in possession of 31 batteries of artillery, with 124 guns, and we have only four companies of engineers, while we are somewhat deficient in the Army Service Corps and Army Medical Corps services.

57. Artillery is an arm so expensive to equip that its increase, though considerable in the last few years, has necessarily been slow and can only be carried further by degrees; yet a sufficient proportion of guns is specially needed for a force composed of citizen soldiers.

58. As regards engineers, Canada possesses, in her large telegraph, telephone and railway organizations, and her great lumber interests, an especially good supply of men admirably fitted for engineer duties. As she possesses, so to speak, a reserve in this arm, with her Royal Military College graduates also in reserve for engineer officers, more attention has been so far given to the raising and equipment of other units than of engineer corps.

59. It is, however, no doubt the case that the organization of additional units should proceed as opportunity offers.

60. As regards the supply of the forces with arms and munitions of war, it may be said that we possess sufficient guns for the existing number of batteries, and that, as the re-

armament with the new 18-pr. guns progresses, more guns will be made available wherewith to arm additional batteries.

61. And it must be added that, at present, we have not a sufficient number of small arms available, nor an adequate reserve of ammunition. But the situation in these respects is improving from day to day.

62. Another important point is the supply of munitions of war, which comprise, besides ammunition, military equipment of every kind. A great deal of this is required, and it would be a mistake to suppose that it can easily be obtained or improvised on mobilization. Further, to avoid the confusion and delay which would otherwise occur, this equipment must be decentralized so that every unit, on being called out for service, should find its equipment.

63. But mobilization equipment, even for the first line, is still far from complete; what there is cannot be properly decentralized owing to lack of storage accommodation; while, for the second line, the deficiencies are, of course, greater.

64. All that can be said is, that steady efforts are being made in the direction of its provision, and equipment for a considerable proportion of the force is already in store, though it must be some time yet before the Minister of Militia will be able to say that complete or nearly complete equipment for the first line of 100,000 men is on hand.

65. Mobilization, it is to be feared, would also be delayed by difficulties in connection with the supply of vehicles and horses, especially riding horses.

66. As regards transport vehicles, some good work has been done, and a certain amount of transport has been registered—especially in certain districts of Ontario where owners have patriotically come forward—but, so far, it has not been found possible to introduce any general or sufficient system of registration, either of transport or remounts. Owners in many parts are suspicious as to what registration may entail; registration costs money; and money is required, even more urgently, for other services.

67. As regards riding horses, the situation is particularly difficult, for there can be no doubt that the riding horse, as such, exists in Eastern Canada only in decreasing numbers. This matter will receive attention, but, meantime, the mounted troops would have, as hitherto, to make the best of the stamp of horse available.

68. Such is, in general terms, the present position in regard to our military forces. In view of the necessity for finding money for the development of the Dominion, it has not been possible to spare sufficient money for military purposes to enable progress in the development of our forces to be as rapid as might otherwise have been desired—and, indeed, it might be said that, until a body of officers had been trained, capable of efficiently organizing and training the military forces, it was not desirable to create those forces too rapidly.

69. Much remains still to be done towards the perfecting of our first line forces, more than at present is financially possible—and nothing has yet been attempted towards the organization of the reserve in second line. But the points of weakness are known; the direction in which effort should be applied is recognized; and, though perhaps it is not so rapid as would appear desirable from a purely military point of view, general progress is, nevertheless, being made, and there can be no doubt at all but that the size of the force which the Dominion could, in case of necessity, place in the field, and, what is even more to the point, feed and maintain when there is an efficient state, has largely increased of late years.

70. To sum up, the points to which it has been desired in this memorandum to draw attention may be recapitulated as follows:—

(a) That expenditure on militia services for 1908-9 shows a decrease of $46,813 as compared with that of 1907-8, in which year the financial effect of the transfer of Halifax and Esquimalt was first fully felt, while the estimates for 1909-10 show a still further decrease of $636,275.

(b) That, while the expenditure for annual drill of the active militia rose from $699,724 in 1904-5 to $1,075,000 (exclusive of the cost of the Quebec celebration) in 1908-9, and is, for the year 1909-10 estimated at $860,000, the increase in cost has been accompanied by a large increase in the number of both men and horses trained, viz.: from 32,000 men and 7,892 horses in 1903-4, to 47,500 men and 8,500 horses in 1908-9.

(c) That the increases in the votes for clothing and necessaries, provisions and supplies, transport and freight, and warlike stores are directly consequent upon the increase in the numbers of the active militia and of the permanent force, due in the latter case to the garrisoning of Halifax and Esquimalt, and to additional requirements of the active militia.

(d) That the increases in the votes for engineer services and maintenance of military properties, are directly due to the increased number of military rifle ranges, buildings and properties on the charge of the Militia Department.

(e) That the increase in the numbers of the permanent staff of the militia force, at headquarters and in the military districts and commands, has been in accord with the views of all the general officers who have served in Canada during the past seventeen years, has been largely forced upon us by the withdrawal of the imperial troops from Halifax and Esquimalt, is absolutely necessary if the militia force is to be able to take and maintain itself in the field, and, lastly, is closely proportionate to the increase which has taken place in the militia force.

(f) That the increase in cost of the permanent force is (outside the higher rates of pay granted in 1904) due to the additions to its establishment rendered necessary by its having to provide garrisons for Halifax and Esquimalt, when transferred to Dominion control; by having to provide instruction for largely increased establishments of active militia, and by having to provide for the organization of the subsidiary services required to enable the militia force as a whole to take the field.

That, further, no reduction is possible in the permanent force without either seriously weakening the garrisons of Halifax and Esquimalt (which would be contrary to Canada's undertaking to the empire), or rendering the force incapable of fulfilling its duty of in-

structing the active militia and organizing it so as to enable it to take the field in case of need.

That, further, the expenditure on the permanent force is $51,000 less for pay and allowances than it was in 1907-08.

(g) That the vote on capital account is indispensable if the militia is to be properly armed for war, and if rifle ranges are to continue to be provided, and that this vote is likely to be required for several years to come.

71. Lastly, a short resume of the present military situation has been given, from which it will be seen that the policy of the Militia Department has been directed steadily towards the attainment of a standard accepted by parliament, and with the single end in view of fitting the militia force as a whole to take the field in such a condition of efficiency that the people of Canada may feel safe in entrusting to its keeping the honour and security of the nation.

A good deal has been said during the last year or two about the increase in the total expenditure on militia account during the past three or four years, an increase amounting to in the neighbourhood of $3,000,000. I have stated on several occasions in this House in the last parliament the reasons which accounted for that increase. These reasons are set out very fully in this memorandum. The taking over of Halifax and Esquimalt which involved an addition of about 1,600 men to the permanent force of this country and very considerable additions to the expenditure for care of buildings and all expenses attendant on the keeping up of such a large force, has probably involved an expenditure of $1,250,000. The force which we are maintaining is not as large as the force which was maintained by the imperial authorities. Their expenditure in maintaining these two forts was about $1,750,000 a year. We voluntarily undertook to assume that responsibility. I do not suppose that any one in this House, or any one in Canada, would, for a moment, desire to recede from that position. We took the position that while we could not do certain things at the time it was suggested that we should do them in the way of a cash subscription to the navy, or the maintenance of a separate force for foreign service, we should relieve the exchequer of the mother country, the overburdened tax payer, at any rate, to the extent of paying for everything in the way of defence which might be required in Canada. So, that offer was made and gratefully accepted, and, as I say, nobody for a moment would think of receding from that position. We have increased the strength of the active militia within those years—

Mr. FOSTER. Have you increased the strength of the permanent force?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, I was just explaining; we increased the permanent force by a matter of 1,600 men for the purpose of taking over, equipping and maintaining the garrisons at Halifax and Esquimalt, the cost, together with the attendant expense connected therewith, amounting to between $1,000,000 and $1,500,000. Referring to paragraph 8, we have increased the numerical strength of the active militia, including the permanent force, which includes the garrisons at Halifax and Esquimalt, to about 57,000.

Mr. DANIEL. That is the number of men drilled annually?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, in cities, in camps, and in the permanent force. We have increased the pay of the militia. By an Act of this parliament of 1904, the pay of the active militia was practically doubled. That is to say the old pay of 50 cents remained but a further sum of 50 cents was given in the form of what is known as efficiency pay, so that the average pay of the men going into camp is from 75 cents to $1 instead of 50 cents as a fixed maximum. All the officers of the active militia agree in stating that the granting of that efficiency pay has been of the greatest possible advantage to the militia. It has promoted discipline and good order, and good rifle shooting, because that pay is not given to any soldier who is disorderly or who misbehaves during camp, nor is it given to any one who does not make a certain percentage of marks in firing at the target. Then the increased cost of living has added to the expenditure. It costs more to-day to feed a man in camp than it did 10 years ago. It costs rather more to clothe him, the blankets and camp equipment are more expensive, and the rations given in the camps are more liberal. The increased cost of living has of course rendered the cost of maintaining the permanent corps greater.

Mr. DANIEL. Referring to paragraph 9, will the regiments which are not brought to a central camp go into camp at their regimental headquarters, or will they be drilled at company headquarters?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, I think at regimental headquarters as regimental units.

Mr. FOSTER. The customs would not be $200,000. It was $115,000 last year.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am speaking of the estimates, not of the actual amount expended. I think it is more than that this year.

Thirteen years ago the annual output of the cartridge factory was less than three-quarters of a million rounds of ammunition cartridge; last year I think it was in the neighborhood of twelve or thirteen millions. So there has been an enormous increase, an increase in the cost

as well. We require to build up a reserve of ammunition. We have actually turned the corner, and we are making more ammunition to-day than we use, and are beginning to lay by a reserve. We should have by rights a reserve of at least 500 rounds for every man in the militia. Assuming there are 50,000—and according to our scheme suppose there are 100,000 or 90,000 using rifles—you will see what a large amount of reserve ammunition that involves, forty million or fifty million rounds.

Mr. FOSTER. How long does the stuff keep good.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. A long time. But we have a system by which we use the oldest manufactured and keep the newest, so there is none of it kept a very long time.

Then he refers to the increase in the engineering service and the maintenance of military property. Well, we are getting more rifle ranges, and military properties and camp grounds; and of course these have to be maintained. There was no engineering staff twelve years ago, there were no engineers.

Mr. FOSTER. Do your engineers take charge of the armouries?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. The armouries are in charge now of enlisted men, as a rule, of soldiers who have to pass a certain examination to qualify them for taking charge of rifles and equipment of all kinds, and in the case of artillery, men thoroughly conversant with guns and ordinance.

Mr. FOSTER. What buildings do your engineers have charge of?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That refers to the engineering service which controls all the construction and repairs of buildings. When a building is completed, like an armoury, which is done by the Public Works Department, it is handed over to our department, and I think it is under the control of the Quarter-Master General.

Mr. FOSTER. For instance, the cottages you built at Kingston, were the plans prepared by your engineers?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. In that case of course the work is done by the Public Works Department. The engineering branch of the Militia Department prepares plans, and these plans are sent to the Public Works Department. I have endeavoured to establish a joint committee of the two departments, an inter-departmental committee, and thought I had succeeded; but unfortunately, I do not know whose fault it is, the officers committee was interrupted, and they are not meeting at present. I hope to be able to re-establish that committee. If that could be done, and a meeting held once a month or once a fortnight of two or three of the leading officers of the two departments, it seems to me a good many things which have happened—I am not referring to anything in particular—but the clashing of the two departments would be avoided. There has not been as good results from the working together of the two departments as there ought to have been, and as I would like to see.

Now one of the increases in the militia estimates most criticised in certain quarters is that for the headquarters and district staff. I will not detain the committee by reading the memorandum on these various points, because it is in the hands of the members of the committee, and they will have an opportunity of reading it at their leisure.

Mr. FOSTER. In connection with paragraph 52, does the hon. minister mean to say that if war actually took place, he is able now to call out 90,000 men and equip and feed them at a moment's notice?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That subject is fully dealt with. It would not be possible perhaps to-morrow to do that, but it is expected to be able to do it within the very near future. For instance, we have not enough rifles in the country to-day. One does not care to make these admissions, but as a matter of fact there is not at the moment sufficient, but soon will be. The artillery is not anything like the strength it should be, but still is efficient as far as it goes, and steady improvement in all these respects is taking place. As I have already said, I would commend this memorandum to the careful consideration of every hon. member of this committee who is interested in this question.

Now, the question may be asked: Is this system that we are pursuing the wisest and the best? As I have already said, it is a system that has been evolved by experience. We have not changed suddenly—it has been against our policy to do so—the conditions which I found in existence in 1896. We have had the good fortune to have with us during several years of my regime one of the ablest officers in the British army. I refer to General Sir Percy Lake. I found him here when I came into office. He had been here, I think, two or three years under the late administration. He remained until his term of five years' service was completed, when he went back to his regiment and served in India, and then was brought to the War Office where he performed distinguished service during the war in South Africa. He came here again, four or five years ago, to take the position of chief of the general staff. He is absolutely familiar with the working and development of the militia in Canada for the last fifteen or six-

teen years, and, whatever credit is to be given for the position which the militia has attained to-day as a well organized and efficient force is more due to General Sir Percy Lake than to any one else. I cheerfully accord to him the justice of making that statement.

I was saying that we have not introduced any abrupt changes, that we have rather taken the course of building up that which existed, which, I think, is the sound course to pursue. I believe that the results have been good in the main. I believe that, in the main, the country has got the full value of the very considerable amount of money it has spent. When you come to think of it, after all, we are spending less than $1 per head of the population. In the United States they spend $3 or $4 per head of the population, even without taking account of the enormous pensions. If you go to Europe, you find that even the mother country spends $7 or $8 per head. I believe it is possible to carry on the development and maintenance of the militia with very little increase over the amount that is now being expended. If the estimates of the current year—there have been considerable reductions for the year 1909-10—could be maintained (and that is less than $1 per head of the population), I should be inclined to think that would be sufficient, at any rate for the present needs, and perhaps for a long time to come. And, when I speak of $1 per head of the population, I do not mean that the expenditure should increase as the population increases. I do not think that will be necessary. Some additional expenditure will be necessary of course. You cannot increase the strength of the militia without increasing the money you spend. If you send 60,000 men into camp it will cost you twice as much—or nearly so—as if you sent 30,000. You have to feed and clothe and transport these men. Then, we have the great northwest country in which the militia has scarcely been developed at all. A few years ago, the question of defending that great country was scarcely considered. The conditions have changed entirely in ten years, and whoever has to administer the militia of Canada during the next ten years will have to consider very carefully the question of putting the militia of the west on the same basis as the militia of the east.

Now, I would like to draw the attention of the committee to the financial side of this question. I do not mean the amount of money being expended, for I have discussed that to some extent and will not deal with it further until we come to the items of the estimates. I desire to discuss the question of how the money is dealt with, which is an extremely important question, and one which, very properly, has engaged the attention of public men and of the people for some time past.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

Are due precautions taken and safeguards provided for the expenditure of this money? Is due forethought taken in framing estimates as a basis of this expense? I believe it is. At any rate, the course pursued is something like this: The officers in the districts and at headquarters who are responsible for carrying on the various services of the militia, are required at a certain period of the year, to send in to headquarters a statement of their requirements for the next year. These requirements are carefully scanned by the officer in charge of the particular branch interested. Eventually, these estimates are brought together and are considered by the deputy minister and by the minister, and usually they are considered in very considerable detail by the minister, with the assistance of the members of the Militia Council. We cannot know, of course, what the Finance Minister's position may be. It is difficult to get a statement in advance—perhaps six months before the estimates are made up—of how much money will be available. So, the estimates are made up and are sent to the Finance Minister, under the signature of the Minister of Militia, and, after due consideration—as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) would know—and after queries and so on, it is decided whether these estimates can go through as they have been sent in, or will have to be sent back. It is no breach of confidence to say, with regard to our present estimates, that the estimates which we sent in were not accepted, and that we had a good deal of difficulty in trying to reduce them at rather short notice. It may be that some of our estimates may not come out as we had hoped or expected, but there will not be any very great divergence. Well, what happens next? The money is voted to the different departments, and requisitions are made out, coming chiefly through the Quartermaster General, who has charge of all the stores, and the Master General of Ordnance, who is responsible for the arming of the militia, and these in turn are sent to the deputy minister, by whom they are brought to me, and then, if they are approved, they are handed over to the Director of Contracts; because we have in the Department of Militia, and have had for a considerable time, a purchasing branch under the control of that officer. The Director of Contracts then proceeds upon certain lines to ask for tenders. With regard to all the provisions and supplies for the camps and for the permanent force, including fuel and forage, tenders are invariably asked by public advertisement or by public notice posted up.

Mr. FOSTER. In your department do you make a discrimination in this advertising between Liberal and Liberal-Conservative newspapers ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The price is fixed by the Printing Bureau, and the name of the paper, I am told by the deputy—which shows how little notice I have taken of that—is supplied by the department. So far as we can possibly keep down the expense of advertising in the newspapers, we do it. When I came into the department, I found that for all the camps and for most of the depots, the supplies were asked for by posters posted up in post offices and other public places. A year ago or so some exception was taken to that. It was alleged that the posters were not put up; somebody who wanted to tender said that he had not seen the notice. Therefore we tried advertising in one or two newspapers in each town, in addition to the posters; and we have come to the conclusion that the money spent in advertising in the newspapers is wasted, as we get no more tenders, and that the old system of posters is really sufficient and probably the best. But I have not answered the question. I think it is more than probable that the ordinary course would be to advertise, for instance, in the city of Toronto, in the 'Globe,' and perhaps in the 'Star.' I do not think the advertisement would be sent either to the 'Mail and Empire' or to the 'News'; but I do not think I would go the length of sending an advertisement to an obscure newspaper because it happened to be on my own side of politics.

I have had the Director of Contracts supply me with a memorandum as to the course pursued by him. I have asked him to ascertain the course followed by the War Office and the Admiralty in England, and I will read a few extracts:

Here is an extract from the report of an investigation that took place in England into the letting of contracts during the South African war:

Q. When you receive those requisitions for the purchase of supplies you issued advertisements to the trade?—A. We issued tenders to the trade as a general rule. There is an annual advertisement issued to the trade in order to invite people to come in for competition, and certain requirements are specially advertised from time to time, but as a general rule we issue tenders only to those people who are on our list.

In that connection I want to say that I caused a very careful examination to be made of several English newspapers, including the London 'Times', for a great many years back, and I failed to find one advertisement for any stores, except this kind of an advertisement, which appeared in the London 'Times':

Annual notice of army contracts. Notice is hereby given that tenders for specified quantities of the undermentioned articles of manufacture are invited from time to time as required.

Then there is a long list beginning with 'A' and ending with 'W'.

Manufacturers who may wish to be invited to tender for army requirements should state the particular articles which they manufacture and the names of at least two well-known firms or public body who have purchased from them and are in a position to certify as to the quality of their production. The services of an intermediary are unnecessary in approaching the department for this purpose. No application is necessary from firms whose names are already on the War Office list. All applications should be in writing and addressed to the Secretary, War Office, London.

From which it appears that the invariable practice of the War Office and Admiralty is to issue forms of tenders to people selected who are on the list and not to ask in a general way for tenders for a specific thing.

Mr. MONK. That is done every year in England. They begin by inviting tenders for all the supplies and every one is given an opportunity to tender.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not at all, my hon. friend did not catch the point. An advertisement is put in the 'Times' informing those interested that contracts will be let and asking any one who wishes to be put on the list to make application, and he will be put on, provided he can show that he has ever done any work, and gives the names of people who can certify that he is fit to be put on. If he does this, his name will be put on the list, and then forms of tenders will be sent to him.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that what is done in your department?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. While that has not been done, I have been considering seriously the advisability of doing it. I have only been studying this branch of the subject within a short time and was not fully aware of the course pursued. But I think it is a very desirable course and would save the department an immense amount of trouble. We have a list in the department.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman have any objections to giving us that list?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have not got it here but I do not think there would be any objection.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister lay that list on the table?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have not the list here.

Mr. FOSTER. You could bring it tomorrow.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would have to consider that. I am trying to make this statement absolutely free from any political or party bias whatever. I know that my hon. friend is greatly surprised and disappointed.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it does not cost anything to make a statement.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not in the habit of making a statement unless it is correct. I was about to say that my instructions to the director of contracts are that whenever a name is put on our list, he shall take pains to consult the commercial agencies or banks or in other ways, to get information as to the character of that particular firm. And unless the evidence is sufficient to show that that firm is entitled to confidence, it will not remain on the list. These are the instructions given, and I think they are followed. As to the politics of the firm, which are on the list. I have not made special inquiries. I happen to know that some of the largest contracts given in my department are given to prominent members of the Conservative party. It suits our convenience to do so. They are the men best fitted to do the work and the fact that they are Conservatives has not prevented their getting it.

Further in the case of war, a good many of the purchases, especially of supplies like forage, were made by private bargain and arrangement.

Paragraph 4 in the 'Instructions for the Director of Navy Contracts,' says :

To insure the supply of articles of satisfactory quality, care must be taken to obtain them only from persons or firms of repute, not however excluding resort to persons and firms in a small way of business in suitable cases and for this purpose the system of limited tenders should be encouraged in preference to general invitation by advertisements.

That is the evidence of the assistant director of navy construction:

In such case, other matters being equal, the principle of excepting the lowest offer should prevail, i. e. that with regard to each particular class of articles you have a list of contractors from whom you invite tenders.

A. Yes. Almost invariably the lowest tender from any person on that limited list is accepted, because we put on one level all on the list.

Q. If you wanted an article at all urgently and the question of time was important, although the price was rather high, however, you might give it to a man who you were quite sure would be punctual.

A. Yes, it is occasionally done.

Tenders for construction work, fuel, provisions, food and forage, &c., and barrack services appear to be called for by public advertisement.

Just as is done in this country. Here is another important extract from the minutes of evidence of the Royal Commission on the South African war 1903—evidence of Mr. Alfred Major, Director of Army Contracts, page 267:

Q. Do you consider it necessary, in order that the trade should be in a position to supply stores, that they should have a share of the provision of those stores in times of peace?

A. Certainly; otherwise they are not prepared to meet our requirements. As regards quality and patterns, they vary in almost every instance from the ordinary trade pattern.

Just let me point out the full import of that answer. If you want to get supplies, you must make contracts with people who are in the habit of doing the work. In Canada where clothing, for instance, is not made by the government as it is in England, it is absolutely of the first importance that the government should deal with firms who are able to do the work and who will undertake to have the necessary plant and employees to do more work in the event of any emergency arising. This is a matter of the utmost importance and to which I do not think due consideration is given. So much for the system in England which is practically the same as that in Canada. Here is one other extract, in which perhaps my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) might be interested, as showing what is sometimes done in the mother country. I am quoting from page 6 of the minutes of evidence taken before the Commission on War Office Organization, 1901 :

Details of a case were given where the general officer commanding applied for the removal of the contractor's name from the list of those to whom tenders should be sent. The Secretary of State decided that the name should not be removed.

Whether that was political influence or otherwise I am not in a position to say. In that same evidence before the same commission, General Buller said:

We are not particular enough with our contractors. We let men on the list who are probably very doubtful.

Here is a bit of evidence which is interesting. Everybody knows who Mr. Fleetwood Wilson is. He makes the following statement:

I made up my mind I would require say 100,000 yards of tartan. I would then put up to the director of contracts my demand. He would ask me who I would suggest as likely to supply that cloth at a reasonable price, of good quality and punctually delivered. I would then suggest certain firms which I knew or which I had reason to believe would serve the department well; give my reasons, and send them up to the director of contracts. The director of contracts in some instances suggests an allotment to other firms or the allotment of different quantities to the same firms. Eventually the director of contracts put all the machinery of putting out tenders and signing forms, etc., into work.

That will indicate the system which has been adopted in England after 100 or 200 years of experience. I have already stated that so far as our system is concerned, contracts for food supplies for the permanent force and annual camps and for fuel are

made only after tenders have been called for by public advertisement.

Now as to stores generally. Competitive tenders are usually obtained by circular letter just as is done in England from firms well and favourably known to the department as reliable and competent for the work they undertake. A list of such firms is kept in the contracts branch and the order or contract goes to the lowest tenderer unless good reason appears to the contrary, a very rare occurrence. Then the goods are manufactured and they are sent in; there is a branch of the contract branch known as the inspection branch. The goods are there subjected to the most careful inspection before acceptance, they undergo careful inspection by trained men, experts in regard to the various articles purchased. Articles found not equal to the standard are rejected. The inspector, after checking quantities and quality, reports the number accepted; and these are sent into ordnance stores. The ordnance officer gives the director of contracts a receipt for them and enters them in his journal of receipts. A record of all receipts and issues from stores is kept; and every stage of every transaction of purchase from the delivery of the stores for inspection until they become unserviceable or are destroyed, is reviewed by an officer of the accounts branch whose business is the auditing of stores. All vouchers relative to the case are sent him.

Suggestions have been made that no care is taken of stores, that there is no tracing of the stores and that we never know what condition they are in or what quantity we have on hand. This is absolutely misleading and grossly unfair to the department. Two sets of ledgers are kept, one set locally at the points where the stores are, all over the country, and another set at Ottawa in the audit branch. Every six months those ledgers are exchanged and the most careful audit that could possibly be made is made constantly, and I believe it is perfectly effective.

Some years ago we had a discussion in this House with regard to contracts for stores. At that time there were present in this House two ex-Ministers of Militia, Sir Adolphe Caron and Mr. Tisdale. It so happened that when I came into office I had cancelled some contracts which had been entered into for a period of three years. In June, 1896, contracts had been made by Mr. Tisdale with certain contractors for considerable quantities of clothing for three years. One of those contracts was not to take effect until a year later, 1897. I submitted the question to the then Minister of Justice who said that such a contract was illegal because a contract could not be made for articles when the money to pay for them had not been voted by parliament. However that may be, the contracts were in due course cancelled. I inserted an advertisement in the public press in all the large cities in Canada asking for tenders for about $70,000 or $75,000 worth of clothing which we required by the middle of April following. The advertisement was inserted, I think, about October or November. What was the result? The result was that when the month of April arrived and the day arrived on which these goods should have been delivered, none of them had been manufactured. I sent a man to the factory of the contractor and there discovered that he had not taken a single stitch and not bought the first yard of cloth. What was my position? Men like the Sanfords, whose firm had been awarded the contract which I had cancelled, had tendered for this contract on the new advertisement but had failed to secure it. Why? Because the man who obtained the contract, whose name I shall not mention, was on the verge of insolvency and in order to keep his head above water for a little longer thought that to have a government contract would materially help him and he put in a tender so low that he himself could not do the work. Then I was forced into this position that I had to go to the Sanford Company and ask them as a favour to make the goods which I required for the then approaching camps at their own price. I am bound to say that their price was as reasonable as could be expected and I think it was at the price at which he tendered for this contract. There is the result of my experience. I have under my hand the speeches and the warnings which Sir Adolphe Caron and Mr. Tisdale gave me across the floor of the House at the time these contracts were terminated by me, and I must admit that what they said proved to be absolutely true, and I have not, with the exception, I think, of one occasion since then, ever asked for public tenders by public advertisement for goods of that kind. What is the distinction? There is no difficulty about food products because we all know about them, and the competition is so keen that we are quite sure that the quality will be good and it is easy to ascertain whether it is or not. But in the case of military supplies such as clothing and arms of various kinds, there is a technical side, and somebody has got to learn how to make those articles. As a rule, they learn at the public expense. But I prefer to deal with reliable men who have already learned, and about whose bona fides, and whose character and reputation as manufacturers, there is no doubt. We have on the list men of that kind. Then for some years past a very large part of our supplies of that kind have been purchased from the same people, and the Sanfords supply the principal amount.

Mr. TALBOT. Is it the intention of the hon. minister to continue giving contracts for military clothing in future without asking for tenders?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We ask for tenders, but in the way I speak of. I hope we shall not be required to advertise in the public newspapers. I do not want to go through again what I went through once before to my sorrow, and which was disastrous to the country, and put us to great inconvenience. I think it would have been much more disastrous if that particular party had been able to make the clothing, because I am sure it would not have been satisfactory, because he had never had any experience in work of that kind. Now, we have, as I say, a competent corps of inspectors. The most careful inspection is carried on as to the colour of the clothing, as to the character of the work, and as to the cut. We have in that inspection room sealed patterns with which everything that comes in is compared, and frequently a garment is literally cut to pieces in order to see that at least one or two of each lot that comes in are all right, from which the rest can be fairly judged. In the case of boots and shoes, a boot is cut in two, cut crosswise and cut lengthwise. I have seen the work done myself, and it is most thoroughly done by experts. In the case of blankets, they are tested to see if they are shoddy. We won't buy anything that contains shoddy. But if, after coming to the department, it shows any shoddy, it is returned, or paid for at a lower price. Then we have another check in addition to the director of contracts who is himself a specialist in a business way, and is watching prices constantly. In addition to the inspectors who are certainly specialists as to the value of goods and clothing, and who have the proper means of making an inspection, we have the price list of the War Office, the vocabulary, with which we can compare our prices with the prices at the War Office in England, adding the duty whatever it may be, and by that means we can come within a fraction of what the article is worth. We have in our department samples of clothing and samples of goods which are furnished to the War Office, and upon which these prices in the vocabulary are based.

I have already spoken of the audit of stores, and of the work done by the pay branch. I would like to say a word as to where these supplies come from. I am sure the committee will be glad to know that perhaps seven-eighths, at least three-forths of all the supplies purchased by the Militia Department are manufactured or supplied in Canada. In fact, with the exception of the artillery, of the guns, which are supplied at present in England, practically everything is supplied in Canada. I would like to read here just a word or two from a memorandum which was laid before the

Mr. TALBOT.

Imperial Conference in 1907. It is a memorandum prepared by the then Quartermaster General, Sir Wm. Nicholson, who is now the chief of the General Staff, and practically the head next to the Minister of Army Council and by Mr. C. F. Madden, who was then Master General of the Ordnance:

It is most desirable that the area of supply of the warlike stores under reference——

That is rifles, cannon, ordnance, everything.

—should be as wide as possible, and, therefore, the colonial government should be urged to arrange for local manufacture and provision, rather than to rely on the resources of the United Kingdom.

Well, we are doing that, and I hope the day will come, and come soon, when cannon, and everything can be manufactured in this country. I may, however, say that at the present moment we are able to get all the limbers, ammunition waggons and carriages manufactured in Canada. They are being manufactured in this very city, and if any hon. member of the committee desires to spend an interesting half hour, I would advise him to go to the works of the Ottawa Car Company, and see the most creditable work that is being done there, and at a price as cheap, or nearly so, as the War Office pays; the price which we pay for those wagons is the War Office price with the duty added. I hope that in a few years we shall have not only a partially self-contained militia, as we have to-day to a very large extent, but that the militia, in so far at any rate as regards the supply of material of every kind, will be absolutely self-contained, and that everything can be manufactured in our own country. The importance of that I need not dwell upon, in the event of any trouble occurring. If any misfortune were to happen to the British fleet our position would be very serious indeed if we were dependent entirely for our supplies on the other side of the Atlantic.

Before concluding my remarks I would like to call attention to a comparison which was made by General Sir Percy Lake, in a memorandum which I laid on the table of the House a year ago, a comparison showing the establishments of the organized units of the Canadian militia in 1895-6, in 1903-4, and 1908-9 respectively. I have also a comparative table to show the armament and equipment of the militia, the cadet corps and the rifle associations for the years 1895-6, 1903-4, and 1908-9. I will not detain the committee by reading these tables but I think it would be desirable, in order to make my statement complete, that they should be published in 'Hansard.'

TABLE TO SHOW ESTABLISHMENTS OF ORGANIZED UNITS OF THE CANADIAN MILITIA IN 1895-6, 1903-4 AND 1908-9 RESPECTIVELY.

Corps.	Establishment, 1895-6.		Establishment, 1903-4.		Establishment, 1908-9.		Remarks.
	Number of Squadrons, Batteries, or Companies.	Total Numbers.	Number of Squadrons, Batteries, or Companies.	Total Numbers.	Number of Squadrons, Batteries or Companies.	Total Numbers.	
Permanent Force. (Note 1.)							
Royal Canadian Dragoons—Squadrons	2	132	2	109	2	200	Establishments provided for in the Estimates for 1908-9. (See Note 4).
Royal Canadian Mounted Rifles—Squadrons	Nil.	.....	1	60	1	120	
Royal Canadian Artillery—							
Horse or Field Batteries	1½	173	2	258	2	315	
Heavy Batteries	Nil.	.....	Nil.	.....	1	165	
Garrison Companies	2	171	2	225	4	629	
Royal Canadian Engineers—Garrison Companies	Nil.	.....	Detachments.	132	2	300	
Royal Canadian Regiment Companies	4	324	5	407	10	1,079	
Permanent Army Service Corps	Nil.	.....	Detachments.	6	Detachments	120	
Permanent Army Medical Corps	Nil.	.....	Nil.	36	Detachments	100	
Canadian Ordnance Corps	Nil.	.....	Detachments.	104	Detachments	214	
Canadian Army Pay Corps	Nil.	.....	Nil.	.....	Detachments	34	
Military Staff Clerks	Nil.	.....	Nil.	.....	Detachments	35	
		800		1,337		3,311	
Active Militia.							
Cavalry or Mounted Rifles—Squadrons	44	2,115	62	5,106	101	8,232	
Field Artillery—Batteries	17	1,345	17	2,013	25	2,712	
Heavy Artillery—Batteries	Nil.	.....	4	478	14	1,675	
Garrison Artillery—Companies	32	2,462	28	1,868	10	1,241	
Field Engineer Companies	2	151	4	708	5	762	
Corps of Guides	Nil.	.....	Detachments.	36	Detachments	107	
Infantry—Companies	615	28,962	654	34,257	710	36,849	
Canadian Army Service Corps—Companies	Nil.	.....	8	848	12	1,281	
Canadian Army Medical Corps—Field Ambulances	Nil.	.....	8 F.Hos.,9 B.C	705	18	1,460	
Corps of Signallers	Nil.	.....	Detachments.	7	Detachments	88	
Totals	.....	35,835	.....	47,423	.....	57,718	
Number of horses	2,872		7,892		11,798		
Number of men trained (Note 2).	19,000		32,000		46,000*		*Estimated.

Note 1.—Authority was given by Parliament in 1905 to increase the establishment of the permanent corps up to a maximum of 5,000 men, as might be found necessary in order to provide for the garrisons of Halifax and Esquimalt, and to allow for organizing additional units for instructional purposes to keep pace with the growth of the Active Militia. Up to the present time only a total establishment of 3,311 all ranks has been authorized.

Note 2.—The permanent corps have been included in each case in the number of men trained.

Note 3.—All units of the Militia provided for in the authorized establishments for the financial year have been shown in each case. In each of the two earlier years, the formation of some units, though provided for, was not carried out in that year, and the same thing may possibly occur in the present year.

Note 4.—Of the difference in numbers between the establishments of the permanent force in 1903-4 and 1908-9, the assumption of responsibility for the defence of Halifax and Esquimalt accounts for 565 artillery, 150 engineers, 745 infantry and 150 departmental corps; total, 1,610.

COMPARATIVE TABLE TO SHOW THE ARMAMENT AND EQUIPMENT OF THE MILITIA, ALSO CADET CORPS AND RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, IN THE YEARS 1895-6, 1903-4 AND 1908-09.

Subject.	1895-6.	1903-04.	1908-09.
Light field gun	80 9-Pounder muzzle loading 36 12-Pr. breech loading (under order)	90 12 Pounder breech loading 8 5″-Howitzer, B.L	90 12-Pr. B.L. 12 15-Pr. B.L. 36 18-Pr. Quick Firing. 8 5″.Howitzer, B.L.
Heavy Field guns	5 40-Pr. Armstrong	17 40-Pr. Armstrong (obsoletej 4 4 7″ Q.F	16 4-7″ Q.F. 12 60-Pr. Q.F. (for delivery in 1908).
Rifles and Carbines	40,000 Sniders (obsolete) 5,000 Martini-Henry 2,000 Lee and Martini-Metford 42,000 Lee-Enfield (under order)	39,000 Lee-Enfield and Lee-Metford 1,000 Martini-Metford	39,000 Lee-Enfield and Lee-Metford. 1,000 Martini-Metford. 42,000 Ross.
Maxim guns, ·303 calibre	15	18	20 and 8 Pompoms.
Ammunition for Field Artillery	About 300 rounds per 9 or 40-Pr. gun 400 per 12-Pr. gun (under order)	About 400 rounds per gun About 130 rounds per howitzer	About 500 rounds per gun for all guns.
Rifle Ammunition	About 200 rounds per Snider About 350 rounds per ·303″ rifle	About 350 rounds per rifle	Over 400 rounds per rifle.
Fortress Armament (Breech loading guns only.)	8 7″ R.B.L. (obsolete) 8 12-Pr. Q.F. (under odrer) 8 6-Pr. Q.F. (under order)	1 6″ B.L. (Drill purposes) 2 6″ Howitzer (Drill purposes) 4 12-Pr. Q.F 8 6-Pr. Q.F	Halifax and Esquimalt are completely armed. Quebec partly so. It is inadvisable to give details of these.
Ammunition for Fortress guns	About 250 rounds per 7″ gun. Complete to scale for smaller guns (under order) as above.	Practically complete for Q.F. guns above on Imperial scale.	Supply complete for above guns.
Camp Equipment	Enough for perhaps 15,000 men	Enough for about 30,000 men	Enough for about 45,000 men.
Personal equipment of men	Knapsack, obsolete, only partly distributed.	Oliver equipment	Oliver equipment complete for all authorized units.
Harness and Saddlery	Incomplete, some 30 years old	Practically complete	Complete for all authorized units.
Engineer Equipment	None	In progress	Complete for 4 Field Cos.
Army Service Corps Equipments	None	In progress for 8 companies	Complete for all existing units.
Medical Equipment	Practically none	For Bearer Cos. and Field Hospitals, making good progress.	Field Ambulances completely equipped.
Signalling Equipment	Practically none.	Commenced and some progress made.	Regimental medical equipment nearly complete.
Reserve Transport (registered)	None	A commencement made	Complete for all existing Sections.
Cadet Corps	Few—no reliable record	104—Members about 5,000	152—Members about 8,000.
Rifle Associations	42	93 Military, 257 Civilian, 28,000 members.	130 Military, 371 Civilian, 38,000 members.

It will be found from these statements that the situation is most satisfactory indeed. If you take the cadet corps as an example, in 1895-6 there were none; in 1903-4, 104, having about 5,000 members, and in 1908-9, 152 with 8,000 members. Of rifle associations there were, in 1895-6, 42; in 1903-4, 93 military, 257 civilian, with a membership of 28,000 and in 1908-9 130 military, 371 civilian, with a membership of 38,000. The number has considerably increased since that. I thank the committee for their very great patience and now will proceed with the discussion of the item.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Before the item is discussed I would like to refer to one rather important matter that the minister has not mentioned in his remarks this afternoon. I think the changes which he proposes for the militia show a great deal of forethought and study and will no doubt eventually work out, in a great many instances, for the betterment of the permanent corps, of the militia, and to the advantage of the country at large, and of the empire in general. But, as regards the formation of the imperial general staff, with ultimately a first and second line of defence and the formation of a corps for service abroad, I think he is to be congratulated on two points; in the first instance on the fact that the chief of the imperial general staff does not issue orders to the colonial general staff. I do not say this because I think our colonial general staff are superior in any way, because I think possibly matters are reversed, but, from the fact that I think the leaders of the colonial general staff will, in this way, retain their own individuality and personality to a greater degree than if commanded by imperial officers. The other point of congratulation, I think, lies in the fact that the government has at last realized that Canada must be prepared to defend herself at home and not rely, as formerly, some members of the cabinet did, altogether on the Monroe doctrine. With the formation of an imperial general staff and with a first and second line of defence there will no doubt be some system of national defence with respect to our borders and seaports. I fully realize the fact that these are not matters for open discussion inside or outside the House, but there might be some method by which not all, but some members of the opposition, might be placed in touch with what is going on in that way. Several times this session and formerly, when the minister has been asked a question, he has given the answer that we are now doing business on imperial lines and that he is not making any statement in regard to the question under discussion. I do not know what the procedure is in the British House of Commons regarding matters of defence, but I think it is more than likely that some members of the opposition, or possibly the leader of the opposition, are taken into the confidence of the government with regard to the country's defence.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Such, I believe, is not the case in this House, because, looking over the estimates I do not see any provision for matters of that kind. I think possibly the leader of the opposition, or a select committee of the House, is entitled to know these things, and know under what estimates these expenditures are made. That is a matter that I would suggest to the minister. I think it would be a very good plan if the leader of the opposition were taken into the counsel of the Minister of Militia and of the government on the question of imperial defence. In that way there will be no prying into the secrets of the country and matters which it would not be proper to discuss would be left alone by the opposition.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I might say that on several ocasions in the House in former times—I remember one in particular during the South African War—I was asked a question as to the quantity of ammunition that was stored in different parts of Canada. It was not a desirable question to answer, but I said openly in the House that if the hon. gentleman, or any one whom the leader of the opposition might select, or the leader of the opposition himself—it was in the days of Sir Charles Tupper—would come to me I would be very glad indeed to tell him all about it, that I had perfect confidence in him, but that I did not think it was in the interest of the country to publish the fact. That can be done again.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I do not know that we ourselves are the only people who are cognizant of our defences. I presume that some foreign countries know as much about them as we do and I judge so from this fact: This afternoon the hon. gentleman quoted Prof. Goldwin Smith with regard to some statement that he made. Reference was made to the fact in the 'Sunday Sun' which, I believe, is Prof. Goldwin Smith's paper, last year this paper criticised the action of the government in this particular and said that we might in time have the St. Lawrence bristling with guns. Perhaps some statement to the leader of the opposition from the Minister of Militia would save any controversy of this kind. The formation of this imperial general staff, I think, is a very good scheme indeed. I think it will lead to something which we have never had

either in the British army or in the colonial forces previous to this time. I think it will lead to the handling of large bodies of men by our colonial officers and even by our imperial commanders. In the Boer war some of the ablest British generals were very deficient in the handling of large bodies of men. In the account in what is called the German Official History of the Boer war, written by a Boer officer, I believe, and a very estimable book it is, full of criticism, but fair criticism, reference is made on more than one occasion to this lack of education on the part of British generals in the handling of large bodies of men at manoeuvres. In this country they can be carried out perhaps on a far better scale than in England and with an interchange of officers I think that system will be of very great benefit to the militia. The minister spoke, not of an army corps, but of a body of militia which would be raised for service abroad. There is one thing in connection with the service of any of our troops abroad which, I trust, the minister will take into consideration, and that is the fact that Canada's arm of defence is not the same as that of troops of the United Kingdom and the other colonies. It will be a very serious drawback if Canadian troops, serving with other imperial troops, are armed with different rifles, particularly if there is no interchangeability of parts. It will cause inconvenience at all times and will result in a great deal of trouble.

As regards the Dominion Rifle Association, or the Dominion Artillery Association, I think it will be very wise if the annual meetings of these bodies are devoted more to the discussion of our national armament and national defences. This will be far better than the usual eulogistic remarks that are made and the votes of thanks that are passed—not but that the votes of thanks are richly deserved, but, as I have said, I think the time can be much better spent in good, strong criticism of our defences and armament.

The minister spoke of a method of training in the schools. That is a most valuable method and one that seems to be growing in favour and showing very good results. I think that, possibly, something might be done to facilitate the formation of these cadet corps in the schools. As I understand it, at present it is necessary to the formation of a cadet corps in a high school that certain forms should be made out, by one of which the school commissioners bind themselves, their heirs and assigns for ever, to be responsible for all the arms and accoutrements issued to that school. School commissioners, as a rule, are business men selected by the ratepayers, and, generally speaking, they are not ready to sign documents of this kind, binding themselves and their heirs and assigns to be for ever responsible for these things. This has prevented cadet corps in many of our large schools from being properly formed.

As to the reduction in the estimates, the minister explained that, perhaps, not so many men as formerly would assemble in the camps, but that they would perhaps drill at headquarters, and some of the city corps might have their annual training at night in the way of drill and so on. I think it would be a good thing for the minister, if he wishes to economize, instead of spending money in transportation, to issue a larger supply of ammunition and let the men devote more time to target practice and to perfecting themselves in the use of the rifle. I think more time should be given to rifle shooting. I have known such instances as this: The Eastern Townships Cavalry corps, one of the very best cavalry bodies in Canada, has been sent for two succeeding years into camp at Laprairie, a place unsuitable for cavalry formation and without targets. The men have been there for two years without firing a single round of ammunition. It is necessary, of course, for a cavalryman to ride—all the more necessary if he has no ammunition, for it would be only by riding that he could keep out of the hands of the enemy.

The minister says that he hopes to be able in time to manufacture all the large guns used in Canada.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I had in mind more particularly the 18-pounders.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Even the manufacture of 18-pounders is a matter to be undertaken, if at all, only after very careful consideration. The minister told us that, in purchasing clothing, he went to the people who were adepts in that manufacture. I think the same should apply to the manufacture of artillery—it should apply even more strongly than in ordinary cases. The firms in England who are engaged in this manufacture, in Woolwich, Birmingham and other places, have been carrying on the manufacture for generations. Far more skill is needed for the manufacture of these implements of war than we can hope to acquire at least for many years to come. The establishment of factories for the manufacture of these larger guns would entail a great expense, and the manufacturers could not look forward to any market outside of Canada. Not much artillery would be required in Canada, and when this was turned out the factory would have nothing else to do. I do not think we are going to sell artillery and rifles and ammunition abroad.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. May I explain on that point? The hon. gentleman is pursuing an unnecessary line of argu-

ment. The people who manufacture guns here, if this plan is ever carried out, will be people who will do the same kind of business that they do in England—build ships. In England, the manufacture of guns is invariably carried on, so far as I know, by men who build not only warships, but ships of commercial purposes as well. And the particular concern—or concerns, for there is more than one—that are considering this question at this moment are people who intend to go into the business of building steel ships in Canada, and who, of course, will not establish a factory to make guns unless they engage in shipbuilding also.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Perhaps it is necessary to follow this discussion now more particularly than later on. There is no similarity between the position here in Canada and that in Great Britain. In Great Britain these large arsenals are turning out guns not only for themselves and the colonies, but for the world at large. If Japan wants artillery, she does not make it at home.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They had to begin some time. Japan is making her own ships at this moment, and her own guns as well.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I did not know that this government intended to adopt a naval policy. Of course, if the government has adopted such a policy and is bound to help the empire——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I said commercial ships.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I do not know that that would be in the same line as the manufacture of arms.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It would cover the manufacture of steel canal boats——

Mr. WORTHINGTON. And snowploughs, I fancy. I do not think that anybody will buy these guns except Canada. We cannot look to Great Britain for a market, for she does not even buy her canned goods for her army from us. I do not propose to detain the House longer. I suppose that these estimates will go through in any case with comparatively little discussion.

Mr. HUGHES. Inasmuch as I am to take the train in a short time, I wish now to say only a few words concerning a couple of matters that were not touched upon by the minister (Sir Frederick Borden)—with the promise that I will entertain the hon. gentleman a little longer on another occasion and will call his attention to certain derelictions of duty on the part of this government in relation to the training of the force. Speaking generally of the staff, I would take the liberty of suggesting to the minister and to the country that in addition to providing a general scheme for the defence of the empire, this general staff should look to the training of the officers throughout each component part of the empire in actual field work, and I presume that is the intention.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Moreover, I do not think that the training of the general staff should be left simply in the hands of a few selected officers in each country. In fact, it has been found in Britain that very many of the officers of the general staff, when brought into actual practice in the field, have turned out to be utter failures. As Lord Roberts himself has said in days gone by—possibly not in the exact words that I use, but in the same spirit—he had never yet had the experience of a staff-college training, and it had never been his privilege to meet many officers with the training of the staff-college who were the equal of many officers who had never seen a staff college. After all, it is a question of the man. In the staff-college officers, just as in the officers of the regiment, the district staff and the headquarters staff, it is a question of the training of officers. If some of the regiments going to camp are deficient, the responsibility for that is in the system for the training of officers that has been enforced in this country for many years. What have we to-day under our present system? Some only of the company officers and the regimental officers are qualified, while the men in the ranks are rarely qualified for officers' positions. The result is that there is no enthusiasm whatever. But in the olden times, when we had the system of training officers on the cadet principle, we had in the ranks of almost every company, one, two, three, four, and sometimes ten young men who carried in their pockets commissions entitling them to command the company or the regiment; so that when the commanding officer wished to select an ensign, that is, a second or a first lieutenant, he could look up and down his list of trained men and select the officer he required. How is it to-day? The officer who wants a second lieutenant says to himself: 'There is farmer Jones' son; he seems to be a pretty capable young man; I will try him.' That is the way the officers are selected, and the captain cannot possibly get these men to qualify. I would again impress on the minister, as I have done for about twenty years, the necessity of returning to the old system of cadet schools, under which education would be the basis of selection, and not the number of titles or stars a man wears. Let the men be turned out with an educational qualification, entitling them to command a company or to be the major or

the colonel of a regiment, and when they attain that position, let them have some training, and you will have enthusiasm in the force where to-day you have none. I am not blaming the minister for this state of things. I fought for a better system for many years before he became minister, and I am afraid I shall have to fight for many years yet before we get back to the old system. With regard to the question of drill in the schools, I would point out that in the British islands the lady teachers drill the boys and girls in military movements, and it is great discipline in the handling of the young students in their classes. As one charming quakeress said, when the English teachers were visiting this country last year: 'Why, we train them in military drill.' 'What, I said: 'A quakeress teaching military drill ?' 'We do not call it military drill,' she said, 'but it is military drill all the same, and we want them to be trained so as to be prepared to defend their country.' I will not enter into the question of the defence of the country further than to remark that in speaking of the army of defence, our good friend the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) said that it was necessary to have one arm of defence throughout the Empire; but the British army in South Africa had eleven different types of rifles, so that there is really nothing in that argument. Our army used the standard arm of Great Britain.

Mr. DANIEL. What were the eleven different types or brands of rifles?

Mr. HUGHES. Speaking from memory, there was the Snider rifle, the Martini——

Mr. DANIEL. By the imperial troops ?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, some of the British troops used the Martini. Then there were the Lee-Enfield, and the Lee-Metford, very few of the marks being interchangeable in these, the long Lee-Enfield, the short carbine, the Martini-Metford—

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Does my hon. friend think it is advisable that there should be a great variety of guns in an army?

Mr. HUGHES. No, I think it would be advisable that the army of the whole empire should be, as it will be in another year or two, armed with the Ross Rifle. With regard to the manufacture of material for war in Canada, I hold that in a very few years we shall have a full partnership union of Great Britain and her colonies, with our Right Hon. friend the Prime Minister of this country one of the shining lights in the full partnership council.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of a gun will he have?

Mr. HUGHES. The musket he shouldered on the Saskatchewan.

Mr. FOSTER. He hadn't it then.

Mr. HUGHES. The musket he wanted to shoulder. But he has apologized for his misdeeds of that day by saying that every schoolboy in Canada should be trained to handle a rifle and to shoot. Why should not Canada have, at some point on the Atlantic and at some point on the Pacific, establishments where we could manufacture our own guns in case of trouble? At the time of the siege of Kimberley, the mere fact that the British in Kimberley had officers capable of turning out a big gun was of great advantage to the British in preventing the surrender of that place. I do not believe that the city of Quebec should be selected as a centre for manufacturing our ammunition and rifles. Some inland point should have been selected—some inland point on the Pacific and another on the Atlantic. At these points we should have establishments which could turn out good field guns, rifles, and ammunition in case we should be cut off by war from the mother land.

I intended speaking on the cadet corps and the training of the young throughout our country, but shall reserve my remarks for another occasion. But I would urge on the minister a reform in the training of officers. Just see the contrast between the civil training and military training. Two young men from the same family go down to the city of Toronto. One goes through the university, where he is treated as a responsible individual and comes out with a degree which fits him for any walk in life. The other is a private in some company and he goes into a barracks, where he is treated as a child and comes out with a sergeant's certificate. Later on he has to go back and qualify for a lieutenancy, and then go back again to qualify for a major, and then qualify again to take command. But his brother, who is a provisional officer, goes down and qualifies at once for a lieutenancy. But these young men, whether privates or officers, ought to don the cadet uniform and be put on an equal footing. They should go through the same training and let the best man in educational fitness come out ahead as in the old days, when all had to graduate as cadets.

Reference has been made by the minister and the hon. member for Sherbrooke to the sea coast defences of the nation. But to my mind, train the young men of the country in the use of the rifle and provide two quick firing guns for every company, and I care not how many millions across the border. If we have 100,000 young Canadians trained to hit a man 500 yards off with a rifle, we need not fear any

enemy. If the boys of Canada are trained to shoot with the rifle and the quick firing gun, we need fear no danger. The records show that scarcely any men are killed by artillery or big guns. The moral effect may be great, but there is scarcely a man hit by one of them. In all Africa but two hundred men at the outside were hit by shells on either side. Yet we find hundreds of thousands of dollars spent on these heavy armaments and very little spent on the smaller and more effective weapons. Even if you examine the records of the Russo-Japanese war, you will find that the greater majority of wounded and killed fell victims to the small arms and not to the shell-firing at all.

I shall reserve any further remarks for another occasion.

Mr. DANIEL. I listened with great interest to the remarks of the minister, who went over the whole subject pretty thoroughly. In my opinion the most important feature of his policy is that of assisting the boys and girls in our schools by giving them more physical drill in the first place, and afterwards by teaching the boys how to handle the rifle. If the minister will carry out that policy, he will in a few years have achieved the great desideratum which Lord Roberts is trying to obtain in England. He will have at his hand a trained body of young men ready to follow the standard if necessary and who have been trained in the use of the rifle and are able to shoot straight. And after all, in a country of such magnificent distances as Canada, and with such a sparse population, the most we can do is to have our young men so trained that if the call to arms is sounded they can take their places in the ranks and be something better than mere recruits. I think that is the very best thing the minister has offered us in his speech. Some very sensitive people make the objection that this would encourage militarism in the country and that our young people, who were drilled in the schools and taught to handle the rifle, would not feel content unless they went into active service, and if they could not find active service at home would find it elsewhere. I do not think there is anything in that objection. This matter of drilling in the schools is an old one on the other side of the Atlantic. When I was a boy, I was drilled twice a week for several years, and I do not think that inclined me to militarism to any great extent; and I am very glad there is a prospect of that system being taken up in all the provinces because it will furnish us a foundation for an army in the cheapest and most satisfactory way we can hope to get it.

As regards the question of rifles, I am inclined to believe it would be certainly a great advantage if all the imperial troops had the same rifle. Next to that is the advantage of having a rifle in all the parts of the empire which will at all events take the same size cartridge, so that the ammunition which serves for one will do for the other.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As suggestions are filling the air, I shall not feel out of place in making a few remarks. In the west almost every young farmer and rancher has a horse, and a very inexpensive way to have a corps established would be to form one of scouts in every locality; and we know that scouts and mounted infantry have proved most useful on every occasion when fighting men were called for. The establishment of these corps would be a matter of very little expense as the farmers' sons would provide their own horses, and all the government need do would be to furnish the arms and equipment and perhaps a fortnight's drill every year. If that was done, year by year a certain esprit de corps would develop between the different companies and you would have at all times in the west a fighting force of the very best young blood in those provinces. Horses would be provided by the men, trained as all those western horses are to stand gun fire, to stand at command, not requiring to be tied. Such a force would be a very valuable asset to Canada in the case of any war or necessity for their use arising. If there is no vestige of necessity for the use of any kind of corps, why then this talk is idle, but if there is a possibility of necessity I would advocate strongly that the young men of the west should, in the way I suggest, be organized into corps of scouts or irregular cavalry or mounted infantry just as it thought best. They would provide their own clothes and horses and all that the government would have to find would be a couple of weeks' instruction each year and the arms and ammunition.

Mr. BARNARD. Perhaps the minister might on this occasion answer certain questions with reference to the garrison at Esquimalt, which I put upon the Order Paper some weeks ago the formal answers to which were, I was going to say, of a more than evasive character. I quite understand that there are certain questions in connection with militia matters to which it is not desirable to give too much publicity, but I do not think the questions I then asked were of that character. If they are I would have much preferred that the minister should have told me so straight out rather than have given me the evasive answers which he did. The first question at column 365 of 'Hansard' was :

1. Did the government use its influence, as provided for in article 9 of the terms of union with British Columbia, in any way to

secure the continued maintenance by the imperial government of the naval station at Esquimalt, either before, after, or at the time the said naval station was abandoned?

I suppose the minister is aware that article 9 of the terms of union expressly provides that the Dominion government will at all times endeavour and use its influence to the utmost to the end that the naval station at Esquimalt shall be maintained by the imperial authorities. If the hon. minister will tell me that the reply given is an answer to the question I shall try to see just what it means. The answer was:

Negotiations are in progress with the imperial government for the transfer of the naval station at Esquimalt to the Canadian government.

The question, it will be noted, is: Did the government use its influence to do a certain thing. The answer is: The government is now negotiating for something else altogether. I would like the minister to give an answer to that if he can.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I certainly did not intend any discourtesy towards my hon. friend, and I must confess that I did not, until this moment, quite apprehend what his meaning was. Neither did I look up that particular provision of the Act of Confederation to which he refers. But I may tell him that having offered to take over Halifax and Esquimalt and having been informed in no doubtful way that the British authorities would be very glad indeed to accede to any offer, it would appear to be rather inconsistent if at the same time we should bring argument to bear upon the imperial authorities to continue that which we had offered to take over. That is so far as we are concerned. I suppose possibly my hon. friend may mean with reference to the ships and not to the garrison. I was answering really the part which pertains to the Militia Department and probably the hon. gentleman ought to have been answered by the Department of Marine and Fisheies.

Mr. BARNARD. It was answered by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh. I misunderstood the question. I may say this much, that it has transpired since the government took over Halifax and Esquimalt that the British admiralty, before we made the offer, had deliberately adopted the policy, although we were not aware of the fact, of practically abandoning Esquimalt as a naval station. They may change their minds, but I am not aware that any effort was made to influence the judgment of the admiralty or the imperial government as to that matter and I do not know that it would have been a proper thing to do.

Mr. BARNARD. I may take it then, I understand, that the Dominion government did not use its influence in any way with the imperial government to get the imperial government to continue to maintain a naval station at Esquimalt?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not aware that it did.

Mr. BARNARD. The hon. gentleman is the Minister of Militia and Defence, and I take it that this would be a matter of which he would be aware if there was any discussion on the subject.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I probably would, but that particular matter is under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BARNARD. It was not at that time, was it?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. BARNARD. When Esquimalt was taken over?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, the garrisons were taken over by the Militia Department both at Halifax and Esquimalt. The Militia Department has nothing to do with the dockyards or anything pertaining to the ships.

Mr BARNARD. I may take it that so far as the minister is aware—and being Minister of Militia and Defence he would be aware—no attempt was made on the part of this government to in any way influence the imperial government in connection with the matter?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think the hon. gentleman should cross-question me; I have told him all I know about it.

Mr. BARNARD. I asked another question which is to be found at column 495 of 'Hansard.' It was answered by the Minister of Militia on the 3rd of February. I asked:

1. Has any expenditure in connection with the naval station at Esquimalt been authorized by the government of Canada, or to the knowledge of the government of Canada, by the imperial government? If so, to what amount, and for what purpose?

The hon. gentleman answered that question by saying it was confidential and could not be disclosed. I would be quite content to accept that answer, but curiously enough the Minister of Marine and Fisheries also answered that question and he said 'No.' It leaves the matter in a somewhat unsatisfatory state. I would like to know if the minister could throw some light on that situation?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will say to my hon. friend at once that I will look into the matter again, and I shall be glad

to tell him. I presume that question was furnished to me by some officer in my department; I did not write the answer myself, but I presume the answer was in accordance with the facts. However, I will look into the thing again and speak to my hon. friend privately about it. There is nothing to conceal from him.

Mr. BARNARD. I thank the hon. gentleman for his courtesy. But there was another question:

How many guns were left by the imperial authorities at Esquimalt when the imperial troops were withdrawn from British Columbia?

The answer the minister gave was:

The same number of guns as were left at Esquimalt by the British government are, however, still there.

That hardly strikes me as being an answer which conveys much information.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No guns have been taken away, I am sure of that. I remember now that I discussed that question with an officer of the department, and he said that it was not desirable to tell how many guns there are at Esquimalt. But I will be ready to tell my hon. friend privately.

Mr. BARNARD. If the hon. gentleman had made that answer at the time, I would have had nothing further to say on the subject. But it looked so much like an evasive answer that I thought I was entitled either to a refusal or a little more information. Then I asked another question:

Is the government aware that one or more of said guns are said to have been left lying unprotected from the weather for months beside the public highway leading from Victoria to Esquimalt?

The answer of the minister was as follows:

The guns are where they were placed by the imperial troops. Their future disposition has been arranged with the full concurrence of the imperial war office.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We know the gun was exactly where it was placed by the imperial authorities. It is true that this government has been in correspondence with the imperial authorities as to what should be done with the gun. I am willing to tell my hon. friend privately what is to be done. I know what is to be done with the gun, but I do not think I should state it here. The gun has received no injury whatever where it has been lying.

Mr. BARNARD. I do not profess to be an expert on gunnery; but I have heard some people who do know something about it, say that it was a gun that cost a good deal of money, and I should not think it would do the gun any good to lie there. I saw it myself lying beside the road without any covering, from some time in the summer until through the winter.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have guns in ships that are exposed to rain and bad weather. I understand these guns are covered with some preparation which protects them. I do not think the gun is suffering any damage.

Mr. BARNARD. I should not think it would do the gun any good to lie in the ditch nine or ten months during the winter season, without any protection whatever.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Is it not a fact that two guns have been removed from where they were left by the imperial authorities to the drill hall at Victoria?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Quite recently, for instructional purposes.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. That was about eighteen months ago. Could the minister tell us what was the cost of removing those guns?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am told $1,200.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I desire to call the attention of the committee to this fact, that when two guns, one twelve inch and the other six inch, had to be removed a few miles from the Esquimalt fortifications to the drill hall at Victoria, although we maintain at those fortifications a regular corps of Canadian artillery, with all the men and all the equipment necessary to handle guns, except horses to draw them, when two of these guns are transferred to the Victoria drill hall for the purposes of instructing the local artillery, a bill of $1,200 is incurred for their removal. Now it seems to me that is an expense which should not have been incurred. I think if we have an efficient brigade or company of garrison artillery at Victoria, that brigade could be employed in moving a twelve-inch and a six-inch gun at a less cost than $1,200. In fact with what little knowledge I have of artillery, it seems to me that about two days' work of a few men and two teams of horses should be all that was required to transfer these guns from the point whence they were taken to the drill hall at Victoria. This battery at Esquimalt, if it is an efficient battery, must have men and material to handle those guns, and to sling them on to any carriage fit to convey them to the drill hall. We should have some explanation of so extraordinary a charge.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The question is unexpected. On the supplementary estimates I will have a statement prepared, and

show exactly how the expense was incurred. and why it was not done in some other way.

Mr. TALBOT. Will the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) tell me if I understood him rightly to say that two teams of horses could have hauled those guns?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. When I said two teams of horses—a team is a very elastic expression—I meant the number of horses which in ordinary course you would attach to a gun carriage drawing these guns.

Mr. TALBOT. Does the hon. gentleman think that the two best teams of horses in Canada could haul a twelve inch gun?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. As I said, I meant the number of horses which one commonly attaches to a gun carriage.

Mr. TALBOT. Probably the hon. gentleman meant a locomotive.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman I think has some connection with the militia. I have been out of the militia for a few years, but when I was in the militia we did not depend on locomotives to haul our guns, but upon the good sturdy men we had in those days.

Mr. TALBOT. I do not believe you had any twelve-inch guns then.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would like to revert to what brought me up originally, and that was the statement of the minister made in answer to another hon. member, that none of those guns had been moved. Now, I do not live at Victoria or at Esquimalt, and have not seen those guns, yet it was known to me that two of them had been removed at considerable expense, and I want to know how it is that no officer of the Militia Department was aware that a single one of those guns had been moved. And if two have been moved, how many more have been moved? The question was asked as to how many guns are there to-day. We are entitled to know more about this and to find out what has become of the other guns.

Mr. FOSTER. This is another case of Bill Miner.

Mr. BARNARD. Could the minister tell us how long it was before these guns were moved that the officers of the 5th Regiment, Canadian Artillery, resigned in a body because they could not get proper appliances for drilling? It was so stated in the Victoria press at the time. It may only be gossip, but the story is that the command was offered down the line until the last subaltern was reached and even he would not continue in the regiment. Can the minister give us any light upon the subject?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am afraid not, but I can get the information.

Mr. BARNARD. Would the minister know if such were the case?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I might have heard it, but I do not remember. I know there was a difficulty but I do not think it was anything so extreme as has been pointed out. As a matter of fact the commanding officer did not resign as far as I know.

Mr. BARNARD. No, he did not resign after the guns were sent. I should imagine that the matter would be present to the mind of the minister owing to the fact that protests from the officers of the regiment were coming into the department for two or three years before the matter was finally settled.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I think I remember that a question was put on the Order Paper by myself at the time at the suggestion of some one in British Columbia, and I received the answer that nothing was known about the matter at all at headquarters. If that is the case, I think the minister has had ample time to look into it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will look into it and give the answer. I know there was a difficulty, but I did not know it was so serious as my hon friend points out. Certainly the commanding officer did not resign.

Mr. BARNARD. Because these very guns that my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) speaks of were sent to the drill shed for the purpose of drilling. Upon cursorily glancing through the report and the memorandum which have been distributed I find, in two or three places, a reference to the fact that the large increase in expenditure was necessitated by the garrisoning of Halifax and Esquimalt. I find that the total cost of the maintenance of the permanent corps at Halifax for the last fiscal year was $761,000 in round numbers, and at Esquimalt $103,000, making a total of $864,138. The total increase for the maintenance of the permanent corps for 1907-8 was $923,700—about $50,000 more than the total cost of the two stations of Halifax and Esquimalt combined. It is also stated in the memorandum accompanying the estimates that it was necessary to increase the officers and men of the permanent corps by about 1,500, and that to carry out the duties imposed by reason of the taking over of the two garrisons of Halifax and Esquimalt required a total of 3,311 men. I take it that it did not cost any more to keep the original 1,500 during the year 1907-8 than it previously did; that is to say that the taking over of the two garrisons of Esquimalt and Halifax would not make any difference as regards the first 1,500, so that if you cut

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

the total expenditure in two for the maintenance of Esquimalt and Halifax you will then find that you have about $432,000 of additional expenditure, while the increase for maintenance is $923,000, which makes a difference of something over $500,000. That is a subject on which the minister might give us some information.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Would it not be better to proceed with the items? These are items of actual expenditure in regard to which comparisons can be made by reference to the Auditor General's Report. I shall endeavour to give all the information as far as I can.

Mr. BARNARD. It seems that this is the proper time to raise the question because the vote is a very general one, being for munitions of war.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, it is item 5, page 8—salaries.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The minister, with the consent of the committee, made a general statement and the discussion was general without any item having been called. At the close of the discussion it was intended to call the first item.

Mr. ROBB. So far the debate seems to have been confined to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who are in favour of the expansion of the military system in Canada. I feel I would be an unworthy representative of my constituency if I did not take advantage of this occasion to say that the people in the county I represent look with considerable disfavour upon any system which will tend to create and encourage in Canada what may be known as a military aristocracy. Now sir, this view possibly has been encouraged by the fact that for some reason or other the battalions from that part of the country had not been completed, with the result that when they arrived in Montreal they recruited them very largely from the wharf rats there. The military drill has been looked on as a sort of a joke. Possibly this is very largely due to the prevalence at the annual camps of the canteen. I submit to the Minister of Militia that the first thing necessary to encourage young men and especially farmers' sons to identify themselves with the militia, is to abolish the canteen at the drills because no mother who has a respect for her son, will permit that boy to go to the annual drills when she knows that the most he will learn will be to smoke cigarettes, drink whisky and mingle with the worst elements in the community. I offer this suggestion in no spirit of criticism of the estimates because it seems that the committee is unanimous in adopting the military policy as outlined by the minister. But I feel it is my duty, as a representative of the people of that part of the country, to point out to the minister one of the great obstacles to the encouragement of the right class of young men, the bone and sinew of the country, to attend the annual camps.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I agree with most of what my hon. friend (Mr. Robb) has said. I think that the fact that captains are not as careful as they should be in the selection of men to take into camp has done the militia a great deal of harm, and that very often the fact that notorious characters are known to be included in these companies has prevented the enlistment of more worthy young men, such as my hon. friend refers to, farmers' sons. I think a good deal of amendment has taken place in that regard, but there is room for more. With regard to the canteen, we have been doing what we can to prevent that nuisance. The regulations are of the strongest kind. In some of the camps, at any rate, the officers are honestly endeavouring to carry out these regulations, but my hon. friend knows how difficult it is to control the sale of liquor. Liquor is brought in though it is against the law to sell it in the canteen. It seems impossible to exclude it. I hope that in all, and I certainly know that in many, of the camps, all measures possible are being taken to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors.

Salaries, $111,690.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that the minister has brought in 47 from the outside service. Will he give us the names of these, with their duties and salaries?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The list I have shows that there were 47 in the temporary and 49 in the permanent list, making a total of 96.

Mr. FOSTER. You have, for instance, three in subdivision B of the first division. Who are these?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Col. Hurdman is the first one I come to. He was in the outside service, an inspector of gun carriages, &c. He was paid out of capital account voted for supplies of that kind. His salary was $2,400, and he is now at $2,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Was his salary raised before he was taken into the inside service?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. The next is J. W. Caldwell, who was paid out of the vote for salaries and wages. He is an inspector. The sum required for his salary will be $2,350. He was for years paid $2,250. The next is James Robertson, who died recently, and whose salary was $2,250. That vacancy has not been filled.

Mr. FOSTER. You have twelve in the second division, subdivision B. Who are they?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Lt.-Col. Brown, inspector of saddlery and leather goods, whose salary was $1,500 and who was paid out of the same vote as Col. Hurdman. He is now to receive $1,600.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Are these two officers receiving a percentage in addition to their salaries?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Lt.-Col. Brown was not increased in salary before being brought in?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. The next is George F. Davidson, paid out of 'Salaries and Wages,' ledger keeper in the accountant's branch. His salary is $1,550—no increase. In the Military Surveys, there are four: J. E. Brown, $1,300, increased to $1,350, but no increase before coming in; M. F. Phelan, $1,250, statutory increase to $1,300; A. H. Cranston, $1,200, statutory increase to $1,250. These are R. M. C. graduates. L. H. Sitwell is the next—$1,100, no increase before coming in, but his salary next year will be $1,150; G. A. Blouin, engineer service, $1,200, no increase before coming in, but salary to be $1,250, a draughtsman; D. Barry, $1,200, no increase: W. L. McLaren, $1,200, no increase; E. P M. White, clerk in the deputy Adjutant General's branch, $1,200, no increase; Wm Moeser, $1,050, no increase; R. W. Kinsman. $1,050, no increase.

Mr. FOSTER. None of these received an increase within six months before?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No .

Mr. FOSTER. And is that true with reference to the rest of these 47 who were brought in from outside?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What increases are there in the permanent force?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There are none this year except the statutory increases.

Department of Militia and Defence—contingencies, $10,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is a reduction in this item of $2,000, due to the fact that we were formerly paying out of it some clerks, and are not doing so now.

Militia and Defence—chargeable to capital —for purchase of ordnance, arms, lands for military purposes, reserve stores of clothing, equipment, &c., and to pay for construction of new rifle ranges, $1,300,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Was the whole of last year's appropriation spent?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, within $2,000.

Mr. DANIEL. How much of this appropriation is expected to be spent in ordnance?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have been spending for ordnance about $350,000 or $400,000, and for rifles, if the 10,000 contracted for are delivered, $250,000. The rest of the vote is for clothing, saddlery and some other things, and for rifle ranges and some land for rifle ranges.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the ordnance field guns or stationary guns?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Mostly 18-pounders.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Is that the new gun being adopted for field artillery?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, that is the gun adopted in England—the best gun in the world.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that the gun that was in evidence at Quebec?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. That was the 4·7 gun. This is a much lighter gun, a quick-firing breech-loading gun. It is easily moved from place to place, while the 4·7 gun could not be so readily moved.

Mr. DANIEL. Are the horse artillery as well as the field artillery armed with the 18-pounder?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think they are here. I think that in England they are armed with a somewhat lighter gun.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of the 18-pounder?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Nearly $5,000, with the limbers and everything connected with it.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to ask the minister if he is prepared to say how much land he thinks the government will require in the neighbourhood of Kingston for the rifle ranges, in addition to what they have already acquired?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The survey is being made at this moment, and I shall be able to tell the hon. gentleman in a few days.

Mr. EDWARDS. Has a value been placed on the land by any person appointed by the government for that purpose?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. I think I showed my hon. friend a valuation that had been made the other day. I think it was $40 an acre.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am aware that that offer was made, but it was made with these words inserted in the letter sent by the department: '$40, without prejudice.' I suppose that means that it is not a definite offer?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is a definite offer; but those words mean that if the gentleman who owns the land chooses to take $40 an acre, we are prepared to pay that, but if he does not, and we have to expropriate, then we will go into court and perhaps get it for $20.

Mr. EDWARDS. What is the name of the gentleman who put the valuation on this land for the government?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Mr. Mihel of Toronto. He is a gentleman connected with one of the loan companies, whom we employ to value for us in different parts of Ontario.

Mr. EDWARDS. I want to call the attention of the minister to another matter. By expropriating the land in the vicinity of Kingston, the government have taken it away from the township, and have thereby thrown a greater burden on the farmers of that township. That land contributed its share of the taxes towards the maintenance of the road running through their property, a main road running into Kingston. The government now owns the land on each side of that road, and I think it is only fair and right that they should do something to help to maintain it. I am led to take that view because of the fact that in the case of other government property—for instance, the property owned by the government in connection with Kingston penitentiary—although it is only on one side of the road, that road is maintained entirely by the government. The people of the township of Pittsburg, which is adjacent to Barriefield, feel that it is a hardship to them to be asked to maintain that road entirely, as it is used greatly for military purposes, especially at the time of the annual camp. It is therefore an advantage to the department to have this road in good shape. I would also call attention to the fact that the board walk, to the repairing of which I believe the government did contribute at one time, is used a great deal by the soldiery, not only those at the fort, but those at the camp, and I would ask the government to contribute something towards maintaining that board walk if not maintaining it entirely. My own opinion is that the government should maintain it entirely.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I agree with the reasonableness of the observations of my hon. friend. I cannot say to what extent we will go. I would require to have a report, but I entirely agree that we should contribute to the full extent of our share in using the road and our ownership on either side.

Mr. G. V. WHITE. I notice in the report of the Militia Council that, commenting on the Petewawa camp site, it refers to the fact that a few property-holders still require to be bought out, and in ten instances the department may be obliged to resort to expropriation as the owners refuse to come to reasonable terms although the department has tried in every way to meet their wishes.

The hon. minister will remember that a few weeks ago I brought to his attention the case of a resident of the township of Petewawa, Mr. Gustave Prange, who owns lots 5 and 6, consession 12. Mr. Prange informed me that the arbitrators, who were sent by the government some time ago to look into the valuation of these lands, had reported on this property and that the price set by them was in advance of that offered him by the government.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think he is mistaken.

Mr. G. V. WHITE. I would like to know in these ten instances what were the prices set by the arbitrators and those offered by the government.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will be glad to bring the whole case down to my hon. friend if he would like to read it. We have had a great deal of trouble and have done our best

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Does this item include the cost of the Ross rifles produced during the year?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. They are charged to capital account?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. What becomes of the rifles replaced by the Ross rifles—the Lee-Enfields? Is no value attached to them?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They are still being used. Owing to the fact that the Ross rifle has not been fitted with a bayonet, the Lee-Enfield has been used very largely. But in the last camp the Ross rifle was used exclusively for target purposes.

Mr. J. D. TAYOR. The Lee-Enfields when called in will not then be so much junk but will be available for use?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Certainly.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. We are heaping up a very large capital account for rifles. When the Snider rifles were retired, no doubt we charged to capital account what we spent on the Martinis. When these were retired, we charged the Lee-Enfields to capital account.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There never was a dollar charged to capital account on account of the militia until 1895-6, when the first Lee-Enfield were purchased. Before

that the rifles were given us by the British government.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. When we replaced the Martinis, the cost of replacing them was charged to capital ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. And now that we are replacing the Lee-Enfield with the Ross Rifle, we are charging that to capital?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In the other case, the rifle which was displaced was obsolete, but the Lee-Enfield is not. It is fit for service and will be kept in store, and we require a great many more rifles than are in actual use. Suppose our militia numbers 57,000, we should have 57,000 rifles all told; but in the event of any trouble our idea has been to have a force on the first line of 100,000 and we must have the balance of those rifles and should have a great many more. It will be a good many years before we will have anything like the number of rifles we require, as we require them for the clubs and schools.

Annual drill, $860,000.

Mr. ARTHURS. Representing one of those countries in which the local militia are at a great distance from the annual camp, I would like the minister to explain how he proposes to have rifle practice carried on when we have no target or ranges. Or will there be a special appropriation for that purpose?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In some communities, for instance, in the county in which I live, it is easy to extemporize a rifle range because there is a range of mountains running through the country and you can get a range withou difficulty free from danger. On the other hand we sometimes use gallery ammunition so that we can get a very good practice at a very short range.

Mr. ARTHURS. Is there any intention of having such arrangements made? For instance, if our battalion, the 23rd, were exercised or had their annual drill at the headquarters such a range might very easily be provided. I believe also it would be a good idea in these rural battalions to issue a certain amount of ammunition to each man irrespective of the annual drill at the camps. Sometimes at Niagara we find men who are known to be good shots but will have great difficulty in qualifying for the additional pay mentioned by the minister, largely owing to the fact that the rifle was inferior or incorrectly sighted, and these men had not a fair opportunity of testing the rifle before going into camp.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. These are all practical suggestions. I shall have this matter looked into, but I cannot say whether that regiment will train at regimental headquarters or not.

Mr. EDWARDS. Coming from Kingston, where it is customary to have an annual drill, I wish to express my appreciation of the minister's words of a few minutes ago in regard to controlling the sale of intoxicating liquors at the camps. I think his utterance should receive the approval of every member of the House and I am sure he will receive the endorsation of every person in this country if he takes the most rigorous means possible to put down drinking at these annual camps.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will do my best.

Mr. EDWARDS. I visited the camp at Kingston last year several times, and I say with regret that the exhibition there, even on Sunday afternoons, of drunkenness, fighting and brawling, was an absolute disgrace to the country. It seems to me that the soldiers, for we have thousands of soldiers there, ought to be able to control that situation.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS. If we call out to camp every year men or boys to make soldiers of them, and if they have not grit enough and stamina enough to control the camp grounds and get the upper hand of men who are disposing of liquor, I do not think they would be of much use if it came to actual service in time of war. What I and others saw there at the camp at Kingston last year was a reproach to this country, and I do not think we could do better than follow the example of that great soldier, Lord Roberts, who, I believe, is a cold water soldier. I am sure the people of Canada will back up the Minister of Militia in taking the most strenuous measures possible to put a stop to that sort of thing for all time to come, for I assure you again that the condition of things at Kingston last year was an absolute disgrace.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am very sorry to hear that but I am glad indeed that the hon. gentleman has made the statement, and I shall bring it to the notice of the Adjutant General, because I cannot help thinking that if the officers in charge of those camps are in earnest and mean business they can control this evil. I have been at the camp at Niagara on several occasions, and I never saw anything of the kind. Last year I attended several camps. At the camp in my own county I do not think there was anything of the kind, although years ago, at the Aldershot camp, there was a great deal

of it. I am more and more convinced that it depends on the officer in charge. If the officer winks at violations of the law there will be violations of the law. If he is sincere in his attempt to enforce the law, the law will, perhaps, not fully but very largely be enforced, certainly to the extent of preventing disgraceful scenes such as the hon. gentleman has referred to.

Mr. EDWARDS. I entirely agree with what the Minister of Militia has said, that the officers should be held responsible, and I believe he will be held responsible in this matter, and should be given to understand that those in authority over them expect them to exercise jurisdiction over the camp and keep these people within bounds.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That has been done over and over again.

Mr. EDWARDS. Any amount of liquor was disposed of, not merely given away, but sold. Proof of that is to be found in the fact that several persons were called before the magistrate, convicted and fined and their fines were paid. I know from my own observation that it was carried on last year in Kingston to a greater extent than I had ever seen it in any camp held there.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is no excuse for that, for in this very matter of the efficiency pay nothing is given to any soldier who improperly conducts himself either by drinking or in any other way, and this provision has had a wonderful restraining influence. I would like very much to know how many men in camp at Kingston received their efficiency pay and how many cases of this kind were reported. I shall see that inquiry is made into the matter, because it is simply scandalous that such a condition of things should exist.

Contingencies, $25,000.

Mr. EDWARDS. I notice on page 52 of the estimates an item for contingencies, miscellaneous and unforeseen expenses, including entertaining allowances. What does that mean?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. For the entertainment of visiting officers. For instance, there are frequent visits of foreign naval officers at Halifax, and sometimes at Esquimalt and Ottawa, and it is not fair to ask the resident officer, whose pay is not very large, to bear the expense of entertaining the visitor out of his own pocket. In Halifax, as I know, this is a considerable tax upon officers.

Gratuities, $2,500.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the minister ever taken the case of Private Molloy, who lost his eyes, into consideration?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend will be glad to know that the Patriotic Fund Association are taking that matter up now, and there will be a meeting next week in reference to it. The hon. gentleman will probably remember that the Act of incorporation of that Association was amended here a year ago in such a way that the members of the Association could vote by letter. The matter has been submitted to them, and I believe resulted in a tie. I think Sir Sanford Fleming is in hopes that at the meeting now coming on it will be decided to give a certain amount of the fund to Trooper Molloy.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is he likely to get a pension?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is my expectation.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister knows that his case deserves the consideration of the government almost more than any other.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. So far as I am concerned, I voted for it, and will do so again, and I hope he will get it.

Maintenance of military properties, $75,000.

Mr. EDWARDS. I think this is the item under which would come the money paid each year for the use of the Cataraqui bridge. Am I right in saying that the annual amount paid by the government for the use of that bridge is $1,400?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Now, I have it on pretty good authority that that bridge is at present of very little use. It is a wooden structure erected many years ago, and would be incapable of supporting the passage of heavy ordnance. I believe that no attempt will be made to take heavy cannon across that bridge, because it would not bear the strain; I think it would be liable to break down. Yet we are paying some $1,400 a year in rent for the use of that bridge. I want to suggest to the minister the construction of a new bridge from Barriefield across to Kingston.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Now it is getting interesting.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is an interesting subject to many people in that locality. Suppose you were to capitalize the annual amount you pay in rent it would represent a sum of $40,000 or $50,000, with which you could build a bridge that you could use free of rent. That would be practically the same thing as paying $1,400 a year, and the bridge would be available at all times. If unfortunately war should occur—of course we do not expect it—and you wanted to move troops across that wooden struc-

ture from Barriefield to Kingston, you would be in danger of breaking through into the water. I think a new bridge could be constructed there at a comparatively small cost. The lake has a good, hard bottom, and the water is comparatively shallow. I would also like to say to the minister that great advantage could be gained there by improving the channel of the Rideau canal. That would be an advantage to vessels, and it would also increase the harbour accommodation at Kingston. Hon. gentlemen who have visited Barriefield will remember that after you cross the bridge from Kingston there is quite a hill; that is government property. A couple of temporary tracks could be laid from that hill down to the bridge, the rock and stone material could be filled into the trucks, the loaded truck coming down to the bridge would carry the empty one back and with comparatively little expense a great portion of the bridge site could be filled in. I know that the city of Kingston owns a portion of the stock in the bridge, and I believe the government could come to terms with the city, construct a new bridge there and save money by the operation. While I do not like to suggest that convict labour should compete with free labour. I would call attention to the fact that near Kingston we have a penitentiary with a great many convicts in it, and I do not see why these convicts cannot be taken down to the neighborhood of the bridge and their services utilized for the purpose of filling in and reconstructing. I think that something along that line might be done and that convict labour might be employed to a partial extent in the work of reconstructing that bridge without very much fault being found by the general public. I trust that the minister will give this some consideration and I think that if it is considered from the standpoint merely of dollars and cents the government can afford to reconstruct that bridge. One thing is absolutely certain and that is that a new bridge will have to be constructed there very soon if you are going to have a crossing that will be of any avail for military purposes at all. Lumber is getting more and more expensive and I think the time is opportune to deal with those owning stock in the present bridge. You could look at the matter from the standpoint of the capitalization of the amount that you annually pay for the rent of the bridge, and, looking at it from a business point of view, I believe that that amount of money would more than construct a new bridge at Barriefield and give you something that would last for all time to come.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not know what the terms of the contract are. I suppose it is a very old contract. Is it a toll bridge?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If the bridge is in the condition which the hon. gentleman states, certainly it ought to be examined at once, and I will direct that an examination shall be made. As to what will be done, I should think that the propcsal would be a very reasonable one that the government and the city of Kingston should take this matter up together and see upon what equitable terms a new bridge might be constructed. At any rate, I would be open to take the matter up at any time and I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought it to our notice. I would be glad if he would address a communication to me, elaborating his views on the subject.

Mr. G. V. WHITE. I would like again to advocate the desirability of the Department of Militia and Defence establishing armouries at the different headquarters of the rural regiments. I am sure that this would have a tendency to keep the rural regiments in line and make the men take an interest in the work of the regiments. We have never had an armoury in Pembroke, but during the recent disastrous fire which visited that town a few months ago, we had the misfortune of losing our entire equipment. We had a couple of rooms rented there and everything went. At the present time we have no equipment to put in an armoury, but I would like to endeavour to prevail upon the minister to look into this matter and if at all possible have an appropriation made for the establishment of armouries at such points as this. I am sure it would tend very materially to strengthen especially the rural regiments.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I remember that my hon. friend and I discussed this matter across the floor of the House a year or two ago and I agree absolutely with every word he has uttered. It is a question of money. It should be done and it must be done. I am afraid that this is not a very good year to take the matter up, but I hope the revenue will be restored later on and that the matter may be taken up. In view of the fact of the great loss at Pembroke it would be a very convenient time to consider the erection of a building of that kind particularly as we have to issue a new equipment and I will be glad to look into the matter. I believe there is a small item of $50,000 in the estimates of the Minister of Public Works for the purpose of building armouries.

Mr. G. V. WHITE. I hope that the minister in view of the fact that we have had such a loss up there will put Pembroke among the first.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will do my best with the Minister of Public Works.

Militia and Defence—income—pay and allowances, $1,646,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Let that stand.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. All right. You may let the others go through with the understanding that anything can be discussed on this particular item.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On which item?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Pay and allowances. We will let that stand with the understanding that we can discuss the Royal Military College or anything else upon that item.

Item allowed to stand.

Warlike stores, $335,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. As to this item which is left standing, I would like the minister to give notice before he brings it up. Otherwise, he might come forward some night and say that, as only one item is to be voted, he would like to put it through.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will not take any advantage, whenever the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) objects.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not speak for myself alone, but on behalf of others who might like to discuss these matters. I would like the minister to give notice.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Quite so. I will remember that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have some inquiries and correspondence about tenders for the supply of breakfast bacon to the militia at Halifax. The matter has been discussed in the public press. The allegation has been made that the bacon supplied is not the article of bacon specified in the advertisement for tenders. I would like the minister to be prepared to discuss this matter when his estimates are again before the committee.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I was prepared to discuss it to-night, but it is hardly worth while to go into it now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The allegation is that tenderers are not on an equal footing, an article being accepted which was not called for. It is said that if the quality that has been accepted is to be accepted in in the future, every one should know it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I shall be prepared to discuss the matter.

Mr. CROSBY. Personally, I have no desire to interrupt the estimates for Militia and Defence, but I have every desire that we should put this matter beyond the gossip that has been going on in Halifax and that vicinity. I have many questions in regard to it which I wish to put to the minister and if he will be prepared to give that information, it will be satisfactory to us as well as to the people there.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will do my best.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. Continue in supply, taking up the estimates of the Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.50 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 10, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the London and Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the National Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 104) respecting the Thessalon and Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Smyth.

QUESTIONS.

BOAT HARBOUR, PICTOU COUNTY, N.S.

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

1. When was the work at Boat Harbour, Toney river, Pictou county, Nova Scotia, commenced?
2. How much has been the expenditure in each year since the work commenced?
3. What is the total expenditure to date?
4. Is the work completed? If not, what further sum, if any, is to be expended to complete ?

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

1. March 12, 1906.
2. 1905-06 . . . . . $ 4,727.55
   1906-07 . . . . . 2,103.11
   1907-08 . . . . . 758.05
   1908-09 . . . . . 1,793.02
3. $9,381.73.
4. Resident engineer reports that, in order to prevent the closing of the channel, it will be necessary to extend the piers, on each side, from time to time. Future expenditure will be according to length of protection work.

OROMOCTO WHARF.

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

1. What was the total cost of the new high water wharf at Oromocto, N.B.?
2. Was the work done under contract?
3. When was it commenced, and when completed?

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

1. $3,849.26.
2. No.
3. Commenced October 12, 1908; not quite completed.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE—COST OF COTTAGES.

Mr. EDWARDS asked:

1. What is the present estimated total cost of the 16 cottages constructed for the civil subordinate staff at Kingston R.M.C., including fittings, furnishings, &c.?
2. How many hot water boilers were purchased from Cluff Brothers for the said cottages, and what was the price of each?
3. What amount of money has been expended to date for any work, fittings or furnishings for which tenders were not asked, to whom and for what was such money paid in each case?
4. What is the amount of any work, fittings and funishings contracted for since the awarding of the original contract to Mr. Sullivan, for which tenders were not asked, and to whom and for what is the money to be paid in each case?
5. From whom were tenders received, and the amount in each case, for (a) alterations to main drain and lowering basement and inside drain, (b) change to pressed brick, (c) electric wiring and fixtures, (d) outside connections, and (e) heating?
6. Will the sum of $57,000 voted this session complete the cottages ready for use, or will a further sum be required?

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

1. $96,000.
2. (a) Four boilers with twin headers to each pair.

(b)	Four boilers	$ 950 00
	Two sets of twin headers	230 00
	Freight	50 40
		$1,230 40

3 and 4.

Boilers, Cluff Brothers	$1,230 00
Printing and advertising, Department of Printing and Stationery	423 46
Travelling expenses, T. W. Fuller	36 00
Architect's commission, H. F. Smith	1,331 14
Photographs, D. A. Weese	10 00
Cartage, Shedden Forwarding Company	3 60

5. (a) M. Sullivan .. 1,777 00
(b) M. Sullivan .. 1,700 00
(c) Haliday Electric Company 3,550 00
F. J. Birch .. 3,690 00
Newman & Spriggs .. 3,735 00
(d) Halliday Electric Company 145 00
(e) M. Sullivan .. 2,750 00
6. (a) Yes; (b) No.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED DREDGE AND CONTRACT WORK.

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

1. Has a government-owned dredge been employed during the past year on any work in Nova Scotia which was under contract?
2. If so, with whom, under what arrangement as to terms, what was the date of the arrangement, and what has been the outcome to date?

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

1 and 2. Dredge 'Canada' worked on excavation of site for spur pier at Digby, under contract dated 22nd May, 1908, with Messrs. J. E. and H. Bigelow, which did not provide for the dredging required. Material was found to be too hard for her machinery, so that work was given up on October 3 last.

TRADE COMMISSIONER AT SHANGHAI.

Mr. BARNARD asked:

1. Has the office of Trade Commissioner at Shanghai recently become vacant?
2. If so, has any new appointment been made to that office, and who has been appointed?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. The office has become vacant.
2. No appointment has been made.

WHARFS IN QUEENS AND SUNBURY.

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

1. What wharfs in the counties of Queens and Sunbury, N.B., did the Department of Public Works order the construction of in the month of September and October last?
2. Was there a departmental estimate of the cost? If so, what was it in each case, and what has been the expenditure to date on each?

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

		Estimated cost.	Expenditure.
1 & 2.	Chase's Point	$4,110 00	$ 538 60
	Maugerville	4,996 00	1,944 17
	McGowan's	2,750 00	1,245 16
	Oromocto	4,379 00	3,849 26

MR. T. P. FOLEY.

Mr. LAKE asked:

1. Is T. P. Foley in the employ of the Interior Department? If so, in what capacity and at what salary?

2. Where does he live, and does he carry on any other business outside of his work for the government? If so, what is the nature of the business?

3. What is the nature of the work he has done during the last year, and has the department received regular reports from him?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). No such person is employed in the Department of the Interior.

QUEBEC BRIDGE—PROPOSED SUBMARINE VIADUCT.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. Referring to the action of the Quebec Board of Trade as embodied in the following resolution:—

Resolved that the apparent advantages of the scheme for a submarine viaduct to replace the fallen Quebec bridge, submitted by Mr. J. S. Armstrong, C.E., of St. John, N.B., are sufficient, in the opinion of this meeting, to warrant it receiving earnest consideration from the Dominion government, has the Dominion government any official communication from the board of trade in reference to this matter?

2. Or has the attention of the government been otherwise called to Mr. Armstrong's proposal to substitute a submarine viaduct for the Quebec bridge scheme; and in either case has the government decided to take any action in the matter?

3. Has the government considered the advisability or necessity of constructing the Quebec bridge at a greater height above the river than the old bridge, say a clear 190 feet, and are the instructions to the engineers now at work to plan and provide for an increased height?

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

1. No.

2. No action is called for as the suggestion is utterly impracticable.

3. The whole question has been reported upon by the Board of Engineers. It has been decided to leave a clear height of 150 feet above high tide for a clear width of 600 feet in the centre.

N.T.R.—QUESTIONS OR DISPUTES WITH GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. Have any questions or disputes arisen between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Transcontinental Railway Commission, or the engineers of the company and the commission, as to the classification or alleged over-classification upon the eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway since the 28th day of April, 1908?

2. If so, (a) what is the nature of these questions or disputes, (b) to what section of the road do they relate, (c) when did they arise, (d) have they been adjusted, (e) what steps have been taken for their adjustment, and (f) what is the result?

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

1. Yes.

2. (a) Alleged over-classification. (b) Districts 'B' and 'F'. (c) From time to time since April 28 last. (d, e and f). Not as yet, but this and any prior disputes will be adjusted by the chief engineers of the commissioners and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and the third arbitrator (Mr. Collingwood Schreiber), who has been agreed upon by them as such, as soon as the snow has sufficiently gone to permit of an examination of the work.

CITY OF BRANDON—EXCHANGE OF LANDS.

Mr. STAPLES—by Mr. Roche—asked:

Has a patent been issued for section No. 6, township 5, range 7, W. 1? If so, to whom has it been issued? If not, why has the patent not been issued?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior): No, this section was granted by order in council of August 9, 1900, to the city of Brandon in exchange for certain lands conveyed to the Crown in connection with the Industrial School at Brandon, but at the request of the secretary-treasurer of the city of Brandon the issue of the patent was stayed.

AMOUNTS PAID TO PARTIES NAMED.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked:

What amounts were paid during the years 1903-4, 1905-6 and 1907-8 by the following departments: (a) Marine and Fisheries, (b) Railways and Canals, (c) Customs, (d) Post Office, (e) Militia and Defence, and (f) Public Works, to the following persons, firms and companies, viz.:—The Wilson Gas Buoys Company, the Canadian Fog Signal Company, James Murphy, William R. Blakiston, James Holliday, Allison Davie, J. B. Cote, Adolphe Huot, Joseph Samson, Samson & Philion, E. Pelletier, Napoleon Mercier, Severin Martel, Michel Thibodeau, Edmond Belanger & Co., Marier & Tremblay, Terreau & Racine, Rock City Tobacco Company, J. N. Martineau, George Marchand, Jean Drolet, Elie Amyot, Charles A. Parent, A. N. Melvin, W. G. Robertson, Wm. Robertson & Co., Howell & Co., St. John Iron Works, Charles McDonald, John A. Moore, Wm. J. Vroom, John A. McAvity, McAvity Bros., George McAvity, Patrick J. Mooney, Polson Bros., or Polson Iron Works, Merwin & Company, F. L. Brooks & Company, F. S. Brooks, Safety Company, Submarine Company, Wm. J. Allen, Mr. Willard?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). This should stand as a notice of motion for return.

MR. CHARLES F. BELL.

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

Under what conditions and for what reasons was Charles F. Bell dismissed from the

Department of the Interior in December, 1907?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The services of Mr. Charles F. Bell, a clerk in the Department of the Interior, were dispensed with on December 31, 1907, because of discourtesy to his superior officers and a refusal to obey orders.

LEVEL RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the sum of $200,000 each year for five consecutive years from the first day of April, 1909, be appropriated and set apart for the consolidated revenue fund of Canada for the purpose of aiding in the providing of protection, safety and convenience for the public in respect of existing highway crossings of railways at rail level, and that the said sum be placed to the credit of a special account to be known as 'The Railway Grade Crossing Fund,' and be applied under the authority of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been apprised of the subject matter of this resolution, has given his consent thereto and has recommended it to the careful consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES.

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

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I desire to call the attention of the government and of the House to a matter of very general importance in order to elicit from the government some idea of what they intend doing in regard to this matter, the Co-operative Bill, which was adopted in this House last year and met with defeat in the Senate. Let me briefly explain the facts in connection with this very important measure. Some years ago I called the attention of the government to the advisability of giving effect in this country to some such legislation as has been adopted in most European countries and in other countries throughout the world in order to encourage co-operation, as a means of affording relief to the working classes, the agricultural classes and poor people generally who are not in a position to combine into joint stock companies, the organization of which demands the expenditure at the very beginning of a very considerable amount of money. I pointed out at that time to the government some of the remarkable successes that had been obtained in Europe by co-operative credit and loan societies, and at that time my hon. friend the Finance Minister promised that attention would be given to this subject. Subsequently in one of the following sessions I introduced a Bill providing for the organization of co-operation in this country among the working classes and the farming classes and generally upon the lines adopted for the legislation in England, combining with it, as far as possible advantageous provisions which are found in continental legislation. The Bill was explained when introduced, discussed on its second reading and the second reading was adopted by the House without dissent. The session was then advanced and acting under the advice of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour further progress in regard to the measure was deferred until the following session. At the beginning of the following session the Bill was again introduced. Its provisions were widely made known throughout the country and the introduction of that legislation received the general approval of the press and of all people who had given any attention whatever to the co-operative movement throughout the world. The Bill was again discussed as to its principles upon the second reading, it was favourably viewed by this House, the second reading was carried and it was referred for examination to a select Committee of this House composed of those members who had taken a particular interest in its introduction, including the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Justice, and the two members in the House who were more particularly supposed to represent the labouring classes. I believe that most of the older members of this House have read the report of that committee. Its sittings extended over a considerable period and we had occasion to go fully into the question of co-operation, its necessity in this country, its utility and the details of the Bill. We heard witnesses of all kinds, men of eminent merit in regard to sociological subjects. We had the advantage of the testimony of His Excellency the Governor General. We also had agriculturists, financiers, the Deputy Minister of Labour who had given this matter very careful consideration and who furnished valuable information, Professor Shortt, and most of the principal employees of the Agricultural Department, in fact all the witnesses who could throw any light upon the subject. Their testimony was uniformly favourable to the passage of the measure we had under consideration. After the unanimous report of the committee upon that Bill, the government declared its intention of adopting the measure. I do not believe that any parliamentary committee throughout the

world has ever gone as fully into the question of co-operation as that Select Committee did. A committee in India has studied the question of co-operation at perhaps greater length and made a fuller report, but this report was ample, it seems to me, to justify the position which the government took at that time, in making it a government measure. The Minister of Labour took charge of the Bill which afterwards came up in its regular turn for third reading. It was considered in Committee of the Whole and gone into at considerable length by that committee. It was then adopted unanimously by this House. It was then sent to the Senate and there the then Secretary of State, acting for the government, took up the Bill, and I must say that the Hon. Mr. Scott gave the subject matter of that legislation very considerable attention. He took communication evidently from cover to cover of the extensive report of the Select Committee of this House. The Bill was read the first time and explained by him in the Senate, read the second time and discussed and the principle of the Bill I believe was adopted without any dissentient voice. It was then sent to the Committee on Banking and Commerce of the Senate in order that certain representatives of the provinces and the secretaries of the Retail Merchants Association might be heard in regard to it.

The Bill remained in the committee of the Senate for four months. There were hearings of different parties; several of us who took great interest in the advancement of that legislation were heard and so were the representatives of the retail associations. I may say here that a very singular misapprehension as to the object of that legislation seems to have existed from the very beginning in the minds of those who were advancing the interests of the Retail Merchants Association. Very far from considering that measure as one to be enacted in the interests of the working classes, in the interest of the agricultural classes, and of poor people generally, they got it into their heads that the object of this legislation was to introduce into this country, in a disguised form, a vast aggregation of European capital in order to stifle the legitimate commerce of this country. How that idea happened to take possession of these people I do not know. I can only attribute it to the fact that there are in England two or more joint stock companies bearing the name of co-operative associations. I refer to the Civil Service Co-operative Stores and to the Army Stores, not co-operative in the sense in which we understand it, but joint stock companies properly so-called, declaring dividends, having a distribution of shares like all joint stock companies and never having been admitted, having, in fact, been refused admission to the co-operative union of England which gathers under its protection all the co-operative associations, properly so-called, of the British Isles. However, it may be that that opinion was entertained here, it found forcible expression by the representatives of the Retail Merchants Association before the committee of the Senate. We, who are anxious to establish the facts, sought vainly to persuade the members of the committee that this was an entire misapprehension and misunderstanding. There were also heard before the committee of the Senate, representatives from the province of Quebec and of the province of Ontario. Mr. Mulvey, assistant Provincial Secretary of Ontario, urged strongly at that time that there was legislation in Ontario providing fully for the organization of just such co-operative societies as we had in view, and which was then under consideration. The views expressed there by Mr. Mulvey seemed to have prevailed with the committee of the Senate, although he was undoubtedly mistaken, and since these events have transpired a co-operative society here in Ottawa that has sought to be organized under the laws of the province of Ontario has found that there is no legislation in Ontario providing for such an organization, and they have been promised, I believe, by the government of that province, that some relief would be afforded them by legislation to be introduced during the present session. The Bill, Mr. Speaker, came back to the Senate after this long delay and towards the close of the session. The committee reported that they recommended that the preamble of the Bill be not adopted. It was pointed out in the discussion which took place in the Senate and to which I will refer briefly——

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) will allow me I would point out that it is irregular to refer to a debate in the Senate. Bourinot says:

It is a part of the unwritten law of parliament that no allusion should be made in one House to the debates of the other chamber, a rule always enforced by the Speaker with the utmost strictness.

He adds, however :

It is perfectly regular, however, to refer to the official printed records of the other branch of the legislature, even though the document may not have been formally asked for and communicated to the House.

Mr. MONK. What I was going to say applies to past debates as I have often heard past debates of the Senate quoted in this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule seems to make no distinction and I thought I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to it.

Mr. MONK. At any rate, by your ruling, I will be permitted to refer to the official decisions of the Senate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I venture to suggest that the rule does not apply to debates of past sessions in the Senate any more than it applies to such debates in the House of Commons. As a mater of fact, it has been the constant practice in this House to refer to debates in the Senate and any enforcement of the rule would prevent a single reference to the many valuable opinions expressed by the members of the Senate from confederation down to the present time. That would seem to be an extreme view. For example, in the debate upon the Autonomy Bill in 1905, there were constant references to the debates which had taken place in the Senate in 1872 or 1873, and all these references took place without the slightest objection and without the slightest idea that any hon. gentleman so referring to them was out of order. I would venture to think that the rule has not the wide application which is sought to be given to it.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps the rule respecting past debates in the House of Commons and the rule respecting debates in the Senate have different objects. The rule respecting past debates in the House is designed to prevent the repetition of a matter which the House has already dealt with. The rule respecting debates in the Senate is on the higher ground of protecting the proper privileges of the Senate, but an evasive manner is sometimes adopted in order to discuss past debates of the Senate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would not be inclined so to regard it. The real object of the rule is to prevent members of the House of Commons answering arguments which have been addressed to the Senate in the same session, when matters of a similar nature might be under consideration in both Houses at the same time. It might be extremely inconvenient and probably undignified that any such course as that should be adopted. Any reference to a debate in the Senate must be respectful, must not lack in that proper respect which is due to a co-ordinate branch of the legislature. Subject to that I never knew that there could be any possible objection to referring to a debate which had taken place in the Senate in a former session.

Mr. FIELDING. It is raised by an evasion, by a reference to another place.

Mr. SPEAKER. Bourinot also says :

> Members sometimes attempt to evade this rule by resorting to ambiguous terms of expression—by referring, for instance, to what happened 'in another place.'

I have no intention of being more severe than is necessary, but I thought it was my duty to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to what seems to be the proper practice.

Mr. MONK. I will not attempt to evade your ruling, Mr. Speaker; in fact, I may say that it saves me the trouble of calling to the attention of this House some opinions expressed in the other Chamber that would cause a good deal of surprise to members of this House who have given some attention to constitutional questions. It appears from the very nature of the proceedings held in the Senate that a certain number of these hon. gentlemen took the trouble to study the report of the Select Committee in this House upon that important subject, whereas some others thought they could effectually dispose of this important measure without giving themselves the trouble to study the matter at all. The then Secretary of State gave the matter much attention in the Senate and supported the measure in pursuance of the policy adopted by the government, and Senator Beique, of Montreal, suggested some important amendments intended to remove all doubt as to the constitutionality of our legislating in the matter. There was placed before the Senate at that time an opinion which had been, shall I say attempted to be obtained, from the Minister of Justice, as to the constitutionality of this measure, and in that opinion, which forms part of the records of parliament, the Minister of Justice said:

> I recognize that it is my duty as official legal adviser of the Governor General and legal member of His Majesty's Privy Council for Canada to advise the Crown upon all matters of law referred to me by the Crown, and to advise the heads of the several departments of the government upon all matters of law connected with such departments, but it would seem to me presumption on my part to offer advice to either House of parliament or to a standing committee of the Senate, especially when among its members there are many honourable and learned gentlemen more competent than I to form an opinion upon any doubtful matter of law.
>
> Moreover the Bill referred to has been passed by the House of Commons and in that view it would ill become a member of that House to question the constitutional power of parliament to enact legislation of this character.

There is no doubt that a very strong lobby was resorted to in the upper House for the defeat of that measure, and I have heard since with much approval strong condemnation of that system of lobbying particularly as applied to the other Chamber. At any rate, the final result of the discussion upon the motion made in the Senate that this singular conclusion at which the Committee on Banking had arrived should not be adopted by the Senate, but that the Bill should be referred to the

Committee of the Whole for further examination was defeated by a vote of 19 to 18. The preamble of the Bill, as the Secretary of State had seen fit to alter it, simply declared that it was desirable in order to promote the interests of the working and agricultural classes of Canada to provide them with a legal method of organizing into co-operative societies. I may state for the information of the House, and it is well known to the government, that since the subject of co-operation has become a live issue in this country many people interested in the public welfare have endeavoured to promote legislation of this kind. The Labour Congress of Canada at its annual convention has been for some years passing resolutions in favour of this legislation. Similar resolutions have been adopted at meetings of clergymen of all denominations, and many other economic associations have taken a warm interest in the matter. It is not surprising then that the action of the Senate caused very great dissatisfaction among the members of the labour congress, and at the last annual meeting held in Halifax in September last the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Moved by delegate Adam Anderson of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners of Montreal:

That this congress views with profound astonishment the colossal ignorance of the Dominion Senate of the modern conditions of economic progress, in opposing co-operation which has been established in Britain, France and Germany for fifty years with such distinguished success in cultivating the highest qualities and developing the highest ideas of citizenship.

Be it resolved that this congress demands that the Dominion government should incorporate in our laws the inalienable right of our people so to combine.

Concurred in unanimously.

I have only to add this: At the beginning of this session a pamphlet was circulated among the members of this House, which purports to emanate from the secretary of the Retail Merchants' Association, whose office is in the city of Toronto, and that pamphlet is entitled: 'The system adopted by co-operative societies exposed. How the people are deceived by so-called co-operative societies.' I shall not take up the time of the House by quoting at length from that pamphlet, but I must say that it displays a very extraordinary degree of ignorance in regard to the success of the co-operative movement on the continent of Europe. Everybody knows that that movement has been attended with marvellous success; that at the present moment the greatest efforts are being made in England to extend it; and that in Ireland the efforts of Sir Horace Plunkett in the direction of agricultural co-operation have changed the entire economic aspect of that country. I cannot qualify this pamphlet otherwise than as a scurrilous document. It casts very grave reflections on the attitude taken by this House with regard to that measure. It states that the measure had been surreptitiously forced through the House and that it did not receive from the House of Commons that treatment which I must say in my long experience as a member this House always accords to measures of this importance. Then, this pamphlet caps the climax by alleging that the object of the legislation was to advance my own interests and the interests of those who manifested some concern in the progress of this legislation. The pamphlet further states that my object as a member of this House in promoting the legislation was in order that I might become an officer of a joint-stock co-operative society organized in my own province. I have never thought it worth while until now to deny that statement. I deny it now. In the expectation that this measure would not meet with defeat in the Senate, numbers of working men in my own constituency in the city of Montreal were prepared to organize societies. In my own constituency one was actually organized and has since been legalized under the incomplete provincial legislation which we have upon this subject, and I consented to become the honorary president of that society. That is the extent of the financial interest which I have had in this great movement in connection with which not one of those who took any interest in it had any financial consideration in view, I am sure. The pamphlet goes on to allege that His Excellency the Governor General, who himself appeared as a witness before the committee of investigation in our House, had some financial motive, inasmuch as he had been president of the Co-operative Union of England, a union which, as everybody knows, has no financial operations in view at all, but merely the promotion of ideas favourable to the spread of co-operation.

There is much more I might insist upon, but I do not wish to take up the time of the House. The question is, what is the government going to do? I think the government, since the idea of this legislation was mooted, has taken a fair and prudent position in regard to it. Is it going to be said that a law desired by everybody who knows anything of co-operation throughout the Dominion of Canada, asked for by resolutions and deputations of all kinds, asked for by the congress of labour, approved of generally by the people throughout the Dominion—is it going to be said that a law of that kind is going to be defeated by the action of nineteen members of the Senate, who it is evident have not bestowed upon the question the attention which it deserves? I hope not. I think the govern-

ment should courageously persist in its course, re-introduce the measure, make it as perfect as possible, and place this country upon the same footing as other countries in regard to this important movement. It has been alleged that the provinces have jurisdiction in this matter. In regard to the formation of societies for certain objects purely local, the provinces might be considered to have jurisdiction; but the point insisted upon at all times when this legislation has been considered, has been that without the benefit of banking operations, we cannot have co-operation in its true and legitimate field of beneficent work. That feature can only be conferred on co-operation through the instrumentality of this legislation. It has been argued, I think very properly, that this being legislation essentially for the benefit of workingmen and the agricultural classes throughout the Dominion, we have jurisdiction to legislate in favour of these classes and to give them the benefit of a cheap and easy mode of organization in co-operative societies. I believe that view was shared at the time by the Minister of Justice, who was present in our committee, and suggested some improvements in the Bill as it was first received in the committee. That view was strongly pressed on the senators; and if hon. members will take the trouble to read the debate that took place in the Senate when the Bill was finally disposed of, they will find that no valid or real argument was put forth against that view. Under these circumstances, I hope the government will take the measure up once more, and I have confidence that the Upper House will not again in this important matter seek to defeat the will of the people.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say just a word or two on this very important question. The hon. gentleman has always been a very ardent apostle of the principle of co-operation in this House, and I must probably attribute to him the fact that the Bill which I introduced last year was so unanimously adopted by the House of Commons. The government has not wavered in its view of the usefulness of the co-operative movement. Last year the government decided to take up this measure and pass it. It was not at first a government measure, but it became a government measure after the report of the special committee appointed to deal with the question. When the Bill went to the other Chamber, it met with very persistent opposition at the hands of some senators belonging to both sides of politics. Views, and very strong views, were expressed against the jurisdiction of this parlament to deal with this question, and the senators who held those views were reinforced by the very active opposition which came from the retail merchants of the Dominion.

Let me say at once that favourable as I am to the principle of this Bill—and I recognize the very many advantages that can be derived from such a measure by the labouring classes—yet I have been impressed since last year with the very strong feeling —it may be a prejudiced feeling—which exists in some parts of our community against the passing of this measure by the federal parliament. I have not wavered from the position I took last year, and I shall be quite ready to support a Bill of the same nature in the House; but there is such a thing as provincial rights, and in my opinion, which I believe is the opinion of the majority of the members of this House, we must respect not only what we term provincial rights, but even provincial prejudices. It is my opinion that this parliament has complete jurisdiction in this matter; but we find that the largest and wealthiest province of the Dominion, the province of Ontario, with another large province, the province of Quebec, represented by their executive, strenuously opposed the passing of this measure when it reached its final stage in the Senate last year. Now, the two Attorney Generals of Ontario and Quebec may be wrong, and I do not discuss the opinion which they expressed last year through their respective representatives before the Senate; but I say it is the duty of this government to respect not only what they assert to be their rights, but even what we may think are only their prejudices. At all events that is my view on the broad question of provincial rights. It may be that within a few months, the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, represented by their respective governments, after careful study of this measure, may come to the conclusion that it is one which ought to become law. I may say to my hon. friend that my sympathies are with this movement, but we must admit that the sentiment in favour of co-operation is not yet very pronounced throughout the Dominion. I however am pleased to see that it is perhaps more developed in the province of Quebec than in any other. Although to a certain degree the principle of co-operation has been adopted in certain centres of the province of Ontario, it has not yet become accepted as a general principle in the country at large.

As Minister of Labour, I have received no petitions from the great provinces of the west or from the maritime provinces, but I have received a limited number from the province of Quebec and a few from the province of Ontario. I myself am in favour of the principle, but as the two large provinces are actually opposed to the passage of this measure, I think we can let the matter stand until some progress in education on the subject has been made. The discussions which took place before the select committee and those which took

place in this House last year and in the Senate will no doubt contribute towards the passing of this measure finally in a few months hence. I rose simply to say that my sympathies are still with the principle of co-operation, but that a little delay will not hurt this measure after all, and any legislation we may pass will not be only for a year or two, but will be for ever if once the principle of co-operation is admitted by both Houses.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The history of this question of co-operation embodied in the legislation of last session has been thoroughly given by my hon. friend who introduced the measure. As a member of the select committee on that subject, and having had some considerable experience with the movement in the old country, I may say that I was very much disappointed at the attitude taken by the Senate last year. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has suggested that the question of provincial rights may have entered into the consideration of this matter. I am not aware that any consideration of the rights of the provinces to enact legislation of this kind was seriously debated in the Senate at all. It is true that the representatives from Ontario and Quebec who met the select committee of the Senate questioned the right of the Dominion government to enact such legislation. No doubt the distributive principle of co-operation is a matter of provincial right and one which the provinces have exercised. In Nova Scotia they have an Act providing for co-operative societies in the distribution of goods to their members. In British Columbia they have the same law and also in Ontario. But the question of banking the profits of co-operative distribution was never supposed to be provided for by provincial legislation, and the object of this Bill is to provide for banking privileges by Dominion legislation. The object of the legislation is to make it possible for any association, in the distribution of goods to its members, to have the banking profits in the sale of these goods, and every authority consulted on this legislation has declared it was necessary to come to this House to get that kind of legislation. I just want to say that it is a surprise to me, after eighty years experience in Britain—for it is eighty years since similar legislation was passed in England by the voluntary associations co-operative movement—to find in this country objection to a principle enacted and put in operation eighty years ago in the old country. A lobby and agitation against the movement was organized by the retail dealers, particularly of Ontario, or it may be perhaps the Dominion organization. There was a similar agitation of England retail dealers some twenty-five years ago against the enactment of similar legislation. But the principle is plain and easy. If half a dozen men are entitled to have special legislation to co-operate their wealth for the purpose of carrying on a certain business and supplying the needs of the public in the operation of that business, has not the public the right to provide its own needs? Why should it not have legislation to supply its own needs as effectively as a limited liability company or other organization? It would be interesting, if I thought it reasonable to occupy the time of the House in so doing, to discuss the industrial and sociological benefits of the principle of co-operation in Great Britain. Every man has the right to study that for himself, but the right to have social organizations to carry on commerce of this kind and invest their own profits is a legitimate one. I do not know what the government will do. It would be unseemly to take the Senate by the throat and make them do what we think they ought to do, but in that connection I noticed a little hesitation on the part of the Postmaster General regarding the authority of this parliament, which I do not think he showed as a member of the select committee years ago. It looked as if he were on the down grade on this question.

Last year, as a member of the select committee, my hon. friend was present and supported the Bill enthusiastically, and, if I am not mistaken, combatted the contention that this parliament had no right to enact legislation of this kind. The question as to the right of this parliament to deal with legislation covered by the banking clauses of this Bill was never a serious question before that select committee, and, certainly, no doubt was expressed in that committee as to that right. I hope the Dominion government will realize the importance of this measure and take the responsibility of using every legitimate influence to secure its enactment. Even suppose for one moment that it is entirely, exclusively, within the jurisdiction of the provinces to legislate on the subject of co-operative societies established to distribute goods among their members, the fact remains that there can be no successful co-operative movement which has various forms in various provinces; the co-operative movement, in order to be successful, must be a national movement, it must be free to extend its operation to every part of the country. The history of the co-operative movement in England has demonstrated that fact. There, they have federal legislation and rights that cover the whole country. And, in my experience, it is utterly impossible for the co-operative movement to exist and be successful unless it has the necessary federal legislation whereby it can operate throughout the whole Dominion. I merely wish to say these few words in support of this Bill, and if this government can do

anything to promote and influence the Senate to pass it, I think they should use their influence to that end.

DESTITUTE IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. JOSEPH RUSSELL (East Toronto). I wish to bring to the notice of members of this House an article which appeared in the Toronto 'Evening Telegram' of March 8 in regard to immigration to this country:

Immigrant Tide Again — Three Hundred strike City—Pitiful disappointment at the Union Station — Some go on to Western Ontario, but many remain here.

About 300 immigrants from the old land arrived at the Union Station this morning. Two hundred and eleven arrived by special C.P.R., and 100 came through by the Grand Trunk. Many who arrived by the C.P.R. remained in Toronto, while the balance, with those of the G.T.R., will be distributed in the western towns of Ontario.

Have Little Money.

There was scarcely $100 in the party that remained in Toronto. One man had $50 of this. The British Welcome League took charge of about 15 families, and will provide for them until they are placed.

A few friends who have been in Canada for about a year met the party, and when they informed the strangers that there was no work here they appeared very much disappointed.

One man with a wife and six children, when told this, wept, because he had no money. He came out here, he said, because they told him in the old country that he would not be in Canada 24 hours before he would have lots of work. This man did not have a dollar.

A number of the men round the Union Station provided the children with breakfast.

I suppose there must be some government department that is responsible for this condition of things, and I think the House is entitled to an explanation.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of Interior). Unfortunately, I was not able to hear what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) said at the beginning of his remarks. I take it that there is complaint that a number of immigrants arrived who were not possessed of the amount of money required by the regulations. I can only say that the statement will be given full consideration and an inquiry will be made. I beg to assure my hon. friend and the House that it is our intention to see to it that the regulations are complied with.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister to a despatch concerning an alleged conditional ratification of the International Waterways Treaty by the United States Senate. I do not know whether this despatch has been brought to the right hon. gentleman's attention or not.

Washington, D.C., Mar. 4.—Senator William Alden Smith of Michigan won another brilliant victory to-day when the Senate ratified the Canadian Boundary and Waterways Treaty with a resolution attached to meet his objections. This action is considered in Washington as insuring to Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., her rightful share of the available water-power in St. Mary's river.

The fight over the waterway question in regard to the Soo proposition has been the subject of bitter controversy at times, and the Michigan senator was pitted against some of the strongest debaters of the upper House, but he won his point after fighting stubbornly and bringing into play a diplomacy that even his best friends did not believe him capable. The victory has placed him without doubt in the ranks of the legislative leaders at the Capitol. He is a force to be reckoned with.

The first part of the despatch is the part to which I wish to call attention. I would ask the Right Hon. the Prime Minister if he is aware that, in the ratification of that treaty there was attached any resolution or limitation such as is stated in the despatch Naturally, we who are so much interested in the development of the water-power, and wish to conserve all that belongs to Canada. are very anxious to know exactly what has been done.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I may inform my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) that the information contained in the despatch is, I will not say in all particulars but in its essential points. accurate. The treaty has been ratified, but with a rider which materially interferes, as I understand it, with the disposition of the water in the St. Mary's river. The question rests there at the present time. I may say that the treaty, though passed by the Senate has not been ratified by the Sovereign of this country. We are this very day sending a despatch to England to have the treaty laid on the table of the House, so that parliament may know exactly what are its terms. I hope to have this before many days are over.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Has the Minister of Agriculture the remaining schedules with regard to the flat increase of $150 to the civil servants?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I believe that the schedule for the House of Commons is about ready to be laid on the table. The Senate schedule I have not yet received. Until I get both of these, I cannot go on. The schedules for

all the departments are prepared—have been for some time.

Mr. FOSTER. It appears that the legislative body itself is the one that is retarding legislation. What is the trouble?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know that I can lay the blame on anybody—if there is any blame. The Speaker and the clerk have been working on the schedule, and it was referred to the Committee on Internal Economy. That body has dealt with it, and I understand that it is now ready to be laid on the table.

Mr. FOSTER. I may state to my hon. friend that to-morrow, before we go into Supply, I propose to make a short statement with reference to what I consider certain irregularities and injustices in the administration of the new Civil Service Act. I shall not propose a motion, but simply make a statement.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—ELEVATORS.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a matter relating to this House which should be remedied. This morning I came here to go to the restaurant for my breakfast at the usual hour, 8.30, and found the elevator to the restaurant out of business. After waiting some ten or fifteen minutes I went round to the other elevator at the main entrance but it was not running. I saw the chief messenger, Mr. Dubé, and he told me they did not start the elevator until nine o'clock, that the Public Works Department did not send the man here until that hour. I waited until about nine o'clock when the one at the dining room was put in operation. It seems a pity that these elevators should not be started before nine o'clock in the morning. The men in the Public Works Department should start work at seven o'clock as other labouring men do and the elevators should commence to operate at that hour. It was out of order this morning when the committee met and we had to use the Senate elevator. No one wishes to climb three flights of stairs to go to his breakfast. The Minister of Public Works should look into the matter and see that the service is improved.

Mr. J. D. REID. The elevator at the main entrance has been out of order a couple of times this session, and last year it fell several times so that a number of members narrowly escaped injury. An elevator that gets out of order every few days should be specially inspected in order to avoid accidents.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I am not complaining about the elevator not running before eight o'clock, as it would be of little use to me, but I wish to emphasize what the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) has said. The elevator at the main entrance is hardly a safe one, it is out of commission almost every day. The engineer in charge is constantly attempting repairs to it but he does not seem to be successful. The Minister of Public Works should at once call in competent men and see that the elevator is made safe; it is not safe now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall see that attention is given to the matter.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Annapolis harbour improvements, ice piers, $45,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Of this amount $25,000 is a revote. The object of this improvement is to arrest the flow of ice into the harbour and so permit shipments from Annapolis in the winter season. There are to be a number of piers with substructures of close-faced, stone-filled cribwork, and concrete superstructures in the Annapolis river.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this the winter port business?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The same matter that we discussed last year.

Mr. FOSTER. The port being some miles above Annapolis.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, Annapolis is quite a shipping port.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been one so far? Last year we did not get any very definite information as to the utility of, and consequently the necessity for, this outlay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend is in error. At the last session of parliament I quoted from reports in the House showing what it was hoped to accomplish by this work, and I was of the opinion that I convinced the majority of the committee that the work was necessary. Since that time tenders were called for the work but nothing has been done and we have determined upon calling for new tenders. An advertisement is now in the newspapers calling for new tenders for the work, so that all we have actually done is to purchase the creosoted timber.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the trouble with the old tenders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contractors refused to sign the contract.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the figures?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The tender was $34,400. The lowest tenderers were Reid and Archibald, of Halifax, but when we called upon

them to sign the contract they declined to do so unless we would insert a clause binding the government to assume certain risks as to the work. We declined to alter the terms of our proposed contract, they declined to sign it, and it was necessary to call for new tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. It is unusual for a contractor to refuse to sign a contract unless the government would assume the risks. What reasons did they advance?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be the risk of the work being destroyed during construction. An ordinary contract requires that the work must be completed by the contractor and we declined to accede to the wishes of the contractor.

Mr. FOSTER. That again raises the question as to what are the particular difficulties there. If there is such a menace that the contractor wishes to ensure himself, is not that a very great menace to the works after they are completed? There must be some abnormal conditions which are different from those at most places. I should think it would tend to make the whole thing risky even after the contractor had got it off his hands.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The engineers do not think so. They think that the work when once completed will stand all right. There was a second tender, that of H. M. Putnam and F. W. Clark, who did not insist upon any such condition in the contract, and who would have been willing to have taken the contract without it.

Mr. FOSTER. What were their figures?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Their tender was on the basis of a force account with ten per cent added.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister objected to that form of tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister any of the correspondence showing what the would-be contractors thought to be the extraordinary elements entering into this work and which they thought constituted the risk?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not, but my recollection is that they expressed the opinion that there might be difficulty in completing the work; that is to say, that during the progress of the work and before it had been completed, it might be destroyed by the action of the tides, and they wished a condition put in that the risk should be assumed by the government. With regard to the other question, the opinion of the engineers is that when the work is once completed it is as likely to stand as any ordinary harbour work.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister give us the particulars of the tender, showing just what the tenderer proposed to do? I have not in my mind a very clear idea of what this structure is and the terms of the tender would make that clear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will draw my hon. friend's attention to the contract, which provides for three piers just a little above the harbour of Annapolis.

Mr. FOSTER. In the river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, in the river. I suppose it can be called the harbour; it is just above Annapolis.

Mr. FOSTER. Do these three piers extend across the river the whole distance?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The whole scheme is to build either eight or ten piers—I am not quite sure—which are to extend all the way across the river. These three piers are to be built first at an estimated cost of $34,400. In addition to that there is the cost of creosoted timber, amounting to $12,619.24. That would make a total estimated cost of $47,019.24, besides which there are some other charges of superintendence, &c., amounting to about $3,400.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be about $50,000 for the three piers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimated cost is $50,000 for the three piers.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it is proposed that there shall be ten piers? That means that your total cost will be $160,000 or $170,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimated total cost of ten piers is $123,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Three of them cost about $50,000, but whether some of them are larger than others I do not know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think some of the others are somewhat smaller.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be that they are, but the minister has not determined that in his own mind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have the engineer's estimate of $123,500 for the ten piers.

Mr. FOSTER. To which we pay a certain amount of deference, but we always find in the end that it is exceeded. Does the minister feel justified in taking $160,000 of the people's money to construct ice piers above the harbour in the Annapolis river? What are the advantages set forth to the minister that has brought him to embark upon that expenditure of public money at this particular time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to the hon. gentleman that the understanding with regard to the building of this pier was arrived at before I became minister. That understanding was arrived at after very careful consideration, after very careful surveys and after it had been determined that

the work would be a useful one. What I had to do when I became minister was to endeavour to carry out the understanding which had been arrived at. I made inquiry with regard to the work and I was convinced that there would be a justification for it. Annapolis is an important shipping point. The shipments from there of lumber, apples, and other products, I believe, are quite large. It is believed that by the construction of these ice piers the river at Annapolis—what, perhaps, might not improperly be called the harbour of Annapolis—would be greatly improved, that these piers will form a barrier against the drift ice that comes down with the tide in the winter season and that the harbour will be kept open during the winter. I believe that from Annapolis down to the mouth the river is open in the winter time; so that it is expected that vessels will be able to come there with safety in the winter season.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister says that he feels convinced, but he has not said anything to the committee to convince it that we should vote the amount of money which we are asked to vote and which will involve an expenditure of $160,000 or $170,000. He speaks of winter navigation. What are the possibilities of winter shipment out of Annapolis? One other point and it is this: The minister said that he found that his predecessor had practically come to an agreement; therefore, he did not consider that he ought to revise it. An agreement with whom? It seems to me that the public interest is paramount and that a minister, coming in and finding that an arrangement is under way, is not bound to carry out that arrangement, unless it is interprovincial or international, or something of that kind. The main point is to find out what it is proposed to do. If there is the possibilities of making Annapolis a winter port we might expend $160,000 or $170,000 upon it. But at this particular juncture in our history does not the minister think that this is one of the things that might wait for a year, wait for two years, wait for a century for that matter?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I have not the local knowledge with regard to this work that would probably satisfy the curiosity of my hon. friend, but I recall very clearly a delegation from the county of Annapolis visiting Ottawa some few years ago, and among the members of that delegation who were especially anxious that this work should be undertaken by the government and who canvassed the support of all of us from Nova Scotia was Mr. Geo. E. Corbett, Conservative candidate in Annapolis in the last election. I am quite sure that that gentleman was very earnest in his advocacy, and that he felt convinced that he was asking the government, through the Department of Public Works, to inaugurate something that would be of great public benefit to the county and to the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. FOSTER. We were told with reference to that famous Aylesworth ditch that Liberals as well as Conservatives had asked for it and it was supposed that settled the whole question. Does it make one pin's difference whether the demand for a public work is made by Liberals or Conservatives? Is not the real question: Is this an expenditure absolutely necessary in the public interest and if not absolutely necessary is it such an advisable expenditure that in these hard times we should take $170,000 of the money of the people for it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only one-third of that at present.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister is enough of a business man to know that if he commences to build a house he has to keep in mind the total expenditure and not the cost of the cellar wall which he may begin with. There are hundreds of instances in which expenditures have been cut off this year because the debt is increasing, the interest charge jumping by the millions, and the treasury depleted. I venture to say that no solid interest will be affected to the extent of anything worth considering if this work is left over until we get so much money that we want to waste it as we have been doing for some years past. At this period it is an outrage to be called upon to spend that amount of money on the harbour of Annapolis in the way of ice piers, and probably provincial bridges afterwards.

Mr. PICKUP. I may say that about thirty miles from Annapolis the Drummond Company have a large iron proposition and they wish to bring their iron to Annapolis for shipment. They have represented to me and to the government that they would build the piers and pockets to accommodate this trade provided the harbour was improved. Otherwise they feared their piers would be destroyed. We are spending money on the harbours of St. John and Halifax and other harbours in the Dominion to make them available for the shipment of the produce of the country, and this harbour at Annapolis is just as valuable as any of them to the extent of the interests it will serve. The improvement will accord a safe winter harbour for shipping and it will protect the wharfs already built as well as other wharfs which will be necessitated by the growing trade of that part of the country. The matter was gone into very fully last year by the minister and by other members of the House and no very great objection was manifested towards this appropriation. I may say that about 140 coastwise vessels and 50 or 60 foreign going vessels load at Annapolis. It is essential to the interests of the district that this work should be done.

Mr. SPROULE. How many vessels load there in the winter ?

Mr. PICKUP. There is one loading there now and another loaded in January, but under present conditions it is not safe for them as the harbour is peculiarly situated and they are in danger from the ice.

Mr. FOSTER. Last year I asked if there were any statistics as to material damage being done to shipping from these ice floes and I did not get any information on the point. If there is any record of actual damage in that respect I would like to get it now, because if no great damage has been done in the past this is a pretty expensive way of going about remedying it. Are the vessels which ply to Annapolis ocean-going vessels ?

Mr. PICKUP. A few years ago there was a great deal of ice from one end of the river to the other and it froze over. Below the frozen part there was open water and a large steamer came in from Great Britain and discharged her load of coal on the ice and took a load of lumber and apples. That was in February and that was the only time the harbour was frozen over.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the apple crop of the Annapolis valley shipped to Europe via Annapolis ?

Mr. PICKUP. Some of it.

Mr. FOSTER. What proportion ?

Mr. PICKUP. I cannot say. If the harbour were available a larger part of the crop would find its way to Europe via Annapolis.

Mr. FOSTER. I was under the impression that the apple crop was exported from other ports.

Mr. PICKUP. That is so, but some of it is shipped from Annapolis and more would be shipped were the harbour improved.

Mr. CROSBY. When were tenders called for this work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think in the early part of last summer.

Mr. CROSBY. Has the contract been let ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. As I stated, tenders were called and Reid and Archibald being the lowest the contract was sent to them for signature but they declined to sign unless we should make certain modifications which we refused to do. In consequence of their refusal we are asking for new tenders.

Mr. CROSBY. Did Reid and Archibald send a certified cheque?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They did.

Mr. CROSBY. Did you return their cheque?

Mr. PICKUP.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROSBY. You have it yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. You intend to hold it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, for the present.

Mr. CROSBY. They have done a great deal of public work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. They are people you know very well?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, very reliable contractors.

Mr. CROSBY. What is the reason you did not have them enter into the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The reason was, as stated before, that they had some doubts apparently as to whether they would be able to complete the work. In all hydraulic work there is more or less danger, and they were not willing to take the risk of completion. They wanted the Crown to take the risk of the plans and of the work standing until it was completed. I refused to assume that risk; I wanted to hold the contractors to the performance of the contract and the completion of the work, and in consequence of our not being able to agree on a modification of the contract as they desired, we have now called for new tenders.

Mr. MADDIN. What was the amount of their tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $34,400.

Mr. AMES. If I am rightly informed, the principal reason for this appropriation has not yet been dwelt upon to any extent. As I understand, the principal reason for erecting these piers across the estuary of the Annapolis river is to enable a provincial bridge to be built upon them at some future date. If that is the case, it seems to me that the vote is being obtained more or less under false pretenses. I would like to know from the minister whether there have been any negotiations with the provincial government or any member of the provincial government or with any member of this House in regard to the use of these piers for the purposes of a bridge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There have been no negotiations with me, and none with the government that I am aware of.

Mr. AMES. There have been cases in which parliament has been hoodwinked into the construction of piers which were to be used for the purposes of a bridge. In the county of Terrebonne back of the Island of Montreal, this government was induced to build, in a river, eight or ten concrete piers which could not possibly be

reached by any boat within four or five miles, and where all access was cut off by a railway half a mile below. There has never been a boat to these piers, nor is there any expectation that a boat will ever go there. That was a case where this government, under the guise of building piers as an aid to navigation, obtained a vote of money from parliament to aid the local authorities in building a bridge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps it might not be out of place if I quoted from a report of the resident engineer at Halifax, Mr. Dodwell, who is an experienced engineer and has been in the department for a good many years, and who deals with the subject from the standpoint of harbour improvements.

Under the date of March 15, 1903, the resident engineer at Halifax reports that he had the opportunity of making a satisfactory inspection of runs of ice during the winter of 1903, and that he saw a representative one on the 25th of February of that year. The river as far as could be seen was full of ice from shore to shore, in cakes and sheets of all sizes, and in thickness from a few inches to six or seven feet. While he stood on the uppermost wharf on the Annapolis side, a large field came down in the last hour of the up-tide, caught on the wharf on which he stood, and lodging against the Granville foreshore, remained fixed and stationary until the flood-tide broke and took it up the river again. This he takes to be good evidence that a line of piers such as outlined in his plan and report of Jan. 18, 1902, and placed on the lower site, or about six hundred feet above the wharf above mentioned would serve to retain the ice in French Basin and the upper reaches of the river and keep the vessel berths in Annapolis free and safe.

Under date of Jan. 14, 1907, Mr. Dodwell, resident engineer at Halifax, reports that there is a probability that the Annapolis Iron Mining Company may at an early date either establish a smelter at Annapolis or may thence ship their ore by water; and if this project materializes, it will emphasize the need for such improvement of existing shipping facilities as will be afforded by the projected ice barrier. He therefore strongly recommends that an appropriation of $75,000 to $100,000 be made as soon as possible.

There is the report of an experienced engineer who has examined the harbour in the winter season and has seen the action of these ice floes, and who is of opinion that the building of these piers will operate as a barrier to retain the ice. It may be that when these piers are completed, it will be possible to place a superstructure of a steel bridge upon them. If that should be the case, I do not myself see that there would be any public objection to it being done; but of course I would not propose to parliament the construction of these piers for the purpose of utilizing them for a bridge. As I understand the report of the engineer, the reason parliament voted the money for this work some two or three years ago, before I became minister, was because it would be useful for the purposes of shipping, as making the Annapolis harbour safe. The Annapolis valley is perhaps the richest section of the whole province of Nova Scotia. It is rich in agricultural products, and is a great fruit district. Large shipments of apples are made from Annapolis to the old country; and if the harbour is made safe, vessels will resort there in a much larger number than at present, and it will become an important shipping point in the winter. I am told that there are also in the vicinity large deposits of valuable iron ore, which will probably be shipped at Annapolis if these improvements are made. We can all realize the enormous advantage of having a port open in the winter season as well as in the summer, and if for this comparatively small expense Annapolis harbour can be placed in that position, I feel that the money will be very well expended.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I do not know whether I can make the matter any plainer than the minister has done, but I would like to offer an explanation. Annapolis Basin is an arm of the Bay of Fundy and is open during the winter season. Ice does not form on the basin or the harbour. The Annapolis river flows into this basin.

Mr. AMES. Is the port of Digby open all the year round?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Yes. It is on another arm of the same basin. The Annapolis river flows from the basin into the bay some twenty miles. The fall of the tide on this river and in the basin is 28 feet. The ice forms during the winter, very heavily up this river to the town of Bridgetown, some 20 miles, and with a fall of 28 feet it will naturally float down during the fall of the tide and go into the Annapolis harbour. After it proceeds down a certain distance, it returns with the incoming tide again. While this ice flows in and out, it does immense damage to the wharfs and shipping, so that in the end the harbour is rendered useless for shipping purposes during the winter simply because of the floating in and out of the ice floes. The purpose of these piers is to prevent, not the formation of ice in the river, but its floating down at falling tide into the Annapolis harbour; and if that purpose be accomplished Annapolis would be made a winter shipping port.

Mr. AMES. Are these piers to be built all the way across the estuary of the Annapolis from the south to the north shore?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At present it is only proposed to build three piers; but later on, if the experiment proves successful, several more piers will be built, which will extend across the river.

Mr. AMES. Are they to be equidistant the one from the other?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROSBY. With regard to the firm of Reid and Archibald, how is it they were not made to carry out their contract? I presume they saw the specifications before tendering.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They refused to sign the contract, and you cannot compel a party who has tendered to sign a contract. All you can do is to make him forfeit his deposit, which was done in this case.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. There are times when it is a hardship to make a party tendering forfeit his deposit. I am not referring to this particular instance, but to another case which was one of great hardship. The party tendering acted in good faith, but found afterwards that the plans were so drawn up that the risk was greater than he anticipated. Of course, he saw the plans and specifications before putting in his tender, but the time was short and he had not the opportunity to make as careful an examination as he should have done. But when he found afterwards, after more careful investigation, that the work was more difficult than appeared at first sight, he declined to enter into a contract and his deposit was forfeited. It seems to me that when, owing to circumstances over which he can have no control, a party who tenders refuses to execute a contract, and has acted in good faith in tendering, his deposit should be returned. That may be a dangerous principle to act upon, but when there is absolute good faith and no suspicion of collusion, I think the deposit should be refunded. The government has no right to take a man's money for nothing.

Mr. MONK. What is the object of the piers across the Annapolis? Is it to prevent the ice going down into the harbour?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. MONK. We have in the province of Quebec an old saying, always found to be true, and that is that you cannot possibly resist the movement of the ice. You may impede it to a certain extent by building piers, but nothing will prevent the ice making its way eventually.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Would the flow of the tide be as great in the rivers you have in mind. In the Annapolis river there is no water left after a short time and the ice would go to the bottom.

Mr. MONK. The rivers I particularly refer to have no tide. But it is a saying with us that no strength of piers will keep the ice back from its course. If these piers are intended to stop the ice, the money will be wasted. We have had experience of that for years in the vicinity of Three Rivers. You can impede the ice to a certain extent but you cannot prevent its following its natural course. But to block the ice and prevent it flowing out seems an impossibility.

Mr. PICKUP. We have a practical demonstration of it. When the river was frozen over, the conditions happened to be very favourable, there was a wind from the west and it was snowing. The ice caught and froze clear across, and remained for about five weeks, no ice moving in the river at all. The harbour below was absolutely free, and, as I said, a vessel came in and loaded from the ice.

Mr. FOSTER. The idea of this is to delay the ice there at low tide?

Mr. PICKUP. Or at any time. If the ice is formed, it will remain there—a solid mass of ice.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand, the minister is now asking for new tenders. Will the contractors be required to supply all the material for the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All except the creosoted timber. That is furnished by the department.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the hon. member (Mr. Pickup) to say that there are about 125 or 135 vessels at this harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Upwards of 200.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the place that is called 'Annapolis Royal'? For I do not see any other.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I have here the trade and navigation returns, and I find that in the year ending March 31 last, the arrivals were 19 British vessels, with a tonnage of 5,462, and six foreign vessels with a tonnage of 1,160, or 25 in all, with a tonnage of 6,622, instead of 145 vessels as mentioned by the hon. member. The outgoing vessels numbered 36 British, with a tonnage of 8,906 and 10 foreign with a tonnage of 3,245 or 46 in all, with a tonnage of 12,151 tons—a wonderful difference between these returns and the statement that has been made. If, during the whole season of navigation, and that is the season—I assume, during which the greater share of the produce would be shipped, the apples for instance—there is only this number of vessels, the place is hardly of the importance one would be led to suppose from the figures that have been given. It may be that, if they could continue navigation winter and summer, more might be done, but the figures do not indicate that this is a port of very much importance. I do not know on what the hon. gentleman bases his statement of the number of vessels.

Mr. PICKUP. Last year on account of the lumber trade being bad, there were not so many vessels entering and clearing. I referred to two years previous. The coastwise vessels are not included in those returns, I am sure.

Mr. SPROULE. Though the coastwise vessels, no doubt, are small, I should think the returns would include them.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the width of the whole estuary or river along which these piers are to be built

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 1,800 feet.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the piers will be 180 feet apart?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the average.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it the intention to have chains from pier to pier to prevent the ice going down through the openings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOSTER. You have a space of sixty yards between your piers, and you have a fall of twenty-eight feet of tide. When that tide is running out, it must have considerable force. Any ice in that tide must go out like the very mischief, and surely will be carried out through a space sixty yards wide.

Mr. PICKUP. The ice is in such large cakes that coming down it would block. That is proved by experience. The result would be an ice bridge behind the piers and a clear harbour below.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be that the ice will be in sufficiently large cakes to catch on the piers and prevent any going through. But when the tide is cavorting around and breaking up ice, it generally succeeds in getting into smaller pieces than that would indicate. And I should be very much afraid to bring up a small vessel at the moment when this pernickety ice might take it into its head to come down on that twenty-eight-foot tide and play the mischief with the boat. Now, in reference to the number of vessels in the harbour, there is a general statement made here of 245 vessels. But the customs officer, whose business it is to keep the records, finds—as has been shown by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule)—only 46 vessels. That is a great disparity. If there is such an awful falling off within two or three years, does not the minister think he ought to be cautious and wait to see whether the rest of the shipping goes away also ? I would like the committee to notice that there is an expenditure of $160,000 or $170,000, made, apparently, on an airy saying that there are iron ores somewhat near, and that there is just a possibility that these may be exported. There is another bare possibility that a smelter may be built there. But is there any certainty of either ? Is it not the way of prudence to wait until there is something tangible in the way of development and business ? The thing would be different if you could show that a large iron deposit was being worked and a smelting business established. But you do not show that, but only a possibility. But there is one certainty, and that is that you are putting in your money, and that without any official indication of great present trade or strong possibility of trade for the future. After all, what goes out of Annapolis is largely a local traffic. The apples for export, I believe, largely go by another way. The apples for St. John and the provinces may cross the bay. But I think that most of this trade is done before this ice trouble commences. As I understand it, this ice trouble develops mainly in the spring.

Mr. BLACK. All winter.

Mr. FOSTER. There would not be any trouble with ice up to December, I suppose; that is, the summer and fall navigation is free of that difficulty. There is another point: I understand the minister to say that the engineer, Mr. Dodwell, had recommended the appropriation of the money for this purpose. It struck me at the time that it is not quite within the sphere of an engineer to recommend public appropriations. The engineer is the arm upon which the executive authority rests, the minister and his colleagues are to be the judges of appropriations. The appropriations are made presumably upon advisable or necessary grounds, but generally commercial grounds are those that weigh. When the minister or the government come to the conclusion that for commercial reasons an expenditure of money is advisable, then the engineer comes in with advice as to the best plan to adopt, what form of construction will be most suitable, &c. It does not seem to me that it is the duty of the engineer of a minister to advise appropriations here or there. If he finds a work in need of repair or something of that kind he may advise appropriations, but he should hardly advise for or against a work except on scientific grounds.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend, I think, is hardly right. The engineer should not give advice as to the commercial advantage of any particular work unless he is asked for such advice, but in my own experience as minister I very often and properly rely upon the opinion of the resident engineer as to the necessity for any particular work. For instance, if I receive a petition asking for the construction of a wharf or urging that some dredging should be done, I very often send a memorandum to the chief engineer asking him to instruct the resident engineer to report as to the necessity for and the cost

of the proposed work. In that case it will be the duty of the engineer to look carefully into the business done at the particular place, to examine the proximity of the proposed wharf to some other wharf or to other harbours. In the case of a breakwater we may ask him to report how far it is from the next harbour of refuge or the next shipping port and generally to report as to the necessity for constructing the work at the particular place indicated. In this particular case, suppose that the petition was presented to the minister for this particular work supported by the member for the district and by Mr. Corbett, a gentleman engaged in business in Annapolis since the eighties, and by other business men, if the minister had referred this to the chief engineer and had asked him to have a careful inquiry made by the resident engineer as to the necessity for and the advantage of the proposed work, and its probable cost, I would think in that case it would be quite proper for the engineer to take into consideration all the circumstances connected with this proposed work; to consider its advisability, its practicability,—

Mr. FOSTER. Practicability, that is proper.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And the objects which would be obtained by it. If he were asked to report in that way, I would see no objection whatever to the resident engineer recommending that the work should be undertaken as being in the public interest and advising that an appropriation for the purpose should be obtained. Just how far the engineer should report would depend on the instructions given to him and the information which he was desired to impart to the department.

Mr. BLAIN. Comparing the explanations of the minister on this matter last year and to-day I think we have a right to be suspicious that this has something to do with a municinal bridge as mentioned by my hon. friend from Montreal. I am aware that the gentleman representing the county is well informed in connection with this case; he has so stated last vear and this afternoon as well. Is there any suggestion that these piers will ultimately be used for a municipal bridge or a provincial bridge?

Mr. PICKUP. Not that I have any knowledge of, no, sir.

Mr. BLAIN. Would it be possible to put a superstructure of steel or iron over these piers that would transform them into a provincial or municipal bridge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a question which has not been looked into at all. It has not been brought to my notice directly or indirectly.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister say he will not allow the piers to be used in future as a municipal bridge without the consent of parliament?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will say, that when that question comes up I will give it the most careful consideration.

Mr. BLAIN. We have seen a Minister of Public Works come to the committee with an item in the estimates asking for a public wharf, and we know as a matter of fact that when that statement was made in the House it was misleading. Future events proved that this so-called wharf was not a wharf, but that it was for a municipal bridge, and to-day it it a municipal bridge. As the government misled the committee and the country and expended money for purposes for which it was not intended and could not lawfully be appropriated, is it unfair for us now, at the very commencement of this work, to ask the minister to say that this money will not be expended for any municipal or provincial purposes ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend means that I would not be a consenting party to contributing any moneys of my department for the purpose of erecting a superstructure upon these piers, I will certainly give him and the committee that assurance.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend knows that that matter is not up for discussion and that this is an evasive answer to the committee. I am not talking about a superstructure that at some future day may be constructed. I am asking my hon. friend if, while he is minister of the department, he will allow a municipality, or the provincial government, to place a superstructure on the piers that are about to be constructed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have learned long since that is the time to bid a certain gentleman good morning when you meet him.

Mr. FOSTER. Especially when you meet him often.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say to my hon. friend that this will not hurry along his case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot help it.

Mr. BLAIN. I think this is a fair request I think we have every right to be suspicious that this is for a purpose that my hon. friend is unwilling to reveal to the committee and I think it is only fair that my hon. friend should pledge his word that he will not allow this work, either now or in the future, to be used for any municipal or provincial bridge. Every man knows that it is a strange procedure to build piers in the river to keep the ice back in order to prevent it from interfering with the harbour. Everybody knows that it must be experi-

mental in the main. It is rumoured—indeed the gentleman sitting beside me says it is current in that section of the province—that this is to be used for a municipal or provincial bridge. Before we consent to vote the item finally it is quite fair for the minister to promise the committee that he will not allow the provincial government or any municipality to put a superstructure upon these piers without the consent of parliament.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The minister would have no authority to do it.

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) state that he is not aware that some such suggestion has been contemplated and discussed in that section of Nova Scotia?

Mr. A K. MACLEAN. I cannot say.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend does not want to say.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. If the hon. gentleman wants an answer all I can say is that I have never heard of such a suggestion in my life. Of course, it may be true. I am not saying that it is not, but I live quite a distance from the locality and I do not know it. What I said was that the minister would have no authority to grant permission to the provincial government or to a municipality to put a superstructure upon these piers.

Mr. BLAIN. The government of which my hon. friend is a prominent supporter has done it before. I had the duty myself of bringing to the attention of this House a case down in the county of Richmond and Wolfe. We had an estimate placed before this House to build a wharf in the town of Disraeli and for two years in succession the item pased the House with the explanation from the minister that it was for a wharf. Evidence was produced on the floor of this House that no vessel carrying freight ever entered that harbour and at this moment upon these piers that were constructed for a wharf, there is a municipal bridge and the old municipal bridge has been removed. Yet the government will not say that they have no intention of doing any such thing again.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman say that evidence has been produced that no vessel has stopped at that wharf?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes. I visited the town and produced on the floor of this House, in the presence of the minister's predecessor, a sworn statement from a gentleman who had lived there for twenty-five years, and was a former mayor, that at no time in the history of the town had there ever been a vessel of any description carrying produce into that wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was that before or after the wharf was built? How does the hon. gentleman expect a vessel to go to a wharf until after it is built?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. There was no vessel to go there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that vessels did go there before and that they have gone there since the wharf was built.

Mr BLAIN. I may say to my hon. friend that it is absolutely impossible for a vessel of any description to go underneath the bridge, to enter the wharf which public money has been expended to build. My hon. friend must know that if he knows anything about his department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It happens in that case that vessels land and deliver their cargo on the lower side of the bridge and at the wharf which is at the lower side of the bridge.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has not been there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is my information.

Mr. BLAIN. I have been there. That is another impossibility because there is a superstructure of a railway along the other side of the bridge that makes it absolutely impossible for a vessel seven feet high to go into the wharf. I would ask my hon. friend to produce to the committee this afternoon a report showing how many vessels have entered there.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. We were discussing the question as to whether or not this vote to provide for the erection of ice piers should be passed. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) did dilate upon some alleged or imaginary wrong that occurred somewhere in Quebec a couple of years ago in reference to the D'Israeli bridge, but my hon. friend need not harp back to ancient history or dig up from the archives anything that gave him satisfaction at that time in order to enable this committee to consider what they should do about this particular vote. My hon. friend's soul seems to have been somewhat vexed as to the question of the possibility of a municipal bridge being erected over these piers. As a matter of fact, in the province of Nova Scotia, the erection of bridges is entirely in the hands of the provincial government. There is therefore no possibility of a municipal bridge which he seems to regard as being a frightful iniquity that might be perpetrated upon somebody—I do not know whom. There is no danger of that occurring in Nova Scotia. With regard to the question as to whether or not the object of the erection of these piers is for the purpose of having a bridge ultimately built, I may say that in so far as hon. gentlemen

supporting the government from Nova Scotia are concerned, we have not heard of there being any such proposition involved in this vote. I may say further that I have learned of the case that was put forth in regard to this matter by Mr. Geo. E. Corbett, who was the Conseravtive candidate in the county of Annapolis in the election of last autumn. Mr. Corbett claimed in the county last year a great deal of credit from the people there because he had come to Ottawa and impressed upon the government the necessity of undertaking this work, and he said that he and not Mr. Pickup, the representative of the county, was the gentleman who ought to receive all the credit that the county could give on account of it. My hon. friend ought to be fair and frank about this thing. We are fair and frank about it. I may say that if as a result of the erection of these piers in the Annapolis harbour the provincial government should come to this government and say that this is a public work that can be utilized for two purposes I do not see any reason why the department should not consider it because I do not see who is going to be hurt by it. If we have the navigation of Annapolis harbour improved by the erection of these piers, is it going to hurt any body if the provincial government should say: We will be able to secure a highway here by making an arrangement satisfactory to both governments? That would be no great iniquity. There is no necessity of the hon. gentleman holding up his hands in holy horror at such a proposition.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. You have your hands up now.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Well I am only suggesting that my hon. friend need not get into the same attitude. As far as I am concerned and as far as every other hon. gentleman supporting the government from Nova Scotia is concerned, we have not heard of this bridge project, and I see no reason why the two governments should not treat on the subject.

Mr. BLAIN. I am sure the committee is highly pleased with the lucid explanation given by my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) as to why this money should be voted. But did you notice that he let the cat out of the bag when he said that at some future time he would not object to see erected on these piers a superstructure for a municipal or provincial bridge.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. You might also notice that I said I had never heard of such a proposition.

Mr. BLAIN. But the hon. gentleman seemed to have it in his mind that such a thing is quite possible, and if it is not going to be done there is nothing to prevent the minister pledging his word now that the piers will not be used for such a purpose.

In Ontario, the municipalities construct their own bridges and it is a question of considerable importance to know whether it is the policy of this government to construct ice piers which may afterwards be used for municipal or provincial bridges. We all know very well that when the appropriation was made for the D'Israeli wharf it was pointed out that there was no water in the lake to enable boats to get to it and no boats in the lake engaged in commercial venture to use the wharf when built. It was pointed out that the D'Israeli wharf would simply be a municipal bridge and it is to-day a municipal bridge and the only one in the municipality. Will the minister pledge his word to the committee that these piers shall not in future be used for the purpose of a municipal bridge?

Mr. TOBIN. I thought the question of the D'Israeli wharf was settled some years ago. If my hon. friend from Peel thinks it is not settled I would ask him to consult with Mr. Champoux, the late Conservative candidate in Richmond and Wolfe at the last election and with whom my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) acted as a detective on one occasion.

Mr. BLAIN. I will ask the Chairman if it is in order to call a member of this House a detective?

Mr. TOBIN. I will withdraw that. At all events the member for Peel went down to Richmond and Wolfe some years ago to investigate the D'Israeli wharf and he met there Mr. Champoux a disappointed contractor who wanted to sell some lumber to the Public Works Department, and he got from Mr. Champoux certain information. Now, Mr. Champoux was the Conservative candidate in Richmond and Wolfe last election and he conducted his campaign in D'Israeli where this wharf was constructed but he did not mention the wharf and he did not make any charge against the government in connection therewith. True, the government built a wharf at the mouth of Black creek which empties into Lake Aylmer and later on the municipality filled up a part of that creek and they now cross on it, but it is not correct to say that the government ever built a bridge for that municipality.

Mr. TAYLOR. They built half of it.

Mr. TOBIN. If my hon. friend from Peel wants to go down on another picnic to Richmond and Wolfe he will find there is no obstruction from the railway bridge and that Mr. Champoux will tell him that he did not make any complaint about the D'Israeli wharf when he appealed to the electors last fall. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) that Lake Aylmer is no small stream; it is 13 or 14 miles long and 4 or 5 miles broad and there are boats plying on the lake, and if they are not do-

ing a freight business, surely the people who live in Stratford, D'Israeli, Lake Weedon, Garthby and other towns on the lake have a right to have their share of public expenditure. I have a petition from the people of the township of Stratford asking for a wharf at Stratford, and these people know the needs of the locality. I have forwarded that petition to the Minister of Public Works and if he does not grant the prayer of the petition this year I trust he will place a vote in the estimates for it next year.

Mr. BLAIN. Does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tobin) regard the D'Israeli wharf as a municipal bridge?

Mr. TOBIN. I do not.

Mr. BLAIN. Part of D'Israeli is situated on one side of that water and part on the other, and the only way to get across is by that bridge or wharf on which this government spent $7,500.

Mr. TOBIN. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the government never appropriated any money to build a bridge at D'Israeli.

Mr. FOSTER. That's right enough; they called it a wharf.

Mr. AMES. May I suggest that we should take a business view of the situation. In this case, where the work is to be for the joint benefit of the Dominion and of the province it would seem as though both should mutually subscribe for that work. If I should build a house on a vacant lot and a neighbour comes later on and builds next to me he has to pay me for the use of my mitoyen wall as soon as he takes advantage of it. I do not know any reason, if these ice piers are needed to stop the ice and are constructed for that purpose and succeed in standing the pressure of the ice, and are properly located, why they should not eventually be used for a bridge; but the moment the provincial authorities ask for the right to use them for a bridge, they ought to contribute their fair share of the expense; and all we ask of the minister is that he will give us some assurance that in such a case an adequate compensation will be demanded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A somewhat similar question came up not very long ago in regard to some ice piers which had been built for the protection of the banks of a river and also for the benefit of navigation in another province. The municipality in which they were constructed proposed to utilize them, with the consent of the government, for the placing upon them of a steel superstructure to be used in place of a bridge which had either been carried away by freshets or had decayed. I stated that in my opinion the local authorities should be permitted to utilize those piers for that purpose on condition that they would be willing to enter into an engagement with my department that they would keep those piers in repair for all time, free of expense to the federal government. I do not see what objection there could be from the standpoint of the public interest to an arrangement of that character. With regard to the wharf at D'Israeli, I am surprised that my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) should allow himself to be misled as to the facts of the case. When he went there on the occasion to which he has referred, he must have studiously avoided the side of the wharf which is frequented by vessels navigating the lake. The same rather unjustifiable and inconsiderate statement was made at the last session of parliament. A report has been made by the resident engineer to the effect that the vessels do go to that wharf and that it is a very useful structure for the purposes of navigation. It is true, the wharf having been built, the municipal authorities use one end of it for supporting a bridge, and their doing so does not interefere with the purposes for which it was built. I hope my hon. friend will get more reliable information before he again speaks on that subject in this House. With regard to the usefulness of these piers, I cannot say what the minister will do in the future, but if application should be made on the part of the provincial government for permission to use these piers to bear the superstructure of a bridge, all I can say is that if I happened to be the Minister of Public Works at that time, I would insist that before that permission should be given, an arrangement for adequate compensation should be entered into —it might take the form of a money payment or the form of an engagement on the part of the provincial authorities to keep the piers in repair, whichever would be best in the public interest. Whatever conclusion would be arrived at would depend on the circumstances. What I want to assure the House is that, so far as my information goes, these piers are being built for the purposes of navigation. These are the sole purposes put forward in the report of the engineer. The engineer is very strongly of opinion that the piers will prove beneficial, that they will form a solid ice bridge or jam at the head of the Annapolis harbour, and thus make the harbour reasonably free from ice and otherwise safe in the winter season.

Mr. BLAIN. As my hon. friend has introduced the subject of the Disraeli wharf, I suppose we shall be allowed to make an answer. In doing so, it will be necessary to take up a little of the time of the committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is, I think, entitled to answer

under the circumstances, but not to make a prolonged statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was the hon. gentleman who introduced it.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister re-introduced it and read me a lecture as to the correctness of the statement, which I think ought to be answered before the committee rises. In the town of Disraeli there was a large wooden superstructure 710 feet long, which was built in the early days by a provincial appropriation aided by the municipality. That was the only way in which the people living on the one side of the river could reach the other side. The hon. gentleman who represents the county conceived the idea of making an application to the government for an appropriation to build a wharf, and such an appropriation was placed in the estimates. I had the honour, along with my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), to visit the town, and we walked across this wooden superstructure, which had been condemned by the inspector of bridges in the province of Quebec. The government, a few weeks before the general election in 1900, employed an army of farmers, more than fifty, to draw in stone for the construction of this wharf, and paid for the stone, not by the cord or toise, but by weight, and a scale was bought at the expense of the government and put alongside of the proposed wharf for the purpose of weighing the stone. The government constructed 310 feet of the bridge across the water, at a cost of $7,250. The municipality, when they realized that the wooden superstructure, over which they were crossing daily was condemned and must be replaced by a better structure, conceived the idea of continuing the work from the end of the government bridge, across the balance of the water, 400 feet: and they applied business methods to their section. They advertised for tenders, while my hon. friend's department did not advertise for any tenders; and with the very same specifications as were adopted by the government, the municipality built the 400 feet at a cost of less than $3,000. I make the statement now, and have no fear of contradiction, that the municipalities knew and that my hon. friend who represents the county knew full well, when they applied to the government for a wharf, that it was to be used for a municipal bridge. When that superstructure was placed, 710 feet long, the government having invested in it $7,250, and the municipality less than half that, the old wooden structure was removed and to-day there is but one passage from one section of the town to the other, and that is the so-called wharf constructed by this government; and I have no hesitation in saying that the gentleman who was then the Minister of Public Works misled the committee when he said the expense was for a public wharf because he knew full well it was for a municipal structure rather than a public improvement.

Mr. JAMESON. I wish to draw attention to a matter of great importance with regard to the Sissiboo or Weymouth river in the county of Digby. This river is crossed by a bridge of the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company some distance below the town of Weymouth. The Sissiboo river is one of the principal waterways of western Nova Scotia and of much importance the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company, as I am credibly informed, purposes during the coming summer to rebuild the bridge, and it is said that it will be constructed with a span of some 35 or 40 feet. I may be permitted to refer very briefly to the history of this bridge. In 1877-8 the Western Counties Railway was projected through Digby county designed to cross the river at this point. The business of the town of Weymouth was then chiefly done two and a half miles down the river below the location of the present business centre. The people of that neighbourhood were so anxious to secure railway connection that they purchased the right of way and practically built a new town two and a half miles more up the river where the railway crosses it. At that time the plans which were approved by the Department of Public Works required a draw or span of 40 feet in width. When the bridge was built however the railway company reduced this span giving only 35 feet in the clear. Ever since this bridge was constructed, the people have been under great disadvantage with regard to shipping facilities, owing to this narrow draw. The Dominion Atlantic Railway Company is as stated proposing to rebuild the bridge, and I am informed have a structure already prepared and on the ground—for the erection of a bridge giving no more than 35 feet in the clear. When the business interests of Weymouth and the outside shipping interests were advised of this, they entered a protest, and the building of the bridge was deferred until that protest was settled. I am informed that an application was made in 1907 to the Board of Railway Commissioners for the reconstruction of the bridge with a 35 feet draw, and that permission was given by the commission but that subsequently it was found the railway company had not submitted their plans to the Department of Public Works, and the wrok on the bridge was completely suspended owing to this agitation of the shipping and local interests. The trade of Weymouth is of considerable importance, a large lumber business is done there, a large pulp industry is carried on, and as time goes

on the port will become still more important from a commercial point of view than it is now. The people and the shipping interests of that district are extremely anxious that a draw or span of 60 feet in width should be placed in the neighbourhood. It is not only the interests of the town of Weymouth but the interests of shipping generally which would be benefited by that wider span. The railway company has, I understand, having been informed of this demand for a wider draw, considered it would be a hardship to impose on them the total cost of its construction. As regards the necessity for a wider draw, I am informed that the carrying of lumber to-day is done in vessels of greater beam than 15 or 25 years ago, and that consequently a vessel of practically the same tonnage would require to-day a wider passage than fifteen or twenty-five years ago. I am informed by shippers that they are now obliged to charter old vessels simply because the cannot get a modern vessel to go through the present draw, and that is one reason why they urge that a wider draw should be built. Further, they have to transport a large quantity of lumber down below this bridge in barges or scows or by teams, which imposes an additional cost amounting to fifty cents per 1,000 feet.

The railway company is suggesting, I believe, that the government should assist in the payment of the cost of construction of this wider draw. With reference to that feature, I would quote from 'Hansard,' volume IV., of 1906, page 7052, etc. Under the item of expenditure on harbours and rivers in British Columbia, I find this reference.

Mr. HYMAN. There is one new item there: Pitt river—substitution of a 230-foot through truss for original 132-foot truss of draw-span on C.P.R. bridge, inclusive of accessory works, $55,085.

He goes on to say :

The Canadian Pacific Railway built a bridge across the river there a number of years ago. They got the permission of the Department of Public Works to build this bridge. The Canadian Pacific Railway are renewing the bridge; they were building a new bridge last year, and it was then found necessary in the interests of navigation to widen the span. We asked them to do so, and they took the ground that having received permission to build according to their original plans, the government should pay for any widening of the spans the Justice Department gave its decision that under the circumstances the government should be liable. Therefore, we were in the position of having either to accept the old span or to pay our share of the cost. This is the amount found by the engineers to be due to the Canadian Pacific Railway by the government.

I ask and urge that what the government did in the case of the Pitt River bridge in British Columbia, in 1906; they should do at the present time in the case of the Sissiboo or Weymouth bridge, and in any case a span of sixty feet should be required to be built. Some time ago, I had the privilege of discussing this matter with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), and he told me that it would receive most careful consideration. I merely present these facts to-day in order that the claims of that district may be fully recognized and not overlooked. I trust the application of the people of Weymouth for a sixty foot draw may meet the favourable consideration of the Department of Public Works and the government, and that, if the government is going to pay any part of this and not require the railway to bear all the cost, provision will be made in the estimates during the present session.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The matter presented by my hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) is not new, either as to the bridge at Weymouth or the action taken by parliament in 1906. If my hon. friend read the papers which I placed at his disposal—as I have no doubt he did—he found the matter referred to there. The position is this: About a year ago, when the Dominion Atlantic Railway were about to rebuild their bridge at this point, my attention was called to the matter by the late hon. member for Digby, Mr. Copp. At his urgent solicitation, I notified the company that they must not proceed with the building of the bridge upon the proposed plan, for the reason that they had not followed the old order in council passed some thirty years ago, which provided that they should build a bridge with a span of not less than 40 feet, whereas they had built with a span of 34 feet, 8 inches. It is contended now, on behalf of the company, that they would have the right to rebuild the bridge according to the design approved of in 1878, and they argue that if the government, in the interests of navigation and for the benefit of the people of Weymouth, should require them to build a bridge with a span, say, 55 or 60 feet, the government should do as they did in the case of the Pitt River bridge, pay part of the cost. The matter is under consideration, but I am not prepared to say what action will be taken in regard to it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not intend that any undue haste in calling votes ' Carried ' shall prevent me from saying a word on this subject. I have had experience here of being prevented from saying something by the extreme application of rules, but I do not propose at this time of my life to be so very easily turned down. I have no objection to the passing of this item. I wish to speak of the unnecessary alarm that

appears to be felt on the part of some hon. members on the opposition side concerning the use that may be made of these piers. If these hon. gentlemen understood the bridge law of the province of Nova Scotia, they would not have the notions about these piers that they have. I dare say it is thought that it would be popular in the county of Annapolis for a representative to be able to get this bridge out of the Dominion money. Let me tell these hon. gentlemen that such a thing is not thought of. He would not make one vote, and he would not detain a gentleman on the road for five minutes by trying to entertain him with such a story as that he was going to build this bridge. I think the mistake arises from our hon. friends from Ontario applying in the case of Nova Scotia the Ontario law respecting bridges and roads. I admire the public spirit of the people of Ontario and the way they have maintained their own roads and bridges direct out of their own pockets. Such is not the custom or law of Nova Scotia, nor has it ever been. Ever since Nova Scotia first became a province, its roads and bridges have been built and maintained out of public government money. There is no such thing as a tax upon the people for building bridges or maintaining roads. Up to 1883, the tax payers did not contribute a cent either directly or indirectly towards the maintenance of roads or bridges. In that year, there was passed what is known as the Bridge Act, under which the government of the province was empowered to borrow money to build large steel bridges wherever they were needed in the province, the interest on that money to be paid, not directly by the individuals who enjoyed the privilege of the bridge, but out of the road grant. That is: There is a road grant paid by the government to each county out of the revenue of the province—not out of direct taxation, and from this allowance, the government deducted enough to cover the interest on the sums spent in building bridges within the county. The only effect that the building of a bridge had upon the individual in the county would be that there would not be so large a road grant that year as if there had been no interest on the money invested in the bridge to be deducted. But, for the last two years, even this has been done away with, and the counties do not pay anything toward the interest on the bridges—the provincial government pays both principal and interest. Therefore, my hon. friends will understand that the people of Annapolis are not concerned about the building of these piers or that bridge. If a bridge is required at Annapolis, it will be built by the government of Nova Scotia. I submit to my hon. friends that from one end of the province of Nova Scotia to the other, they cannot point to any case in which the government of Nova Scotia ever called upon the Dominion government to contribute a single farthing toward the building or maintaining of a work that legitimately belonged to the provincial government. By no subterfuge, plan or scheme has the provincial government tried to cause the Dominion government to undertake any duty or face any expenditure that properly belonged to the local authority. They are well able to look after their own affairs and I assure hon. gentlemen they are not asking any favours from this government or asking this government to do anything which is the duty of the local government or themselves to perform. Some hon. gentlemen may not understand how these expenditures in our province bear upon the individual. The spending of this money by this government would not relieve the farmers or merchants of that district of any expense as this work would be done by the provincial government and not by the municipality. It is not felt at all by the individual. I do not understand the alarm of members of the opposition even if such an expenditure was to be made in Nova Scotia. Only last night it was suggested that the government should build a bridge and a piece of road in Kingston. That was considered a first rate proposition, at all events there was no opposition to it.

Mr. BLAIN. That was a proposition to construct and maintain a road in front of property purchased by the Minister of Militia.

Mr. McKENZIE. That does not make the slightest difference. We have in Halifax more government and imperial property than there is in Kingston, yet we never heard of either the imperial or Canadian government contributing one farthing towards the maintenance of anything municipal in connection with that city simply because that property was there. I think that rule should apply at Kingston as well as at Halifax. An hon. member from Manitoba had a bridge of this kind built in his country, but the opposition raised no objection to it and it was even suggested that this government should paint it and maintain the approaches. This was regarded by these gentlemen as all right because it came from one of themselves. I do not think it is right, I think that each government should confine its activity to the sphere allotted to it by the constitution.

I simply wanted to point out that there was no object in any Nova Scotia member urging this government to build a work of this kind for municipal purposes as it would not relieve the people of the neighbourhood. The farmers and the people generally of Nova Scotia are not concerned as to where the money comes from.

Mr. AMES. It is extremely interesting to have the hon. member for Victoria County, Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) tell

us that the people of Nova Scotia do not wish any money spent upon anything provincial, tell us that this sort of thing may be done in other provinces but in Nova Scotia it is never done. The hon. member's predecessor succeeded in persuading the minister to spend a considerable sum of money 11 miles up Middle river in his own county in order to build sheer dams to protect the land of farmers on that river, and also to spend a considerable sum on the Baddeck river to protect the farmers. These are small streams, they are absolutely unnavigable and could not possibly come under the head of harbours and rivers. It comes with a strange grace from the hon. member for Victoria county to tell us that the Dominion government is never asked or expected to spend money in Nova Scotia for provincial purposes, when in his own county we have some of the most glaring examples of the contrary that are to be found in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. MADDIN. Whilst we gather from the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria, that in 1883 the 'Greater Bridges Act' as it was called, was passed in Nova Scotia and that all bridges in that province are supposed to be built by the local government, it is not a new story, in the province of Nova Scotia at election time, that it is an excellent thing to have a good friend at court. We heard it in the local elections in 1901, in Nova Scotia when we were told that by supporting the local government in certain countries we would have a greater possibility than we had before of securing compensation for the building of the eastern extension of the Intercolonial Railway, and while it is a fact that the expense for bridges is to be borne by the government in that province, it must also be borne in mind that the revenue of that province is not great, being slightly more than $1,000,000 a year, so that it will not enable the provincial government to erect many $200,000 bridges in Nova Scotia. I submit that if the electors in Annapolis approached the local government at Halifax and asked them to erect a bridge across this stream at a cost of $200,000 or $250,000, the Nova Scotia government would take into consideration the amount of traffic to be catered to and they would hesitate to spend such a large sum of money.

But I do submit that if a candidate for the local House were to go to the government at Halifax and say: The estimated cost of a bridge across this river is $200,000, the estimated cost of the piers is $160,000 or $170,000 the superstructure will only cost $60,000 or $70,000, and then would add that the federal government at Ottawa had been good enough to undertake to furnish the foundations and piers and all that we would require to do would be to furnish the superstructure, that candidate would have a strong argument to submit to the government at Halifax and would be very likely to succeed in his application. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) has pointed out a couple of instances in the county of Victoria where money was spent twelve miles up the Middle river and on Baddeck river, for the protection of the lands of farmers there. In the county of Colchester, during the by-election of 1907, a sum of money was spent at Tatamagouche for the purpose of erecting a wharf and when the hon. member for Colchester put a question on the Order Paper in this House asking to know what the depth of water was at that wharf he was told that there was no water at low tide and that there were four feet of water at high tide. The hon. member for Colchester has been exhibiting a photograph in this House. I do not know whether he is here to-day or not, but he exhibited this photograph to a large number of members and it shows that this so-called wharf is nothing more or less than a bridge. It shows a horse and cart and some people on the bridge and if you look at the ordinary high water mark along the shore, as shown in the photograph, you will see that it would have to be a high spring or fall tide that would give four feet of water. It is a dangerous precedent to establish in this House that any of the municipalities or provinces can look to the federal government for assistance in constructing bridges. It is but entering the thin edge of the wedge, and if it becomes known that upon the pretense of having ice breakers erected in one constituency and if these ice breakers can afterwards be used for the purpose of erecting a bridge, I have no doubt that all kinds of suggestions and petitions will come to this government asking for ice piers, where, as a matter of fact, it is a bridge that is desired rather than ice breakers. It may be called a wharf in the petition or in the estimates, it may be called ice breakers in the petition or the estimates, but I submit that where it is a bridge that is really sought, that makes a great deal of difference. A rose by any other name would smell as sweet. There was a statement made by the Minister of Public Works with regard to the traffic to be served at this point. I take it to be correct as stated by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) that they have a rise and fall of the tide there of twenty-eight feet and having the rise and fall of the tide there, as in all other places, twice in twenty-four hours, and the temperature not being of such a character as to allow the formation of large bodies of ice, I would conclude that the interference with shipping caused by these conditions is unimportant. The public

reports indicate that there is a very small number of vessels entering or leaving that port. As far as the shipping of iron ore from that port is concerned, I would like to refer the Minister of Public Works to the fact that in the Mines report, which came to hand this session, the statement is made that the iron mines at Thorbrooke, in Annapolis, employ some 104 men. Their total output of ore is about 300 tons per day and this output is now sent to Londonderry. The report says:

> The output now sent to Londonderry is handled by the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company, whose branch line of 6 miles connects with the mines, and the Intercolonial Railway.
>
> | | Miles. |
> |---|---|
> | Length of haul, Dominion Atlantic Railway.. .. .. | 80 |
> | Length of haul, Intercolonial Railway.. | 64 |
> | Total rail haul.. .. .. | 144 |

That is where the output of the iron mines in Kings goes. It must of necessity go to one of four places to be smelted in the province; it must go to Londonderry, Trenton, Sydney Mines or Sydney. It is the purpose of this company, as outlined in the Mines report, to increase the output to 3,000 tons per day, and the report further states that arrangements are being made for shipping, and that a large pier will be built at Annapolis Royal from which these shipments will be made. For this purpose they will doubtless employ ore carrying boats which usually have a capacity of from 3,000 to 7,000 tons, and I submit that such boats at these will not be hindered by ice in a place that has a rise and fall of 28 feet of tide as they have in that harbour. If it is going to be a part of the policy of this government to grant assistance to municipalities and provincial governments in their road-making schemes we should know it. I do not know but that perhaps it might be a commendable policy. I am not committed one way or another with regard to it but I do submit that it might be more profitable to spend the money along such commendable lines rather than to squander it as has been done in the past. But if it is the policy of this government to grant assistance to provincial governments for the purpose of building municipal or provincial bridges it should come before this House clothed properly and bear on its face what it really is. If the purpose is to build a bridge across a river in Nova Scotia or in any other province the application should come before the government in the shape of a petition for a bridge across such river, and it should not come in the guise of an application for an ice pier or a wharf. These are all the observations that I have to make with regard to the estimate. I submit that it is bad policy to assist a provincial government in the building of bridges under the pretense of building ice breakers and wharfs; if that is what is contemplated by the politicians in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the width and height of these piers and what material are they to be constructed of?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The average height will be about 75 feet. They are to be built of stone filled crib-work with a concrete superstructure and there will be creosoted square timber in large quantities used in them as well.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the width and what is the length

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the width. The inner pier is 35 feet high at low water.

Mr. PATERSON. A statement was made as to the number of vessels going there by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I do not think he got them all because there are more vessels visiting that port in and out than he gave. The hon. gentleman only got one table. He will find the other at page 550.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the dimensions of these piers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not happen to have the length here because the appropriation was made two years ago, and the details were then given. We are building three at present.

Mr. SPROULE I would like to have the height, the length, and the width of these piers. What is supposed to be the life of this creosoted timber?

Mr. PUGSLEY. So far it has given satisfaction and its use is becoming more general in recent years. I do not know that we have experience enough to say what the life of creosoted timber is.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me it would be worth while ascertaining whether it would not be the part of wisdom, depending of course on the relative cost and permanency of other materials, to use cement and stone where the teredo worm has to be guarded against.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In some cases we build entirely of concrete, but in this case we are building only the superstructure of concrete. The concrete costs considerably more.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like the minister to get me the dimensions of these piers, how much of this work is to be concrete and how much stone, what kind of timber is used, and the quantity for each pier. If we have these details we can estimate the cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get that information.

Mr. SPROULE. Formerly the experiment was tried of covering the piers with copper, and I think it was regarded as a greater preventative against the teredo worm than creosoted timber. When we are spending such large sums of money all these questions should be carefully considered by the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will give that consideration.

Mr. BLAIN. Last year the minister stated that $12,000 worth of timber had been purchased. Was the purchase made by public tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. There are very few dealers in creosoted timber in Canada. The market price was paid.

Mr. BLAIN. Was that timber delivered last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister think it is in the public interest to purchase $12,000 worth of timber without competition?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not usually, but this is creosoted timber.

Mr. TAYLOR. Anybody can creosote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is creosoted in the Southern States and there are only two concerns which do that work.

Mr. BLAIN. What firm supplied this timber?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Norfolk Creosoting works.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any correspondence in the Public Works Department from the municipalities of Granville, or Annapolis, or from the local government with respect to this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not since I became a minister, that I have seen.

Mr. BLAIN. Prior to that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. BLAIN. If there is, will the correspondence be brought down?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to lay it on the table.

Mr. SPROULE. According to the trade and navigation returns, there were in Annapolis Royal only eighteen vessels from the United States, one from the British West Indies and one from Norway, carrying an aggregate of 1,679 tons.

Mr. PATERSON. There is the coasting trade in addition.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I regret to see that the estimates for harbours and rivers for Nova Scotia do not contain any sum for contract dredging. Last year contracts were awarded for dredging work in some of the harbours and rivers of Nova Scotia, and I trust that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works may see his way to making provision for the carrying out of those contracts. In my own constituency dredging is most necessary in one or two cases, and I trust that the minister will be able to have an additional vote of $200,000 or $300,000 placed in the supplementary estimates to provide for such cases. I am quite willing that a great many of the usual items under the head of Harbours and Rivers should be abandoned this year; but the matter of dredging is very important, and I think the government and the House generally would agree to a supplementary vote for dredging in several of the provinces.

Mr. BLAIN. It has been abandoned in a great many sections in the western part of Canada.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The necessity for dredging may not be so great on the great lakes as it is in the maritime provinces. Another remark I wish to make is that in the province of Nova Scotia at least we have not received from the government dredges the amount of work annually that we might fairly expect. I think that has been the case ever since confederation. The dredges do not get to work early enough in the spring and stop too early in the autumn, and the number of hours they work daily is altogether too small. There are a number of places in the province of Nova Scotia where the dredges could easily work all winter. The office in St. John appears to be altogether too inactive and too slow in its supervision of the work. In the province of Nova Scotia we have never obtained the amount of dredging which the necessities of our ports and harbours demand. Therefore my request is twofold—that we should get more work out of the government dredges than we have been doing from confederation down, and that a vote of $200,000 or $300,000 be placed in the supplementary estimates to carry on dredging in the province of Nova Scotia, for which contracts were entered into in 1908.

Mr. SPROULE. Would you get better results from dredging done by the government or by contractors?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I would prefer the work to be done by contractors.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like to emphasize the remarks of my hon. friend from Lunenburg. I quite appreciate the necessity of suspending, for a time at least, all

works that are not absolutely essential; but in the matter of dredging, in some instances where the work has been under contract and has been commenced, I do not observe in the estimates anything for its continuance this year. That may possibly be reasonable in some instances, but in one particular instance of which I am cognizant, the result will be, that if the work is not continued during this season, the work that was done last year will be practically lost to the department. There was some dredging required in Baie Verte, on the border line between Westmoreland and Cumberland. For very many years the municipalities have been asking to have this dredging done, and at the last session of parliament a vote was passed for the purpose, and a contract was entered into, and the work commenced. It was for the purpose of dredging a bar which blocked the entrance to the river and the harbour. For some reason this work was suspended in the early autumn, when the bar was only half cut through. If that work is proceeded with this year, and a cutting made through the channel, the work done last season will be available; but if it is allowed to stand and no money provided for the continuance of that contract, the work done last summer will fill in and be practically lost. It seems to me that the minister, in order to save the money already expended should make provision for the continuance of that work. I refer particularly to the dredging of the Port Elgin harbour on the Gaspereau river in the Baie Verte. I would ask the minister to bear this in mind, as it is coupled with the request of my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean). The conditions at Port Elgin are certainly such that the case is much stronger, and I would like to emphasize what has already been said in that regard.

Mr. GAUVREAU. I want to join my voice with those of my hon. friends from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) and Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean), but will apply their words to the province of Quebec and especially to the riding I have the honour to represent. Last year a contract was granted for the dredging at Fraserville wharf, but for one reason or another the dredging was not done. Riviere du Loup is a commercial town with a population of over 7,000, and for many years steamers have ceased calling there because of the lowness of the water. We require to extend our traffic down by the north coast to the Gaspé basin, and I hope that the minister in his next estimates will find his way clear to put in an amount just to carry out the contract for dredging which was granted last year. It is very important to River du Loup that this dredging should be done.

Some resolutions reported.

At six o'clock the House adjourned.

Mr. EMMERSON.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 11, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

WHITBY HARBOUR.

Mr. HUGHES—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Is the government contemplating taking over Whitby harbour from the present owners?
2. What representations are made to the government to induce it to take over the said harbour?
3. Who are the present owners of Whitby harbour?
4. What are the returns of Whitby harbour for the last five years?
5. Was the present member of parliament for South Ontario authorized by the government to promise before the recent elections that it would take over the harbour?
6. Has the government authorized the said member to negotiate with the owners of the harbour, or with others, in regard to the purchase of said harbour?

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

1. Matter under consideration.
2. Resolutions passed by the town council of Whitby and the county council of the county of Ontario, petitions sent in by owners and captains of vessels trading on Lake Ontario and representations made by prominent individuals submitted as follows: That Whitby being the shortest railway route between Lakes Huron and Ontario, it may be an important unit in the moving of large quantities of the grain product of Manitoba and the Territories to the sea-board by an all Canadian route; that the comparatively central situation of this harbour and its position with regard to the outlet of the Welland canal make it a desirable one for a harbour of refuge on the north shore of Lake Ontario, and further, that, owing to its railway connections with Midland and the Ontario government Temiscaming Railway, Whitby Harbour would, if improved, serve as a natural outlet of the trade of Central and New Ontario.
3. Port Whitby Harbour Company.
4. No record in the department.
5 and 6. No.

PORT OF OSHAWA.

Mr. HUGHES—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Who is the collector of customs at Oshawa harbour, and what is his salary?
2. What revenue has been collected at the port of Oshawa each year since it was taken over by the government, and from what source was the revenue derived?

3. In addition to the salary of the collector, what other expenses have been incurred by the government each year in connection therewith since taking over the port?

4. What representations were made to induce the government to invest in the harbour?

Hon. Wm. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. George F. Blamey is collector of Customs at Oshawa; salary, $1,200 a year.

2. The customs revenue collected at the port of Oshawa is as follows:

During 1904-5	$ 40,684 66
During 1905-6	50,325 69
9 months during 1906-7	50,042 61
During 1907-8	73,729 69
11 months during 1908-9	71,691 07
	$286,473 72

3. The following expenses in addition to the collector's salary have been incurred in connection with the customs service at Oshawa from July 1, 1904, to March 1, 1909, viz: $556.65.

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

4. The petition of the town council of Oshawa states: 'That the decrease in revenue of this port is largely due to the want of much needed improvements in the way of added dock and breakwater protection and dredging at the harbour which the Harbour Company is unable to supply; also that unless some action is taken to supply these needed harbour improvements, the harbour will become unsafe and unapproachable for vessels of ordinary capacity, such as are required for the heavy classes of freight, viz: iron and other raw material used by the numerous local factories and the coal required not only by them, but by all the people of the town and most of the farmers in the surrounding country. This has already seriously affected the grain trade and will continue to do so until remedied, and, if longer neglected, it will soon cut off the large passenger business now done at this port, and, what is of greater importance, the town shall lose the check upon the freight and passenger rates charged by the railway companies, which the competitive water route has always heretofore afforded; this would so hamper the manufacturing and commercial interests that its possibility must be regarded as a present serious menace to the prosperity of the town and of the surrounding farming country of which it forms the trade centre.'

The council therefore resolved that, in its belief: 'an urgent necessity exists for the prompt intervention of the Dominion parliament to prevent by timely aid at its present session (1898), this loss to this community which cannot longer be averted by private enterprise,' and requested the government 'to take such action as may be necessary to make the Oshawa harbour a harbour of refuge by providing for the undertaking of the improvements referred to in the government engineer's report.'

Further representations were made to the effect that 'the town needs a harbour of refuge for freight as well as passenger purposes, for the export of fruit and import of coal,' and that, if the harbour improvements were carried out, the local manufacturers would be placed on equal footing with any others in Canada.

LANDS UNDISPOSED OF IN NORTHWEST PROVINCES.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM asked:

How many acres of land are still undisposed of by the government in each of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

Undisposed of land in Manitoba at the 1st January, 1909, is 17,862,240 acres.

Undisposed of land in Saskatchewan at 1st January, 1909, is 104,878,159 acres.

Undisposed of land in Alberta at the 1st January, 1909, is 117,369,630 acres.

These figures are approximate.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—STATIONERY AND PRINTING.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

What were the amounts paid by the Intercolonial Railway for stationery and printing for the year July 31, 1905, to June 30, 1906; from July 1, 1906, to March 31, 1907; and from April 1, 1907, to March 31, 1908.

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

1. Year ended June 30, 1906—	
Printing	$ 88,509 70
Stationery	18,428 43
Nine months ended March 31, 1907—	
Printing	$ 86,921 67
Stationery	13,325 16
Year ended March 31, 1908—	
Printing	$104,188 76
Stationery	34,330 46

WHARFS IN QUEENS AND SUNBURY.

Mr. CROCKET asked:

1. For what wharfs in the counties of Queens and Sunbury did the Department of Public Works call for tenders in October last?

2. What was the date of the call for tenders, and what was the date stated within which tenders would be received?

3. Was there a department estimate of the cost of these wharfs? If so, what was it in each case?

4. Were tenders received for all the wharfs for which they were called, and what was the lowest tender in each case?

5. What was the reason that none of the tenders were accepted?

6. Is it intended to call for new tenders for all these wharfs during the present year, or to build them without tender and contract?

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

1, 2 and 3.

Names of Places.	Date of call.	Tenders due.	Estimated cost.
			$ cts.
Burton	October 9.	Nov. 12.	19,561 00
Lower Jemseg	" 9.	" 12.	10,954 00
Newcastle	" 9.	" 12.	8,257 00
Scotchtown	" 9.	" 12.	18,733 00
Young's Cove	" 9.	" 12.	11,381 00
Barker's	" 9.	" 12.	8,067 00
Trowbound Cove.	" 9.	" 12.	6,701 00
McAllister's	" 9.	" 12.	9,072 00
The Range	" 9.	" 12.	4,861 00

4. (a) No.

(b) Burton: D. C. Burpee, Gibson, N.B. $16,580
Lower Jemseg: C. B. & G. W. Colwell, Jemseg, N.B. 1,600
Newcastle: B. L. Simmons, Fredericton, N.B. 6,950
Scotchtown: C. J. B. Simmons, Fredericton, N.B. 13,658
Young's Cove: R. J. Kelly, White's Cove, N.B. 4,000

5 and 6. It was decided to change the style of construction and to call for new tenders.

DAILY MAIL SERVICE IN QUEENS AND SUNBURY.

Mr. CROCKET asked:

1. How many new daily mail services were established in the counties of Queens and Sunbury, N.B., in the months of September and October last, and how many new post offices?

2. Did the Post Office Department before ordering the establishment of these services and offices have a report from the post office inspector as to the cost of maintenance and probabe revenue? If so, what was it in the case of each office established?

3. Had any of these mail services or Post Offices been previously applied for and refused? If so, when and on what grounds were the applications refused?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

Only one daily mail service was established in the counties of Queens and Sunbury during the months of September and October last, to serve a new post office at Washadamoak, the cost of such service being $25 per annum. The following is a list of new post offices established showing also estimated revenue and cost of service:

Elm Hill—
Estimated revenue $15
Cost of tri-weekly service 35
Established upon report of post office inspector.

Washadamoak—
Estimated revenue $15
Cost of daily service 25
Established upon report of post office inspector.

Central Maugerville—
Estimated revenue $20
No special cost for daily service, as office is situate on an existing mail route.
Established upon report of post office inspector.

Upper Welsford—
Estimated revenue $20
No special cost for tri-weekly service, as office is situate on an existing mail route.
Established upon report of post office inspector.

Canaan Rapids—
Estimated revenue $20
Cost of semi-weekly service 60
This office was refused during the year 1905 on the report of the inspector that it would accommodate only seven families; but the inspector having subsequently advised the department that a greater number of persons would now benefit by such an office authority was given for its establishment.

Snell—
Estimated revenue $10
Cost of tri-weekly service 60
This application was marked to stand during February, 1908, the report of the post office inspector showing that a limited number of families would be accommodated, and that the proposed office would be within a reasonable distance of two other offices, but from a subsequent report it appearing that the distance of neighbouring offices was greater, and the district much isolated, the office was then authorized.

PERMANENT CORPS AND ACTIVE MILITIA.

Mr. HUGHES—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. Have the batteries in Kingston or elsewhere in Canada sleighs for their guns for winter use? If not, why not?

2. Have the permanent corps suitable clothing, kit and equipment sufficient for a winter campaign?

3. Have the ordinary active militia the same?

4. Is there any sufficient reasons why these should or should not be supplied, and what are they?

5. Are the batteries manned up to full establishment?

6. Are the other permanent corps manned to full establishment?

7. Have the corps been up to full strength in camps during the last three years?

8. To what is the cause of shortage in members attributed?

9. Why do some officers bring out full members in corps and others be deficient?

10. Is the Kingston district rifle range open for rifle practice? If not, what is the cause of delay?

11. Is it the intention of the government to revert to the older plan of recognizing educational and other fitness as the basis of obtaining certificates and not mere rank?

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

1. The batteries have some old pattern sleighs, but these are not considered satisfactory, so a new pattern is under trial at the present time. As soon as the new pattern is perfected, it is the intention of the department to equip the batteries with it.

2. Yes; Consisting of great coat or cloak, fur cap, mitts or gloves, muffler, cardigan jacket and at certain stations moccasins and long stockings.

3. No: The only article of winter kit issued to non-permanent units, in addition to the regimental peace issue, is the great-coat or cloak. Other articles required to complete winter kit would be supplied upon mobilization.

4. The training of non-permanent units is mainly carried out in the spring or summer months. The cost of issuing winter kit to non-permanent units and of holding in reserve a sufficient quantity of such articles to equip the men required to raise such units to war establishment is prohibitive.

Moreover, it is considered that, if winter kit were issued and a reserve stock held, there would be a great loss to the country annually through the deterioration of the same.

5-6. Yes, to the full establishment as allowed by the estimates voted.

7. Not all corps.

8-9. To business conditions and the difference in energy and enthusiasm of commanding officers.

10. The range has not yet been opened for rifle practice, as it has only recently been handed over to the department by the contractor. Also, some additional land within the danger area in the rear of the butts has still to be acquired. It is, however, expected that everything will be in readiness for the ensuing shooting season.

11. It is not proposed to alter the present system of obtaining certificates of qualification. These certificates, however, are not granted for mere rank.

LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE OF CANADIAN CITIES.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

1. Has the Department of the Interior determined, with precision, the longitudes and latitudes of the following cities or any of them: Halifax, N.S., St. John, N.B., Rimouski, Que., Three Rivers, Montreal, Que., Ottawa, Toronto, Kingston, Hamilton, Owen Sound, Ont., Winnipeg, Man., Calgary, Alta., Vancouver and Victoria, B.C.?

2. If these longitudes and latitudes have not been determined by the officers of the Department of the Interior, what are they, according to the most authentic maps and the best information in the possession of the said department?

3. What is the difference, solar time, between Toronto and Ottawa, Toronto and Montreal, Ottawa and Montreal, Montreal and Quebec, Quebec and St. John, N.B., Quebec and Halifax, Victoria and Halfiax?

Hon FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior).

1. Yes, as defined in answer to No. 2.

2. See answer to No. 1. The latitude and longitude of the cities mentioned are as follows:

Place.	Longitude.			Latitude.			Remarks.
	h.	m.	s.	°	′	″	
Halifax	4	14	25	44	40	08	Astronomically determined by Department of the Interior.
St. John, N.B.	4	24	13	45	16	35	Longitude scaled from map. Latitude determined by Department of the Interior.
Rimouski	4	34	11	48	27	10	Scaled from maps.
Three Rivers	4	50	09	46	20	37	Astronomically determined by Department of the Interior.
Montreal	4	54	19	45	30	22	Longitude by exchange with Greenwich. Latitude by McGill Observatory.
Ottawa	5	02	52	45	23	38	Astronomically determined by Department of the Interior.
Toronto	5	17	35	43	39	36	The Canadian Astronomical Hand Book, 1907.
Kingston	5	05	53	44	13	47	Astronomically determined by Department of Interior.
Hamilton	5	19	36	43	16	00	Scaled from maps.
Owen Sound	5	23	47	44	33	56	Astronomically determined by Department of Interior.
Winnipeg	6	28	34	49	53	52	" " "
Calgary	7	36	15	51	02	39	" " "
Vancouver	8	12	28	49	17	48	" " "
Victoria	8	13	27	48	25	31	" " "

3. The difference in solar time between the cities mentioned is as follows:

	H.	M.	S.
Toronto-Ottawa		14	43
Toronto-Montreal		23	16
Ottawa-Montreal		8	33
Montreal-Quebec		9	27
Quebec-St. John, N. B.		20	39
Quebec-Halifax		30	27
Victoria-Halifax	3	59	02

IMPORTATION OF REGISTERED STOCK.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR asked:

1. Did this government at any time make arrangements with the government of the United States whereby registered stock would be imported for breeding purposes into either country from the other free of duty?

2. If so, at what date were such arrangements made, and are they effective now?

3. Were regulations under such arrangements promulgated for the information of those concerned? If so, how were they promulgated?

4. Have these regulations been amended at any time? If so, what is the effect of the amendment?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1, 2, 3, 4. No.

Such regulations have been in force in both countries for some years. They were made by each country acting independently of the other. The Canadian regulations have been amended from time to time. The effect of recent amendments is to require the importer to be a British subject or domiciled in Canada and to produce with his entry a certificate of record and pedigree issued by the office of the Canadian National Records and approved by the Department of Agriculture. In the case of Holstein-Friesian cattle the certificate is issued by the secretary of the Holstein-Friesian Breeders' Association of Canada. The amended regulations have been furnished by the Department of Agriculture to the principal newspapers in Canada and the live stock associations. They have been published in the Official 'Gazette' and mailed to all customs officers.

DISCARDED BRITISH SHIPS OF WAR.

Mr. BARNARD asked:

Has the imperial government made any offer or proposal to this government to allow them the use of any ships of war now out of commission or discarded as obsolete, to be used by the government of Canada for the purpose of fisheries protection or coast defence?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). No.

EXPENDITURE OF PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FOR MILITIA PURPOSES.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What amount of money has been expended by the Public Works Department for militia purposes for each year since 1896 on capital and current account, respectively?

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

	Capital.	Income.
1896-97		$ 84,845 76
1897-98		102,101 50
1898-99		52,211 67
1899-1900	$ 4,342 66	76,278 59
1900-01	40,481 55	111,815 07
1901-02	33,480 98	247,200 80
1902-03		148,080 71
1903-04	1,522 62	155,017 58
1904-05		419,407 51
1905-06		387,157 21
1906-07		256,106 48
1907-08		502,208 19
1908-09 (to date)		576,848 66
Totals	$79,827 81	$3,119,279 73

IRRIGATION OF CERTAIN LANDS.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked:

1. Has the government received any irrigation propositions for the lands or any part of them applied for by Percy Aylwin?

2. If so, what were these propositions?

3. Has the department any notice of Mr. Aylwin's application having been assigned, or otherwise disposed of?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes. An application to purchase these and other lands was received in May, 1908, from the Canadian International Colonization Company, of Winnipeg, Manitoba.

2. (a) To be permitted to purchase 350,000 acres of land at $3 per acre, and to be allowed a credit not exceeding $2 per acre for the cost of the irrigation works to be constructed; the said credit to be treated as part of the purchase price.

(b) To irrigate from one-fifth to one-fourth of the area purchased.

(c) To make a deposit of $400,000 as security for the construction of the irrigation works.

(d) To make a further deposit of $100,000 as a guarantee for the continuous supply of water to consumers, or to give such guarantee in such other form as might be acceptable.

3. No.

DISMISSALS FROM PUBLIC SERVICE.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. Were George A. Johnston, George P. Ward, H. W. Ross, Munroe Charlebois, James O. Cowan, James White and L. J. Kehoe dismissed from the public service in 1906?

2. If so, what was the reason for their dismissal?

3. What was their salary while in the service?

4. Are any of the above named persons now in the employ of the government? If so, who,

and what is the date of his last appointment or reinstatement?

5. Was any part of the money said to have been improperly received by these men, or any of them, refunded to the Department of Immigration as suggested by the Auditor General, Report 1906, L—91?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.

2. Irregularity in their accounts.

3. Salaries while in the service.

Name.	1901-02.	1902-03.	1903-04.	1904-05.	1905-06.	1906-07.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
George A. Johnston	560 00	1,010 00	1,035 67	988 00	916 00	364 00
George P. Ward	.....	.....	20 00	664 00	876 00	400 00
H. W. Ross	.....	.....	.....	272 00	784 00	380 00
James O. Cowan	164 00	626 00	628 00	706 00	756 00	408 00
James White	.....	.....	228 00	604 00	852 00	384 00
L. J. Kehoe	.....	.....	176 00	660 00	694 00	360 00
Honoré Charlebois	.....	.....	268 00	728 00	626 00	412 00

4. Yes.

Geo. A. Johnston, 14th August, 1908.

Honore Charlebois, 9th July, 1907.

Note. The answer to No. 4 is only given as far as the Department of the Interior is concerned.

5. Yes.

IMMIGRATION—PRINTING AND ADVERTISING.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked:

1. What amount of money has been expended by the government for printing in connection with immigration matters during the fiscal year 1908 and up to 1st of March, 1909?

2. What amount of money has been expended for advertising in newspapers for the same purpose?

3. What are the names of the said newspapers and the amount paid to each?

4. What pamphlets were issued, what are their names, from whom were they purchased, by whom published, and what prices were paid for each?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Stands as motion for return.

FISHING—LAKE WINNIPEGOSIS.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked:

1. Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries received a petition since January, 1909, from residents of Winnipegosis district, asking that the lake be reopened for summer fishing?

2. If so, is it the intention to comply with their request? If not, why not?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (for Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes.

2. This question was answered on the 22nd February, 'Hansard' No. 24, page 1454.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN RIFLES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. Is the government aware that a large number of Swiss or other foreign rifles are said to be brought into Canada in wholesale lots, and retailed throughout the country at a small figure for sporting purposes, and that these rifles are small bore, long range arms, carrying more than a mile, selling for about $3 each, and are used indiscriminately in the vicinity of towns and villages, thereby causing a great source of danger to life and limb?

2. If so, under what customs law or regulation are these rifles brought into Canada?

3. Who are the importers, in what quantities, and under what class do they come in?

4. When the government discarded the Snider rifle for more modern arm, how were these rifles disposed of, to whom, at what price, and in what quantities?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. The government is aware that a large number of foreign rifles of long range have been brought into Canada and distributed by the trade throughout the country. These rifles are advertised for sale by retail in some instances at about $5 each, but the government is not aware of their use indiscriminately in the vicinity of towns and villages.

2. These rifles have been admitted by collectors of customs the same as other arms which have been imported, without restriction, for many years. A circular was issued recently to collectors of customs, pointing out that permission from the Department of Customs is required for the importation of military rifles (repeating arm), except from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The department has not granted permission for importation of these rifles since January last.

3. One large importing firm is known to the government, but there are several smaller importers. All the importers, and the quantities of rifles imported, can, however, only be ascertained upon examination of a large number of documents, which would require time. Provision is

made in Tariff item No. 424 for a duty of 30 per cent (General Tariff) on rifles imported into Canada.

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

4. The Snider rifles were disposed of as follows:—

(1). By sale on tenders received after public advertisement dated 25th July, 1898.

To Lt. Col. F. Minden Cole, Montreal, 30,000 at 75 cents each—and 400 (damaged beyond any repair) at 25 cents each.

(2). Now in use by cadet corps and on ordnance charge 11,493.

AVIATION—EXPERIMENTS BY CANADIANS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). I notice from the newspapers that very successful experiments have been made by certain Canadians in aerial navigation and especially at Baddeck, in N. S., in the case of the invention of Mr. Alexander Bell, the eminent Canadian. I wish to know whether the government has taken any steps to recognize the advance of this science in Canada, and if not, is it their intention to take measures to encourage the science as in the case of the Marconi wireless telegraph system?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). We have the highest appreciation of the work that has been accomplished by Mr. Douglas McCurdy and also Mr. Baldwin of Toronto, who is associated with him in the work, with Dr. Graham Bell. We have not, shall I say fortunately or unfortunately, any branch of our public service in which we could conveniently utilize the discoveries of these scientific gentlemen. Nevertheless we felt that we should take some notice of their achievements and for the present we have taken steps to draw the attention of the imperial government to them in the hope that the officials of the War Office and the Admiralty, who are now directing their attention to aerial navigation, may be able to avail of the services of these young Canadians and thus retain them for the benefit of the empire.

Mr. HUGHES. Hear, hear.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—COST OF N.B. SECTION.

Mr. C. L. OWEN (Northumberland). Last session the Minister of Railways and Canals stated in the House that the lowest estimate for the construction of that part of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Moncton to Winnipeg was $28,000 per mile. The minister afterwards stated that this estimate had been increased to $63,437 per mile. Has this last estimate been changed since last session, and if not, is the section of the Grand Trunk from Moncton to Winnipeg being constructed at that cost per mile. Does this estimate per mile include terminals and railway stations on that section between Moncton and Winnipeg, and will the minister state as nearly as possible the exact mileage including switches from Moncton to Winnipeg?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Some time ago I answered the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) that on inquiry, the Board of Transcontinental Railway Commissioners had assured me they had no reason to date to make any further revision of their estimate per mile. If my hon. friend will allow me until to-morrow I will try to get exact information from the engineers as to his other questions.

PAPER, PULP, &c.—NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE U. S.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have there been any negotiations with the government of the United States respecting lower reciprocal duties or abolition of duties upon paper, pulp, logs and lumber, or, has the government declined to negotiate with regard to this matter.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There has been no negotiation nor any attempt at negotiation on this matter.

LEVEL RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:—

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the sum of $200,000 each year for five consecutive years from the first day of April, 1909, be appropriated and set apart from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada for the purpose of aiding in the providing of protection, safety and convenience for the public in respect of existing highway crossings of railways at rail level, and that the said sums be placed to the credit of a special account to be known as 'The Railway Grade Crossing Fund,' and be applied under authority of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is due to the committee that I should make a short explanation of the details of the proposed Bill. As the general question was discussed at great length a few days ago, it is not necessary for me to add any argument to convince the members of the committee or the country that a situation does exist that needs some remedy. It is not a situation that can be remedied by any theories. To my mind it is a condition that requires a prac-

tical solution. The crux of the remedy, so far as this House is concerned, is the enlargement of the power of the Railway Commission and a contribution from parliament towards the purpose we have in view. Objection has been raised in one or two quarters to the federal authorities making any contribution for the elimination of the dangers of level crossings, it being contended that all the expense should be borne by the railways and the municipalities. There are conditions under which that might be proper, and the board will have full power to adopt that principle where in its judgment those conditions exist. But if we are to get rid of this great danger, even partially, I think we must at once be practical, and with that object I have followed to a certain extent, in the drafting of this measure, the policy adopted in every state of the union which has endeavoured to grapple with the problem. Were we beginning railway construction at the present time, it would not be difficult to frame legislation for giving the Board of Railway Commissioners power to protect level crossings hereafter to be constructed. But in a new country like ours we have been so anxious to have railways constructed that the federal authority has aided them, the provinces have aided them, and the municipalities have aided them, and until recent years we have allowed them to have pretty much their own way in regard to the protection of the crossings. As a result of our combined lack of scrutiny of the construction of railway crossings, and of the different conditions that have arisen owing to growth of population, increased speed of trains and development of the country, it has become necessary for us to take active steps to undo in a measure what we have done, or, in other words, to adapt our legislation to present conditions. It being a question that is practical, I believe the only practical way for this House to deal with it is to assent to a contribution to assist in the elimination of this evil, and in that view I have introduced the resolution. Now, in short, the Bill proposes that we shall contribute $200,000 a year for five years to a fund to be designated for the purpose I have indicated. We do not propose to give the board power to divide the $200,000 as it pleases, but we propose to restrict the contribution in this way. For no crossing shall there be contributed more than 20 per cent of the cost nor more than $5,000. The board may not draw on this fund at all, but we give it power to do so within these restrictions. The board will have power, as it has now, to apportion the cost between the railway, the municipality, other person or corporation and this fund. We say other corporation or person, to provide for the case of a toll road owned by a company or the case of a street railway company. It has been a little difficult to define the crossing, as it may have one track, two tracks, three tracks, or even four tracks.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there a limit as to the municipality as well ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not in this Bill. In the United States Act there is a limit to the amount contributed by a municipality, but the conditons are different there from those existing in Canada. Conditnons have arisen in Ontario in connection with large viaduct schemes, to which the municipality contributes a larger portion than it does in other cases. The law is not changed in that respect. We are only passing restrictive legislation with reference to the amount we are to contribute ourselves. As to a crossing, we propose to describe that as a work not including more than from one to four tracks. The reason will be obvious. Some crossings might include at terminals fifteen or twenty tracks, and it would not be fair to have the word ' crossing ' mean more than a certain number of tracks. That number I have placed at four. In order that one municipality may not get all the benefit of this fund in one year by having a large number of crossings, we propose to enact that not more than three crossings in any one municipality in any one year shall be contributed to from this fund.

Another important point is that the contributions I have outlined are to be for crossings that now exist, but I am proposing to place a clause in the Act which will say that crossings, hereafter created by railways yet to be constructed crossing highways, shall be constructed at the expense of the company and without any charge on our fund or on the municipality, thus making a distinction between crossings which already exist and those which are to be brought into existence in the future. I am making some distinction in the case of railways not yet built, as to the priority between the railway and the highway. If the railway is run through a section where there is no highway practically, and it crosses no highway, and is built according to the directions of the Board of Railway Commissioners, it ought not to be in the future, if a highway is constructed across the track, in the same position as if the highway were constructed first. In such a case the board can apportion the cost as between the railways and the municipality.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. minister mean a highway in law or in fact? Will the Act apply where a highway has been set apart by the survey, but not actually constructed?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not given that a great deal of thought, though the other day, in discussing it, I drew attention to the fact that a street might be provided for and not be built. That can be discussed in committee and possibly we might

get over the difficulty, if it be a difficulty, by defining what is meant by a highway.

Another definition determines what we mean by a municipality. We describe it as a city, town, incorporated village, township or parish, in order to guard against the word 'municipality' being constructed as a county by some courts.

These are the main provisions, so far as level crossings are concerned, and it is but fair to say that in this Bill there are certain other items which it would not be out of place to explain for the moment. In our Act as now existing, some difficulty has arisen as to the issuing of bonds. The same difficulty arose under the old country Act, and the English Act provides for it. I think they provide for it in the Company's Act, but I propose to provide for it in this Act as it applies particularly to railway companies. It appears that by a judgment in the British courts, when bonds are pledged as security, say as collateral security, they are at that moment treated as having been issued but just deposited as security. In such a case, they could not be re-issued except as a new issue. In looking over the British Act I find they have remedied that. In several provinces they have done it in the Company's Act. In order to clear up the matter, I propose to introduce a clause to cover that point.

There is a question particularly affecting the people of the west and that is the protection along the lines of railway by means of fire guards. I have had representations made by members from the west and also by the railway companies themselves, regarding the power of the railways to plough furrows in lands not on their line for the purpose of protection against fire. I am providing that they may be allowed to do that under conditions to be prescribed by the Board of Railway Commissioners. There is this difficulty that the railway companies think they ought to have the right to go on other property and be exempt from all liabilities for damages. In some cases that might be proper and in others not, because they might in some cases injure more property than they would protect. I have thought it advisable not to release them from any liabilities under the Act. On the other hand we do not want to impose in perpetuity the liability, and we concluded that the fair way was to provide that the railway companies could, under conditions prescribed by the board, establish these fire guards.

There is another point I want to deal with, of great importance to the railway companies and the people, particularly in sections where railway construction is taking place. On all these points I am open to discussion and conviction. The law, as it now stands, provides that if plans are

Mr. GRAHAM.

filed for the location of a railway, no matter how long a time may elapse between the filing of these plans and the taking over of the property, the value of the property shall remain at the price it was when the plans were filed. Let me illustrate. In a section of country where a railway is to be constructed or a charter granted, the company may proceed to file plans. The companies have their charters renewed. They may have had their plans filed in a certain locality and ten years may elapse before they proceed to take possession of the land for the right of way. The law intended that the land should not increase in value owing to the expected building of railways. It was intended to protect the railways to that extent. But circumstances often arise in which the land increases in value very rapidly, independent of the railway going there, and it hardly seems fair that a company should have the privilege of tieing up the land or keeping it at this high value ten or twenty years before they intend building the road, while the property all around is increasing in value. I propose to say that two years will be allowed after filing of the plans for the railway to obtain a title. That two years corresponds with the time given the railway companies by this House for the expenditure of 15 per cent of their charter. After two years they have to come back and get their charters renewed. I thought it would be fair to make these periods concurrent. I would ask the committee to place a clause in the Bill saying that the price of property shall remain as at the time the plans were filed, provided the company obtains titles to these lands within two years of the filing of these plans. That situation has arisen in some parts of Canada, and I think it is but fair that we should apply the remedy. That is a clause I have inserted in the Bill, and at present I think it need interfere with no person.

Mr. MACDONELL. Will that clause be retroactive, or will the government take care that existing litigations—for there are such, as mentioned by the minister—are not included in this section?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not made provision for that in the clause, but I think we would have to guard against interference with present litigation. I am opposed to interfering with any case now in dispute in the courts. These are the main points in the Bill, which I submit to the confidence of the House. I think I have gone further than the resolution would warrant me in going, but as they are in the Bill I thought it better to make a full explanation.

Mr. CONMEE. With regard to the filing of plans, the minister has pointed out very clearly what the object of his proposal is, and it is a very laudable object in my

opinion. But there is another defect in this connection, if I am rightly informed, in reference to the filing of plans along and adjacent to navigable waters and harbours. As I understand it, the railway company makes plans and submits them to the railway board, or the minister, as the case may be. The railway board, or minister, might refuse to ratify the plans. But that is not the practice; the plans, as a rule, are ratified. Because, there seems to be no other course. The law is not elastic enough, it seems to me. The railway board ought to have power to ratify such portions of the plans as they see fit, and, later, if the public interests and the business of the road require it, they could ratify further portions. In that way, some portion of the water fronts and harbours might be conserved to the public; under existing circumstances, the railway company usually manages to get it all. Will the minister please consider that point?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will.

Mr. LENNOX. Would the minister explain how he understands the jurisdiction of the railway board as regards municipalities? Does he understand that the board has power, without any Act on the part of the municipality, to order the municipality to contribute towards, let us say, providing means of protection; or is it only when the municipality initiates the proceedings and so submits itself to the jurisdiction of the board?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it is comparatively clear that the board has jurisdiction to compel a municipality as well as an individual. The decision of the board may be made an order of the court by a very simple process. I do not wish to express a legal opinion, not being a lawyer, but I have discussed the matter with the Minister of Justice and several other gentlemen, and the opinion seems to be that, even if we did not, in the first instance, have ample powers, the passing of this portion of the Bill, being incident to the working out of the Act in detail, would give full authority.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to ask another question. Has the minister conferred in any way with any of the provincial governments with a view to their co-operating in bringing about the desired improvement in our conditions?

Mr. GRAHAM. I may say that I have done so. It is only within the last few days that I have been able to work this Bill out into the shape in which I now have it. It is a very intricate matter, when you come to get it down on paper. I wrote a brief letter to each of the provincial premiers, outlining what I was doing, and asking for their co-operation. I suggested to them my own opinion that the provinces might care to contribute something, but that it would be out of place for me to urge that view. But I did suggest that it would help in the working out of the Bill if they would give the municipalities any powers they required in reference to raising money for the purposes indicated, as the provincial authorities control the municipalities. I suggested to them also that if the municipalities through themselves, or in some way through the legislature, would consider the advisability of passing certain by-laws as to the necessity of exercising care in crossing tracks, it might be a benefit. I received a reply from the premier of Ontario expressing sympathy with the movement. I shall hear from him again, as they have not had time to discuss the matter fuller. Other premiers have not had time to reply.

Mr. HAGGART. There seems to be a consensus of opinion in favour of legislation in the direction of that introduced by the Minister of Railways. There is one matter which the hon. gentleman has neglected to deal with in his speech: he did not tell the number of crossings to be provided for, nor whether the grant of the sum proposed each year for five years would be sufficient to wipe out the dangerous crossings altogether, or whether this would provide for only a moiety. In any case, this is a step in the right direction. The nice question arises, that has been suggested by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) as to the power of this House to compel municipalities to contribute to these crossings. In the past, we have dealt with this matter through the Railway Commisison. Municipalities have applied to the commission to have the railway crossings regulated. It may be said, as has been suggested, that, when the municipalities have been applicants, the commission may have jurisdiction by reason of that fact. But I think we have gone further than that; I think that the railway companies have applied to the Railway Commission asking that municipalities should be required to contribute towards highway crossings and that the commission has dealt with that matter. I have expressed myself pretty clearly as to the jurisdiction of this parliament to legislate on these matters. I believe it to be quite clear that, as this parliament has power to grant a railway charter, it has the right to legislate on everything incidental to the carrying on of the railway. Property and civil rights are handed over to the jurisdiction of the provinces. But we go so far as to say that a municipality shall contribute towards a railway crossing. We go so far as to say that the railway

company shall have the right to enter into private property adjacent to the railway and make a fire guard.

If we can do that, we can almost do anything in reference to assuming jurisdiction over civil rights and property. My memory is in the past, to a great extent. I have listened to the opinions of the ablest lawyers, and have consulted them with reference to that very subject. I had occasion to consult Sir John Thompson in reference to that matter, and he was clear that where the parliament of Canada had decided that any subject was incidental to something which they had jurisdiction over, parliament could exercise jurisdiction over that subject, and the highest court in Great Britain would not inquire whether it was incidental or not. According to that opinion, I think that our jurisdiction is certain. I think there is no doubt that the minister is proceeding in the right direction, because it is clear, from the debates in the House, and the opinions of the press, and of every one else, that the disgraceful state of affairs in this country regarding level crossings must be put an end to. It is but reasonable that the Dominion government should contribute something towards that end. It is a small amount that the Dominion government are contributing, and it could not be left to a fairer court than the Railway Commission to apportion the amount between the government, the railways and municipalities. I congratulate the minister on the resolution, and on the able advocacy of the legislation by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and others. I consider the legislation to be absolutely in the right direction.

Mr. BLAIN. When the minister was explaining his Bill, I notice he said that the limit of the tracks was four. I have in mind one or two very dangerous crossings where there are five tracks over the highway. Why should not the minister make provision for cases of that kind?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will see that I am helping him. Where there are more than four tracks the federal fund could be drawn upon for practically two crossings instead of one. A situation of that kind could call for an appropriation for two crossings on the same highway. I was limiting the Bill to four tracks, because in some places there might be terminals, and I wanted to get away from the large viaduct schemes. In that case there would be nothing to preclude the commission from drawing on the federal fund an amount to equal two crossings.

Mr. EDWARDS. The same thought occurred to me when the Minister of Railways was limiting the crossings to only four tracks. I have in mind a particular crossing which has been declared dangerous by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, by the Board of Railway Commissioners and by the Minister of Railways himself. There are six tracks. The Grand Trunk has made a shunting ground across the highway with six tracks, one running a distance of 25 or 30 feet beyond the highway, but it is sufficient to make six tracks across the highway. I understood the minister to say that he proposed not only to limit the purpose of this Bill to crossings where there were not more than four tracks, but also to limit the number of cases in each municipality.

Mr. GRAHAM. In any one year.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to understand from the minister whether, for instance, if the crossing I have referred to was taken in, and a portion of the money was given to that crossing—and I believe we could get a portion of it—would that be the same as three crossings in that particular year for that municipality?—because there are six tracks there.

Mr. GRAHAM. The idea of the Bill is that, for this purpose, you can call a crossing of four tracks or less one crossing; if you had eight tracks there would be two crossings.

Mr. BARR. Do we understand then that in case of five tracks, if there were one track more than four, the municipality would get double the amount? Would it be $5,000 for each track? It seems to me that would be an unfair proportion. If there were eight or ten tracks the municipality would only be paid for two crossings.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend has missed the point. I have confined the grant to not more than 20 per cent in any case, because they could not get over that restriction, if they did over the other. The Board of Railway Commissioners will have full power to restrict as they see fit. We are adding a limit over which they cannot go, both as to percentage and as to amount.

Mr. WRIGHT. There was a point I did not understand. If I understood the minister correctly, he confines the operations of this Act to incorporated municipalities. Now in the newer sections of the west, in northern Ontario, and doubtless in other parts of the country, there are settlements close to railways, but there is no municipal organization. I would like, if possible, that people in these circumstances should have the same privilege, and that the minister should extend the Act to places where the people have not organized municipally, but where the crossings are just as dangerous as in cities and towns.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is nothing in this Act to prevent the Board of Railway Commissioners from dealing with crossings in unorganized districts as with crossings any-

where else. If there is no municipality, there may be some other power upon which they could draw for a portion of the fund. The object of this Act is to eliminate the danger of any level crossing in Canada. So far as possible I have tried to outline the parties among whom the costs should be apportioned.

Mr. WRIGHT. Can they draw on this fund in the cases I have mentioned?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there will be no question about that.

Mr. STANFIELD. I understand none of this fund will be used to protect level crossings on government railways. I would ask the minister if it is intended in the near future to take into consideration the level crossings on government railways. He must know that in Nova Scotia, for instance, there are numerous dangerous level crossings that should be protected.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a matter which gave me a good deal of thought—how we should proceed in regard to government railways. But back of it all we have to remember that it is the same government and the same treasury, whether the money comes out of this fund or out of some other fund. As the government railways pay no taxes to either the municipalities or provinces, the municipalities, with reference to government railways, occupy a somewhat different position from that which they occupy with reference to private-owned railways. In the estimates of this year my hon. friend will find several amounts devoted to the elimination of level crossings. We propose to do at least as good work on the government railways as we are trying to make private-owned railways do throughout the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. CROCKET. I understand the minister to say that the word ' municipality ' as defined in this Bill, will apply to cities, towns and incorporated villages. In the province of New Brunswick we have no townships and we have very few villages that are incorporated. Would the municipality or the county be liable in a case of that kind where there was a crossing running through a village that was not incorporated?

Mr. GRAHAM. In my explanation I intended to use the word ' parish ' in addition to ' townships.'

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. You did use it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would not that cover your case?

Mr. CROCKET. Of course, we have parishes.

Mr. LENNOX. I certainly am very much pleased that we are to have a defined policy as to part of this question. I maintain a reasonable respect for the Railway Board, but I have greater faith in the wisdom of 220 men than in the wisdon of five or six ; and what I have set out for particularly in this matter is that we shall have some kind of general principle upon which the question of the control of railway crossings shall be settled. I notice too with pleasure that the minister has a double limit to the liability which we will incur; first, that we shall not contribute more than 20 per cent and secondly that in any case we shall not go beyond $5,000 for the protection of any one crossing. I am inclined to think that it will be found that this is a valuable limitation, and that, as well, it will probably be found to be a reasonable amount. But, whilst I am very much pleased that we are to have, in part, a defined policy upon the question of railway crossings, I regret—and I hope it will not continue to be a regret, as I trust the minister will take into consideration the advisability of amending his judgment in that regard—I regret that we have not some limit to the contribution to be made by municipalities, if a contribution is to be made by the municipalities at all. If it is necessary that we should have a limit in the case of the country, with its comparatively large resources, I do submit that it is even more important and necessary that we should have a limit in the case of the country, with its comparatively large resources, I do submit that it is even more important and necessary that we should have a limit beyond which the municipalities shall not be called upon to contribute. The minister might answer me by saying that there is such a wide range to this question that it is hard to place the limit. I know it is, but the limit might be on a sliding scale of some kind.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. On a percentage basis.

Mr. LENNOX. On a percentage basis, as is suggested, and I think it will be found to work out very fairly. I would certainly urge that we have a limit as regards contributions by municipalities, a definite percentage beyond which they cannot be called upon to contribute unless they desire by consent of the council of the municipality to contribute a larger amount. I notice in the findings of the Railway Board that a good many of the cases are adjusted by agreement between the railway companies and the municipalities and it is probably a very fair and desirable way in some instances. I have in my mind, more particularly, the question of rural municipalities. All the same that there should be a limit as to all municipalities. Speak- for the moment as to rural municipalities, I want to say a word or two. I said the other day I was of opinion that rural municipalities should probably not be called upon to contribute at all. Some one was disposed to take me to task and ask: Why should city municipalities

pay and why should rural municipalities not pay? I did not exactly say that. In the first place, I thought, that with the able representatives we have here from the various cities of Canada they would be able to present their view of the matter better than I could as to what should be the measure of responsibility of the cities, but I do feel that there is a distinction to be drawn between rural municipalities and cities in this respect. Whilst a rural municipality is benefited by the railway, a city is practically made by the railway and therefore there should be a very sharp distinction drawn between what should be contributed by a city and what should be contributed by a rural municipality. In many cases, the great trunk lines are running through these municipalities and the majority of their trains contribute nothing to the advantage of the municipalities through which they merely run, but in the case of the large city, every train that passes into it is of advantage to it.

Enough as to that. I desire merely to emphasize the one phase of the matter that I do feel that we will not have this matter settled in a satisfactory way and the country will not accept it as being satisfactory unless we adopt the principle which is in operation in every state of the union. I believe that in every state of the union where they have laws similar to this there is a definite limit beyond which the municipalities cannot be called upon to contribute, and I think it is more essential to have a limit as regards the municipalities than that we should have a limit with regard to the government. The government have better means of presenting their views of the matter than any municipality can have in this country. I am not going into details of that. I congratulate the minister most earnestly and candidly upon having brought in this measure. There are a great many details, of course, that I am not sure are in the measure, but it would hardly be expected that the minister would, at one fell swoop, bring us down all the details that we might think desirable in a measure of this kind. I am not at all convinced of the minister's reasoning or of the advisability of his attitude as regards the limit of four tracks as constituting a crossing. The more tracks the more it is a crossing and the more deadly it is. I would not like the railway companies to be put in a position to hamper the people of the country, or in small towns, by putting in an extra switch and then, as a result of this saying: There is an unlimited liability on your part to contribute and if you initiate proceedings you will have to contribute at the rate of two crossings for these five tracks. That would hardly be an end to be desired. I do not think that probably a limit of four tracks is advisable although I am not going to absolutely condemn it at the moment. I recognize that whilst it may be said to be two crossings, it does not follow that we will pay two full contributions. I recognize that the Railway Board will endeavour to judge fairly between parties and will make the contribution proportionate to what the circumstances are.

Mr. BLAIN. The municipality would have to contribute towards two crossings, would it not ?

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think so. I am assuming that the Railway Board would exercise a sound discretion, and that they would not call upon a municipality to contribute double for five tracks of the contribution for four tracks. I think they would make it proportionate having regard to the total expense. Then, as to three crossings a year, I presume that some provision of that kind is necessary. That is three, I understand for one municipality. That is really necessary in order that some kind of equitable arrangement should be made. We want a good deal of information in reference to this question of new railways and new highways. I take it there can be no distinction drawn between a highway which has been put into actual use, and a highway which was set apart on the original survey and which was an existing highway in law, though not in fact, before the railway came into possession. Am I right in understanding the minister that this applies to providing money not only for protection by way of gates for example, but for separation of grades by overhead or underground crossings.

Mr. GRAHAM. The elimination of the danger whatever it is.

Mr. LENNOX. To read the resolution you would almost think it was confined to grade crossings; it is not happily worded in that regard. A railway grade crossing has come to mean a crossing at rail level but so long as the minister understands it in the way indicated, it is all right. Does the minister intend that this contribution shall apply indiscriminately, not only to the elimination of grade crossings, but to protection by other means such as gates and other safety devices short of separation of grades ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think we are going a little too much into details at this stage. Although the Bill does not say so, I believe the board will take the view that there shall be no draft made on the federal fund for the protection of a crossing by a gate—that would be a matter between the railways and the municipalities—but for the elimination of the grade crossing itself where the expenditure is large.

Mr. LENNOX. I draw a sharp distinction between the elimination of a grade crossing and mere protection at that cross-

ing. While I am ready to admit the justice of the Dominion contributing something for the separation of railway and highway crossings where the expenditure is large, I do not think we should go to the extent of contributing to protection by gates or bells. If the Bill is confined to the separation of grades I am in harmony with the minister. I understand that if a railway is constructed after this date that railway shall be obliged at its own expense to provide the necessary protection, and the railway board and the Railway Department will have the duty of seeing that such crossings are properly protected either by separation of the grades or whatever is necessary. But, although it may seem to be perfectly unnecessary when the railway is built to provide protection, it may subsequently become necessary on account of the increase of population to order protection, and I presume the Bill will be so worded that notwithstanding permission should be given to the railway to build without protection at the time of its original construction, the board will still retain control so as to order the necessary protection at a subsequent date. I presume also that the Bill will apply to all the railways which we charter this session. Then it is a matter of considerable importance as to who shall initiate proceedings in the matter of protecting the public. Is it to be left to some individual or to a municipality or to the railway companies which sometimes do initiate proceedings for protection. Or, is it intended that the initiation of proceedings for the elimination of crossings upon existing railways shall be the duty of some body like the railway board on behalf of the public?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Bill provides for that.

Mr. LENNOX. We are to contribute $200,000 a year for the next five years. I do not suppose that is going to be the end of our contribution but that is not important now. Will the board have power to commit us beyond the limit of a year? For instance, take the subway in Toronto which will cost $250,000; will the board have power to make an order regulating how much is to be paid by Canada each year as the work progresses for several years in advance?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. LENNOX. It would almost seem to be necessary to have some provision of that kind. Now, I shall refer to a matter which is not perhaps directly connected with the question before the House but which has some bearing on it. Mr. Hays said in his Stratford speech that it would cost $50,000,000 to carry out what has been suggested in parliament in this respect. He did not define exactly what had been suggested in parliament, but he is reported as saying they had 50,000 crossings on the Grand Trunk. Apparently that is a mistake. I inquired in the Railway Department how many crossings there were on the Grand Trunk and the minister suggested that there were probably 3,000. However, the people are determined to have protection at these crossings and the railways might just as well criticise what we are doing in parliament in a fair way. Nobody ever spoke of protecting all the crossings or even a large proportion of the crossings in Canada. We all recognize that a great many of them do not require protection, but there is a percentage which do require protection either by separation of grade or some other device, and it is idle for Mr. Hays or any one else however eminent to talk of it costing an average of $17,000 each for all the crossings in Canada. I apprehend that there is really a very small proportion of the railway crossings in Canada that require protection, and it will be in the interest of the railway companies, and of everybody who desires to avoid the nationalization of railways, to concur with the people's representatives in meeting the demands of the people fairly in this matter. I see that yesterday or the day before, in the discussion of the Lancaster Bill, one of the railway lawyers repeated the heresy of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways—I used the word heresy advisedly, because I get it from one of his own party papers.

Mr. GRAHAM. You do not generally take them as an authority.

Mr. LENNOX. In this case it is fairly good. To consider whether the people are careless or not is not the way to approach this matter. It is not a question whether an accident results from the people's carelessness or not. We know that people are careless, not only in the matter of railway crossings, but in all the various walks of life; in this and in many other respects we have to protect them against their own indiscretions. In reference to this matter the Toronto 'Star' says:

> One heresy that ought to be renounced forever is the notion that the public are bound to look out for the trains at crossings. It would be just as reasonable to say that a man has a right to dig a hole in a highway and demand that travellers shall drive carefully lest they fall into the hole. The highways should be made safe. Railway crossings where there is a great deal of traffic should be so guarded that travellers can drive past without thinking of the trains.

I certainly congratulate the minister on having made an advance in this very important matter, and I wish, as far as I am able, to facilitate the passage of this Act,

amended and improved as it passes through the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. Just a word in reference to the initiation of proceedings. We have given the Board of Railway Commissioners full power to initiate proceedings themselves. In fact, we expect the board to ascertain from the railways and from their own investigations where the most dangerous crossings are, and to deal with them first; but of course applications made by municipalities or others shall be dealt with as at present. With regard to the number of railways to a crossing, in view of the large terminals in the cities, we have to confine the application to a certain number. I hardly think my hon. friend's reference to my good journalistic friend's remark in the Toronto 'Star' quite works out. A railway is very necessary, while a hole in the road is not necessary, in the public interest.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know that that is a fair way to put it. A hole in a road is not necessary; neither is a trap on a railway. The railway is necessary, so is the highway, but a hole in the one or a trap in the other, is not necessary. I am glad that the minister has taken some action in this matter, but I do not fully understand what the policy of the government is. There is a provision of $200,000 a year for five years. I would be inclined to think that under the conditions laid down by the minister, that would not bring about a very large measure of relief. Is it the intention that this grant shall be perpetual? In short, how are we to bring about in this country a condition of things that will secure a very much greater degree of safety of life and property at crossings than we have had in the past? The minister has not given us very much light. Of course, we realize that if the country is once committed to a policy of this kind by a sort of agreement with the railway companies, by an implied agreement with the municipalities. it may have to be carried out by any goverment that comes into power afterwards. That is the reason I am making a little inquiry as to whether the policy is supposed to continue after the next five years, because I feel a personal interest in that question.

Mr. GRAHAM. You do not want to commit the next government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is another point. I am not quite so clear as my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) with regard to dealing with the municipalities. I realize fully the doctrine to which he has alluded, and which might be summed up in this way, that any jurisdiction that is necessarily incidental, for the proper exercise of jurisdiction conferred upon this parliament, may be assumed by this parliament, and indeed is possessed by this parliament; but there will be this curious complication in connection with these municipalities. Suppose that the parliament of Canada passes legislation which orders, or which authorizes the Board of Railway Commissioners to order, that any municipality in Canada shall pay a certain proportion in respect of protection at a crossing; you are imposing that order upon a body which has not been brought into existence by this parliament, which this parliament could not bring into existence. The powers of that municipal body are limited by its charter, by the Act which creates it; and you might find this parliament, or the Board of Railway Commissioners under the authority of this parliament, ordering a municipal council to do that which under the terms of the provincial Act creating it, it has no authority whatever to do. You would therefore be confronted with one of two dilemmas: you would order this municipal body to do that which it has no authority to do, which it could be restrained from attempting to do, or you would be obliged to go further and declare that the parliament of Canada could alter or deal with the constitution or charter of that body and give it powers which it had not possessed before. I would think that question would present very grave difficulty. I realize on the other hand that if any municipal body comes before the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada and makes application for protection at a highway crossing, the board, inasmuch as it has the right under the authority conferred upon it by parliament to refuse that application, would also have the right to grant the application, subject to a condition, and that condition might go so far as to declare that the municipal body itself should bear part of the cost. It would be then for the municipality to obtain the requisite power if it saw fit to avail itself of the decision of the Board of Railway Commissioners in that regard. There is one other point upon which the minister has not been definite. Suppose the protection to be afforded, under order of the Board of Railway Commissioners, takes the shape of some permanent work, which will be subject to deterioration and need repair from time to time, what is the proposal of the minister in that regard? Is this parliament to continue for all time to come to bear its share in the maintenance of this work or are we to be done with it once for all, when we have paid our share in the first instance? That is a subject which ought to be taken into consideration before the Bill is finally passed.

Mr. ELSON. I desire to make a few remarks upon this very important question of level crossings to which a large part of

the Bill applies. I believe there are far more people killed on the level crossings in the country than on those of the cities or towns, and I do not think that there is any constituency in which there have been so many persons killed and injured upon level crossings as in the one I have the honour to represent. In my view it is certainly the duty of the government to take active measures to protect those crossings. In order to justify what I have just said, let me mention a few of the serious accidents which have taken place in my own riding. A few years ago, a farmer was going home from the city of London. He had his two daughters with him in the rig. When they came to a level crossing, he looked in one direction and could see no train, but he could not see very far in the other direction on account of the bank through which the railway was cut. He started to cross the track, and just when the horse had reached it, a flyer came along at the rate of sixty miles per hour and upon the down grade. He tried his best to get across in time but failed. The train struck him and killed him, and his two daughters were hurled some distance away and picked up dead. The engineer, in giving his evidence at the coroner's inquest, said that when he saw those people on the track a shudder came over him, and he did his best to slow down, but owing to the short distance—he was about twenty yards away —and the great speed of the train coming on the down grade, he could not accomplish much in the way of slowing down, so he closed his eyes in order to avoid the horrible sight of what he knew was bound to happen. The crash came and the three persons in the rig were killed immediately. That is not all. At the next three-quarters of a mile is the next crossing. There was a business man—and business men are as a rule pretty watchful—driving over the track. He was struck by a train and immediately killed. Only three-quarters of a mile further on there is another level crossing, where a farmer, who was going home in the broad daylight, was struck by a train and killed. We had yesterday in the Senate the argument made that everyone should stop just before coming to a level crossing, but the trouble is the horses get frightened, and the driver is afraid to go on or to stop. In the instance I last mentioned, had the man not stopped at all, he would have saved his life. But as the train came closer, his horse became frightened and ran away and got on the track just in time to kill the man. The next crossing is a bridge. How many do you think were killed there? I am glad to say that there were no lives lost there at all. But there are many other accidents to which I could allude did I not hesitate to take up the time of the House. It is about time that protection should be given at these crossings. In many cases a bridge would do, but in many others a subway would be required. In others a gate and a man would suffice, and in other places probably an electric bell would have the desired effect. Every place should be considered according to its local character and surroundings. But the great question is: all this costs a great deal of money and who is to meet it? Should the companies meet it themselves or should the country help them? When I take up the year-book of last year, I notice that the country has granted to railways $181,025,000, and in addition 52,000,000 acres of land. One would naturally think that when so much has been given by the people, the railways themselves ought to make their crossings safe. However, these railways have been asked for by the people, and as the hon. the Minister of Railways said the other evening, it would be only right that the people should contribute something to assist in curing this evil. My idea is that the government should withhold the bonuses which are being granted to new railways and apply them to a fund to assist in protecting these crossings.

Then, again, I think the municipalities ought to tax the railways a little more than they do. But the municipalities, in my opinion, ought not to be called upon to pay any portion of this expense. Having had some years experience in a large township council and county council, I know for a fact that the people have enough to do to meet their responsibilities in building bridges, making roads and providing public institutions. All this involves a heavy burden. If the municipalities have to pay any part of the expense in relation to these crossings, it will be like paying three times. They would make their direct contribution as municipalities, then their portion of that paid by the province, and also their portion of that paid by the Dominion. I hope that, in view of the large undertakings now before the country, the municipalities will be free. I am glad the government is taking this matter in hand. It is a great work, and one that the people want carried out. I hope it will be done through the government, not the municipalities, assisting the railways and let this great scheme of making our crossings safe be a national scheme, showing to the world that Canada is determined to protect the lives of her people at her railway crossings.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 106) An Act to

amend the Railway Act. He said: This is the Bill based on the resolution. I may be allowed to say that I received word, late to-day, that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) was ill at home, and desired me to allow the resolution to stand over until the first of next week. It was then too late to accede to the request, but we will keep the measure at a stage that will afford the hon. member every opportunity to discuss it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—MEN OF DREDGE 'NORTHUMBERLAND' AND THE VOTERS' LIST.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. N. RHODES (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker, I had a question placed on the Order Paper which appeared in the 'Votes and Proceedings' of February 23, but, as yet, I have had no reply, though questions that I have put on the paper in the meantime have been answered. I may say that this is rather important, because there is an endeavour in Pictou to place upon the voters' list there the officers and crew of the government dredge 'Northumberland.' I can understand why there has been some delay in answering, for the reason that the final meeting of the court of revision, which disposes of the voters' lists in Nova Scotia, was on March 5. Since that date has passed, I cannot see any reason for delay in replying to the question.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I do not see how any answer made to a question in this House could in any way affect the proceedings so far as the registration of voters is concerned. I can assure my hon. friend that I had no information as to the registration of voters, and no knowledge that a question of that kind was up in the county of Pictou. I have been endeavouring to get the information. The question was as to the residence of a number of working people, and it has taken some time to get that information. I trust to be able to answer the question to-morrow.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North). It is an entirely erroneous impression that my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) seems to have that answering a question here would have any bearing on the question whether a name should or should not be placed on the voters' list. The reviser's court is a court in which a case must be proven, as in any other court. If there is evidence that any person who is making application in Pictou has no right to go on the list, that evidence can be put before the revisers. It is going rather far afield to say that an answer to a question in this House would have any effect upon such proceedings. Therefore, I do not think there is any point in the insinuation made by the hon. member.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would like to take up a short time in making a statement with reference to the Civil Service, in a somewhat general way, with the hope that, when we come to the consideration of the Bill which is to be founded on the resolution laid before the House and passed through the committee not long ago, the points that I desire to raise may be taken into consideration. Our Civil Service in Canada has been, heretofore, so divided and distributed, so hidden, as it were in numberless nooks and crannies, not only at Ottawa, but all through the country, that I doubt if any of us have had an adequate idea of its extent and work and, consequently, of its importance. If nothing else were to come out of the discussions we have had than the concentration of the attention of the House and country upon this most important factor of the public work of Canada, a great deal will have been gained. Of course a great deal more will be gained if after the attention of the House and country is directed to such an important part of the machinery of the country's administration, it results in a much improved system and a better operation of that great service branch. First, I would like to make a few preliminary remarks as to what has taken place within the last year in the way of the amalgamation of the Civil Service force. I do not think that any of us probably understood, when the Bill was introduced last year and discussed, how much it meant, what change it would make in the Civil Service as we had been accustomed to consider it and to view it.

Well, what has happened? On the 1st day of September, 1908, in pursuance of that legislation, there was a fusion of two large portions of the Civil Service. The old regular Civil Service amounts in its numbers to 1,228; the effect of the legislation of last year was to add to the regular Civil Service brought under statute and regulations, 1,577 who previously to that time had not belonged to it. That is, the legislation had as its first effect to more than double the regular Civil Service at Ottawa. Now I admit that was surprising to myself; and if at the time we were discussing this Bill we had all had an idea that it meant such a very large change in the stated service, probably we would have approached it with a still greater sense of responsibility and duty than we actually did. Those 1,577 persons added to the regular Civil Service make now 2,891, who will figure in 1909-10 on the pay-roll of Canada to the extent of $3,933,757; or, with the proposed flat increase

which was estimated by the Minister of Agriculture at $347,000, will raise that pay-roll to $4,280,757. That is a veritable standing army, whose pay-roll creeps pretty closely up to the pay-roll of the whole defensive force of Canada, including the militia and regular troops. Well, that does not end it. It is said that about 4,700 are engaged in the employment of the government of Canada outside and beyond the present inside service in Ottawa; and it is probable that the pay-roll of that 4,700 people very nearly equals the pay-roll of the inside Civil Service as it now exists. That makes an army of 7,600 people, with a pay-roll of something over $8,000,000, a civic army which far overtops in its expenses the pay-roll of the militia and regular troops of this country. Now, I think, as I said before, that after we have drawn the Civil Service out from these lump votes and these contingencies, and these service votes, from its nooks and crannies, and have displayed them in one solid mass under one regular vote to be taken every year, we will have a better idea and a more adequate view probably of our responsibilities in reference to this great force than we have had heretofore.

Well, what came to pass? At a certain time, owing to pressure from both the outside and the inside Civil Service, the government formed a commission, not the first that has been formed, but formed a commission in 1907 to look into the general conditions of this great service of the country. That commission performed its duties, it brought in its report, and it came to the following conclusions as its main recommendations. It found in that service that there was an increasing and rapidly ascending scale and cost of living; it found that there were very often stationary and almost always insufficient salaries paid; it found everywhere in that service, here and outside, the blight of party patronage; on the whole, it found a service the majority of whose members were fairly efficient, I think, and honest in the discharge of their duties, but which was, from the reasons given by the commission, dispirited, discontented, not to say somewhat hopeless, in reference to their conditions and their future. The commission, after viewing those conditions, made the following recommendations: That a system of appointment and promotion, based on merit and efficiency, be introduced; the elimination of party patronage; the enlargement of the scope, and a widening of the horizon of the Civil Service, so as to place within its reach the prizes of the service as well as the lesser positions of the same; an increased remuneration of from 12½ to 15 per cent to be given with just discrimination; and in the last place, a superannuation system having in view, not only the betterment of the service, but the cheapening of the ultimate cost of the service. These then were the recommendations that came from the Civil Service Commission, an echo of the recommendations of the previous Civil Service commissions, which, from the time they were first issued in this country, have mainly reported along those lines.

Now the government met that commission in a certain way. In the first place, they divided the service into two parts, and they said: We will take the recommendation of the commission with regard to the basis of the service, in reference to the force at Ottawa, but we will not take it in reference to that portion of the Civil Service which is outside Ottawa. Recollect that the recommendations of the commission, founded on their investigations, showed exactly the same generic conditions all through the service, as regards cost of living, as regards the patronage system, and as regards every other point upon which they touched. But the government were not able, at least at that time, to do anything with reference to adopting any of the recommendations of the commission outside the Civil Service at Ottawa, to include those which, up to that time, had belonged to the outside Civil Service here at Ottawa. So, having cut in two the service, and decided to do something with reference to one-half of it, they let the other half drift for the time being. I am not going to follow that now; probably some discussion will take place in the House with reference to that question before we get through with the legislation.

What was done with reference to the service at Ottawa now made into the inside civil service? The idea of basing the system of the service upon merit and the ascertainment of that merit by examination was approved by the government and embodied in the legislation relating to the Civil Service. So that, with reference to the service, from this time forward there should be, according to the spirit of the Act, both appointment and promotion based upon merit and experience, such merit and experience to be ascertained in the way that is constituted under the law. But, the government, after having laid down that basis, did not go as far in the matter of conforming to the principle that they had adopted for the law in the classification which they based upon their legislation. Instead of carrying out the commissioners' recommendation and the spirit of the law as regards its basis in having some discrimination and some distinction made with reference to the service as it stood when it came to the matter of classification, the government adopted what might be called the simple mechanical rule—the man was to be placed in the main according to the salary that he at the time happened to be in the enjoyment of. The ne-er do well, in the enjoyment of a certain salary and in a certain class, stood just as good a chance as the

man who had always done his work and done it well. So, in all the different grades, that was the one lack in carrying out the principle of the Bill with reference to classifications. Then, by a simple clause a certain class under the Act, in the outside service at Ottawa, was brought into the new system on the same mechanical classification. The salary that the outsider insider was in receipt of fixed his position when he came within the Act. No question as to quality, no question as to time of service, no question of any other sort or any other kind but simply, what is his salary. With that question answered he goes into his class. So that the 1,577 men and women who were added to the 1,228 already in the service came in and were distributed in the service on this one basis of the salary they at the time happened to enjoy. One might say just here that that was not the best condition upon which to start the new system. In that way there was injected into the system at the very start what the appointment of the commissioners on the basis of the Act was designed to prevent. It was desirable that there should be a distinction made between competence and incompetence, as to length of service and as to efficiency in the carrying out of the service. The question as to how to get at that may have been a difficult one, but it is a difficulty that has been met in other countries and it might have been met in ours. The point I wish to establish is that the government have simply taken the mechanical method of classification, and applied it to all classes of the service without regard to those distinctions and discriminations which the principle of the Act and the appointment of the commissioners are supposed to have in view.

Now, do not, Mr. Speaker, have me understood as saying that amongst the outside insiders who have come in there were not good, efficient men even though they had never passed a qualifying or preliminary examination. There were good men in the outside department, men of merit, men of sterling abilities in the way of carrying out their duties, men of great application and great industry. These have been brought into the service and they will not be a weakness to it but will, on the contrary, be a strength to it. All that I want to emphasize is that the government, for the sake of avoiding the care and labour of making a discriminating classification, chose rather not to have the bother placed upon them, and consequently they adopted the easier method of making it absolutely mechanical or nearly absolutely mechanical. Then, with reference to the outside service, that part which has been brought into the regular service, the 1,557 employees; how have they been brought into the service, and under what conditions? The system of mechanical classification, as it has been applied both to the outside and inside service by the government has had a bad effect on the service in this respect. I do not think I go too far in saying that this method which has been employed has strengthened the undignified and mischievous spirit of pull and haul in order that a relative advantage should be got under the new classification and under the new arrangement which has had the effect of rather setting back the more sensitive, the more able, the more high minded employee and of giving an advantage to the man who would assert himself and by political or party, or official favour, pull for a better position than he otherwise would have got. As a result of that there is in the service, from one end of it to the other, a feeling of discontent and injustice which it will take a long while to eradicate and which, if it exists in any service, is not for the better carrying out of that service, does not tend to make it more effective and better working. With reference to the outside-inside service, what was a fair interpretation, when we enacted in July last that the service was to consist of this outside portion and the regular service, and that the outside portion was to be brought in and distributed on the salaries they had? I appeal to every hon. member of this House if it does not strike him as fair play and square dealing to let these outsiders come in at the salaries they had as contemplated by the legislation, and if it would strike any fair man as being square dealing that just prior to the time that the new Act was to come into force, on September 1, a large number of such employees should be arbitrarily increased in their salaries and thus be given a more favoured position under the new Act after the first day of September?

It does not seem to me that it was playing fair with the Act and the spirit of the Act that ministers should take a certain number of their employees and, in view of the fact that they were to come under the classification of the Civil Service Act on the 1st day of September on the salaries they were then receiving, increase their salaries so that they would get a higher classification than under the Act they would be entitled to. I have not had time to go through the whole of the ministerial operations in this respect, but I have looked into some of the larger departments. When the estimates of the Militia Department were going through the Minister of Militia informed me that of the 47 employes who were transferred from the outside to the inside service on September the 1st, not one had had his salary raised within six months previous to September 1st. And, although in the Post Office Department a large number of officials were transferred from the outside to the inside service on

the first day of September, a return laid on the table by the Postmaster General shows that prior to that date none of these men had had their salaries increased in order to give them a more favoured basis in the classification. I have not been able to analyse very closely the return of the Railway Department, but it would appear that the outside employees of that department came to the inside service on the 1st of September with the same salaries they had been enjoying previously. But the same is not true with regard to other departments. Let us see about the Department of Public Works. There is an order in council from the Public Works Department passed on the 5th of May authorizing the continued employment for one year in the outside service, at the salaries specified of 111 non-professionals, thirty draftsmen, thirty-three engineers and architects, making in all 174 officials at an aggregate salary of $202,480. The order in council does not state whether the salaries of these men were increased, and one would think that when a minister brings in a report with reference to 174 officials of this class he should state not only their salaries but whether they were increased or not. However it is not stated in the order in council, and I take it for granted there was no increase. Starting from that ground, however, we find that as time came closer to the 1st of September the Minister of Public Works on the 6th of August by order in council made the following new appointments: three at $500, $700, and $900 respectively; three at $550, $1,250, and $1,900 respectively; two at $800 and $700 respectively, making 8 new appointees with an aggregate salary of $7,350 all dated back to the 1st of April though the order in council passed on the 6th of August. On that same day the same minister brought down 56 special increases to the outside men, running from $50 to $350 per man, all dated back to the 1st of April, and involving an increased charge of $4,300. Then on the 31st day of August, pretty close to the 1st of September, the same minister comes with an order in council increasing the salaries of 60 officials of the outside service to the amount of $9,150, and making 3 new appointments at $3,400 total salaries. That order in council does not state when it is to take effect or whether it is to be dated back to the 1st of April as the others, but I will assume it is to take effect on the date of the order in council. Now, in all the Minister of Public works made 16 new appointments to the outside service involving $15,827 and made 117 increases involving $13,750, a total of $24,500 added before the 1st day of September to the chosen ones of his outside force. It does not require any very skilful investigation to show how this was done with a view of getting these officials into the inside service on a higher classification than that intended by the Act. Let me give some instances. I shall not mention names at present, but I find here that on the 6th of August one man got an increase of $200 and on the 31st of August he got an increase of $300 making a total increase of $500.

Mr. HUGHES. In one year?

Mr. FOSTER. In less than one month. The evident purpose of that was to put this man up to a salary of $2,100 so that when the first day of September came he would get into the classification which had a salary attached to it running from $2,-100 to $2,800. Here is another man who is getting $1,750, an increase of $50, on August 6, and $300 on August 31; the result being to put him on a salary of $2,100, ranging up to $2,800. And so I could go through a long list of increases—$50 and $200, $150 and $100, $50 and $150, $300, $50 and $150, $300 and $100, $100 and $300, $150 and $50, $100 and $200, $100 and $200 repeated over and over again, $100 and $250; the object being to bring the man who was getting $1,250 up to $1,600, so that when September 1 dawned he would find himself at the minimum of a class in which his salary would run up to $2,100 by annual increases. That does not appear to me to be playing fair, in any of three particulars. It is not playing fair with the outside men themselves. They were within twenty-four hours of coming under a discriminating and able commission, who would see their merits, and under whose administration promotions and increases, if merited, were altogether likely; and yet that was not awaited, but the ministerial power was brought into exercise, and the minister and his deputy, out of the large force, made one hundred and seventeen increases and placed his selections by these different accretions of salary, in the new coach, in splendid running form, but left all the others, who did not get the ear of the minister, on the outside, to come in as they were and take their chances in the new organization. Neither do I think it was playing fair with the other departments and their outside services. Here is a minister who says: My view is that in spirit and in right I ought not to take advantage of the brief power which I have to increase as I please the salaries of my outside men, and in that way put them into the new service under improved conditions. These other ministers were pressed to do it, that I well know. They refused the pressure, and their outside men enter the new service handicapped as compared with those of the less discriminating and less conscientious ministers. Neither was it fair to the Civil Service itself; I need not labour that point, and it was not fair to the system itself. It was not fair to those in the

outside service where the discrimination was made; it was not fair to the members of the Cabinet who played fair with their outside men; it was not fair to the general service itself; and it was not fair to the general principle and spirit of the Act.

Let us come to another minister, and here I find that I have to make a retraction. On the ordinary classification which was handed in, I looked at the transfers that were made—John Smith, $800, transferred at $800; Timothy Brown, $1,500, transferred at $1,500. I ran my eye over the list of the Minister of Agriculture and I said: Here is a man who has played fair; every man who comes into the new is put at the same salary that he had in the old. And I complimented my hon. friend, and my hon. friend took the compliment—blushed under it somewhat, but took it, and swallowed it down; and then, choking a little, said that there might be one or two instances in which he had necessarily to reward merit, but he plumed himself on the compliment. Mr. Speaker, I beg to retract that, and I am going to state the reasons why I do so. According to a return brought down by the Minister of Agriculture himself, I find that he went out like a good shepherd among his outside force, and gathered in the particular sheep that he wanted, called them by name, herded up 146 of them. and drove them into the increase inclosure—81 with an increase of $50 each, 21 with an increase of $100, 15 with an increase of $150, 19 with an increase of $200, 2 with an increase of $250, five with an increase of $300, 2 with an increase of $350, 3 with an increase of $400, 1 with an increase of $450, 2 with an increase of $500, and 1 with an increase of $600; making increases to the 146 persons amounting to $15,310. And the skill with which these increases land the chosen one on the top of the slide when the toboggan is actually ready to go would be amazing if we had not known the Minister of Agriculture before. These were also made effective on the first day of April, many of them, some on the first day of August; but the increases dated back two months or one month, as is shown in the orders in council. Of these 146 a number were increased in May, but the most of them in two days—on the 28th and 31st of August respectively. The decisive hour was drawing nigh; there was little time left to make hay while the sun shone, and the Minister of Agriculture went to work and made it. Seven were raised so that they got on at the $2,100 up-going scale, 21 so they got on at the $800 to $1,600 scale, by additions of $50, $100, $150, $200 and $250; 7 were raised to the $2,100 to $2,800 scale by additions of $150, $200, $300, $350, $400 and $500; 7 were raised to the $1,600 to $2,100 scale by increases of $450 in one case, $250 in another, $500 in another, $150 in another, $50 in another, $100 in another, $400 in another.

Mr. FOSTER.

Another peculiarity which I just mentioned without giving it any further comment is that I find that of the seven raised to $2,100 two were appointed before 1896 and all the others were appointed in 1901, 1905 and 1907; and of the 21 who were raised to $1,600 all were appointed in 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904 and 1906. Of the seven who were raised to $1,600, all but one were appointed in 1902, 1899, 1898, 1900, 1901, 1907. Summing up the matter, the total transfers that the minister made was 194 at $207,150; the new appointments he made in 1908 were 14 at $13,100; the increases from April 1 were 146, $15,310. Just to show the patronage that this modest minister had, let me tell you what he has done, as the record shows. It was the fault of his position, of course, of the times and circumstances, and not done by design, but here are the facts. This hon. minister has 24 farm hands at $35,400, an average of about $1,200 or $1,300 per man; 10 live-stock men at $10,100, or an average salary of over $1,000; three exhibition clerks at $2,500, or $800 average; civil government contingencies, 21 men at $14,500, or $700 average; public health, 3 at $6,450, or $2,100 each. Seed branch, 21 at an average of $1,000 each; health of animals, 22 at an average of $1,400 each; 4 tobacco men at an average of $1,200 each; 29 dairy and cold storage men at an average of $1,000 each; 29 census men at an average of nearly $1,000 each; 28 archive men at an average of $1,000 each and a little over. And of all these men, numbering 194, 160 have been appointed since he took the reins of office.

Mr. FISHER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. That shows the immense power of patronage which was handed by the old system into the hands of the minister. But if the Minister of Public Works did well and the Minister of Agriculture did better, what can be said of the Minister of the Interior. I shall now proceed to devote a little attention to him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Six o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I can finish with the Minister of the Interior in a very few minutes.

Mr. OLIVER. It will not take five minutes to point out all that is wrong in the Interior Department.

Mr. FOSTER. It would not if the Minister of the Interior had power to keep all the lids down. But, if my right hon. friend will call it six o'clock, I shall put off these interesting disclosures until after recess.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) took occasion to tell me,

just at the close of the afternoon sitting, that he would be unavoidably absent this evening but he was kind enough to say that I need not spare him because he was not here. Of course, it would go without saying that I would not. I said that the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Agriculture had done well, but that words could hardly be found in the English language to adequately describe how much better the Minister of the Interior had done in this peculiar work. The Minister of the Interior transferred 504 from the outside-inside service to the regular department on the 1st of September. He had a larger field in which to work than either the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Public Works, and he showed that he was a very diligent husbandman. From the 1st of June to the 31st of August, the Minister of the Interior made increases to 270 of the 504 of his outside flock. On June 22, 23 and 30, he rounded up 43 and drove them into the inclosure. In July, he added to the chosen number 13. In early August he made an addition of 18. But the great pressure took place on the 26th, 27th and 31st of August, when he drove 196 into the fold—making altogether, as I have said, 270 increases in the outside service, at an expense to the country of $42,830 a year. These increases run from $50 to $550, and they date back in some cases from one to two months prior to the order in council, and they were arranged with the usual skill so as to place the persons who were increased at the top of the slide. There were 58 who were increased to $900, so as to bring them into the class running to a maximum of $1,600. These were increased by additions of $200, $300 and $350. Then, 32 were increased so as to bring them into the division commencing with $1,600 and running to $2,100, the additions being from $200 to $500. Nine were increased to $2,100 so as to enter the class running from $2,100 to $2,800, and the increases in these cases run as high as $550. But the Minister of the Interior did more: In the months of July and August, he made 45 appointments in all at a salary total of $30,080, and these 45, of course, were translated on the 1st of September into the regular service. So that, in new appointments and increases, 315 treatments took place, with an added cost to the country of $72,910. The Minister of the Interior also made a number of double increases. Without naming any of the parties at the present time—the analysis can take place when the Bill is before us—it may be said that one gentleman, who was in receipt of $850 was increased, on August 27, by $50 and also on August 27, (there must have been two council meetings that day) by $300, making a total of $350, and bringing his salary up to $1,200. Another gentleman, whose salary was $900, received two increases, on the same day, of $50 each, raising him to $1,000 and putting him in the 2B class. Another gentleman, on June 20, received $100 increase, and on August 27 another $100, the purpose of which was to bring him up to $1,600, from which he would advance to $2,100. Another gentleman was in receipt of $850; on July 2, he received an increase of $350, and on August 27, another increase of $400, making a total increase of $750, which accomplished the trick of placing him in the class running from $1,600 to $2,100. Now, I may mention here, for fear I do not get at it later, that this is a striking example. This gentleman received increases amounting to $750. He is eligible for the flat increase of $150. So, this officer who had a salary of $850 receives increases amounting to $900;—his increases are greater than his original salary. Another gentleman received $1,800, but on August 6, he got an increase of $100 and on August 27, an increase of $200, raising him to the class commencing with $2,100 and running to $2,800. Another gentleman, then in receipt of $1,280, was increased on June 30 by $50 and on August 27 by $270, raising him also into the class running from $1,600 to $2,100. Another received an increase of $50 on August 27, I suppose in the morning, and in the afternoon, after maturer consideration, another increase of $550, raising him to $2,100, whence he will sail to the $2,800 goal. Another gentleman, whose salary was $1,300, on June 30 was increased by $50, and on August 27 by $250, bringing him into the $1,600 to $2,100 class. Another gentleman, who was getting $600, received an increase on August 26 of $200, and on August 27—after a night's deliberation—another increase of $100, so that he was placed in the class running from $900 to $1,200. In this case, when this gentleman receives the flat increase of $150 there will be added $450 to a salary of $600, thus nearly doubling the salary and bringing him into the class that runs up to $1,200. Asother gentleman, receiving $950, on July 31, got an increase of $50, and on August 27 an increase of $200, which raised him to $1,200.

Now there is something peculiar with reference to this matter. When the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Agriculture wanted to make these increases, they at least had the grace to go to council and get an order in council for it. With reference to the majority of these increases they were made without any reference to council at all, on ministerial authority and ministerial authority alone. I put the question to the Minister of the Interior, I asked him the total vote for 1908-9 of salaries of clerks, and he answered me $394,122. I asked him how many he had then, and what their salaries would amount to for the year, and he answered me 416, the salaries amounting to $381,292. On that basis he would have had a surplus of $12,830 But he

made a total increase amounting to $42,510, and dated some of them back. The question I have been trying to solve is by what right or authority did he make, after the votes in parliament had been given, increases to amount to $42,510 when he had only a surplus of $12,830 of the amount which was voted. But he went further, and I think it was a few days before the 1st of September he actually looked about him, in the outside world, and he made 45 new appointments. In the year 1908 he made 116 new appointments, involving salaries of $75,310, and the whole of those 116 appointees of 1908, on the 1st day of September, went into the regular Civil Service with the salaries at which he would have appointed them, ranging from $500 up to $1,200. Again I press the question—I would if the minister were here—as to whether he has contravened the spirit and letter of the Act? The old Act and the new Act are at one in this: The constitutional requirement, as well as the legal requirement, is that before the increase of the salary is voted the appropriation shall be had. Where were all these appointments and all these increases made from when there was no parliamentary appropriation for that special purpose? The minister tries to fortify himself in part by saying that the Act establishing the department gave the minister himself the right to make appointments out of the general service votes. That is, if he had a vote for lands, he could make as many employees as he liked, and do it by the ministerial fiat alone. That is not in the spirit of the law. That law, it seems to me, refers to temporary assistants, and to temporary assistants alone; and I do not think it gives the minister the right to make what are to all intents and purposes permanent appointments. If the minister knew when he was making these 45 appointments that they were not temporary, that on the 1st day of September every one of those men would be in the Civil Service of this country, and could not be got out of it, he was practically making permanent appointments, doing it without reference to parliament, doing it, as I contend, without a special vote. Now what right has a minister, on the 27th day of August, to vote an increase to an employee and to date it back to the 1st of April, 1908? There is no authority in the Act, either the old or the new Act, so far as I can find. That is not in accordance with the spirit of the Civil Service in its foundation, either in the old or in the new. Yet dating back has been done by the Minister of Public Works, and has been done by the Minister of the Interior; I am not so certain as to whether it was done by the Minister of Agriculture or not, but I think in some cases it was.

Now it is instructive to take page 536 of the Unrevised 'Hansard,' and look over these six pages and a half of increases and appointments. I want to read a few of them to show how it is done. Here is a clerk who is receiving $550, what you might call a first appointment, with a low salary, and probably in a low class, compared with other classes. This clerk receiving $550, is given an increase of $250 on the 27th August. What is the purpose? To bring the clerk up to $800 so that, on the 1st day of September, he may come into the class running from $800 to $1,600. Another clerk is receiving $550, on the same day a $250 addition is given, with the very same result, that the clerk is raised to the $800 minimum. Another and still another, receiving $500, and $300 of an increase is added on the 27th day of August, and the clerk is brought up into the $800 to $1,600 schedule. I do not want to weary the House by going through all of these. But here is a set of three, where a $400 increase is given on the 31st day of August in order to raise them to a higher class. Here is a clerk receiving $500, and on August 31 gets $228 added. Here is one who is receiving $550, and on the 27th of August $350 is added, and the clerk is raised to the class running from $900 to $1,-200. Another addition of $350, and another addition of $350, to bring a clerk up to $1,600 minimum, running into the class from $1,-600 up to $2,100. Here is a list of four all in a row, each of them receiving $700, each of them by $200 increases raised to the class, on the next day, running from $900 to $1,200 in the new schedules. I do not want to weary the House by reading the list, but this is the nature of it, from beginning to end. The purpose, in nine cases out of ten, is evident, it is to boost the recipient so that on the next day he may get into the new arrangement on a favoured basis.

Now let us make a summary of the work of these three gentlemen and see how it stands.

	Department of Public Works.		Department of Agriculture.		Department of the Interior.		Totals.	
	No.	Salaries.	No.	Salaries.	No.	Salaries.	No.	Salaries.
		$		$				$
New appointments, 1908...	16	15,827	14	13,100	116	75,310	146	104.237
Increases after June 1.....	117	13,750	146	15,310	270	42,830	503	71,890
Total	133	29,577	160	28,410	380	118,140	649	176,127
Flat increase at $150.....	.....	19,950	.....	24,000	.....	57,900	649	101,850

The Minister of Agriculture told us this year when he came back that all the legislation passed last year, which was to serve the inside permament force, had added to the salaries of the inside men was $37,000. Yet, all this time these three ministers were working for the outside people and they increased their salaries by $72,000 or thereabouts. Another peculiar thing is this. I have gone through these different schedules of the increases given to men from the outside service and what do I find? I find that in nearly every case this was so arranged that they are eligible for the $150 increase; so that added to all these increases I have spoken of, and which seem generous enough, probably every one of these men will get $150 from the 1st of April, 1908. I put again this question: How could these increases be dated back? Was it fair, was it in accordance with the spirit of the Act, was it in accordance with the letter of the Act? How could these increases be made, as they were made in many cases, without the sanction of council? Is that in accordance with the spirit of the Act? Is it in accordance with any kind of good government of the Civil Service? How could they be made without votes having been first passed by parliament as was done in the cases which I have cited? These questions require answers, but over and above it all is, to my mind, the most serious thing—the indisposition of these hon. gentlemen to play fair with the Civil Service and with civil servants. I tell you that if boys were playing marbles in the street for keeps and two or three of them were to try that game they would be sent to coventry if the boys were proper minded at all. If lacrosse or hockey players were to act with that lack of the spirit of fair play they would be sent to the wings by the umpire mighty quickly. I leave it to the good sense of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House if that was playing fair with the interests that were at stake. Now, whilst all this was going on in that part of the service, 1,577 in number, that on the 1st day of September were to become part of the regular establishment, what was being done for the regular establishment itself? That is a pertinent question, Mr. Speaker. Outside of the boosting up of some of the higher class of officials, done before we went from this parliament last July, the rank and file of the Civil Service were held up and no increase was given to them at all. They were brothers in the service working side by side with the outsider. They were the permanents, they had to pass an examination, they had to toil on under the rules and regulations, they had to submit to all the restrictions, many of them had been long years in the service, and yet these brothers were entirely neglected and nothing done in their behalf. The other brothers outside and toiling alongside of them had ministers who were looking, through, in and amongst, and these had a large number of increases given to them whilst the regular, permanent employees received nothing, had no consideration. Oh, yes, they received something. They received the bitter penance of a right withheld unless they voted properly. They had to submit to the indignity of being canvassed by the men who told them that the premier would do so and so if he were elected; he is the boss of the job; you better look out how you vote! During a long period of turmoil and strife, the Civil Service, the members of the regular household, were kept there as the football of the politicians. Is there any doubt about it? When the Minister of Agriculture got time to work out the mighty uplift that would be given to the permanent Civil Service by the legislation they passed last year he arose one day in this House and told us what the mighty uplift was. It amounted to the royal sum of $37,800. Am I right in that? I think that is about the figure.

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember the figure.

Mr. FOSTER. With what incalculable care, with the expenditure of how many sleepless nights and days of toil had the ministers elaborated their scheme to give to the permanent service of this country from 12½ to 15½ per cent of an increase? When it was all done they got the magnificent sum, amongst 1,228 of them, of $37,000. What is the key to the matter? The ministers did not spend an hour working out the results of their plan before they proposed it and had it passed by this House. Now they come back to this House. They have had a little leisure after the elections to work out the enormous uplift, they find out what it is, then they spend more sleepless nights, they work long hours in the room and in the cabinet and at last they come to a determination as the result of grave logarithmic calculations. We will give $150 of a flat increase to every man, woman, youngster and oldster in the service! I wonder that the Minister of Agriculture looks so healthy as he does after all the toil involved in the process of getting at such a result.

Mr. FISHER. He has a good conscience.

Mr. FOSTER. A good conscience? Well, there are relative degrees of goodness.

Mr. FISHER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Hardness is sometimes the sign of goodness. I will not debate that with my hon. friend. Now, when we are at this point let us see what this $150 flat increase means. Why is it given? It is given in order to compensate the long

working, hard working civil servant who has been inadequately paid for a number of years while the cost of living has been high and yearly growing higher. Is there any basis for this grant unless that is it? How do the government attempt to do that? The basis of it is that which I have mentioned and no other basis can justify it. The man who has been the longest in the service and done the best work ought to get more than the man who has been the shortest time in the service and done the poorest work. Why? because he has been long in the service at an inadequate salary; he has received no increase and yet the cost of living has increased. By this method the flat increase is applied to everybody. The young lady or the young lad of a month's service who works by the side of a father of a family who has been in the service for fifteen, twenty or thirty years and has all the burdens and responsibilities of the family, in which the cost of living and inadequate salary tell, get the same increase as he does. They each get the same; is there justice in that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That's according to Scripture.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Prime Minister think there is justice in that? I don't wonder he does not get up and say he does, because I do not believe he does. Under that plan of compensation the yearling gets the same as the oldster; the man appointed on the 31st of August who has never done a turn for the government and who has never lived under the condition of inadequate salary and high living cost, gets his compensation of $150. Does the Prime Minister think that is fair? I have too much belief in his good judgment and good heart to think that he would say that is justice. The man who is outside of the service and who has been boosted by a $600 increase into this new schedule gets the $150, working alongside or may be ahead of the man who has been in the permanent service for many years and who has borne the burden and heat of the day under inadequate salary and increased cost of living. I am obliged to think that no business man, no just man, would think that was applying the scales of even justice on the ground upon which it is assumed that $150 is to be given. If it is to be given as compensation for inadequate wage and increased cost of living it must be given with discrimination so that the man in the service who has suffered most shall get the most and he who has suffered least shall get the least. If you take the number of those whose salaries have been increased in the outside service and on September the 1st came into the inside service you will find that 19 out of every 20 of them will get the $150 increase under this proposition, notwithstanding that many of them have got increases ranging from $200 up to $800 before the 1st of September, and in addition to that placed in a higher schedule. But when you come to the 1,228 Civil Servants, who were under the Civil Service Act before the 1st of September you will find that many of these are at the maximum of their class and cannot receive the benefit under this proposition, of the $150 flat increase, while those men who have been boosted by the minister to the tune of several hundred dollars will, in addition to that, receive this $150 flat increase. Does my right hon. friend think that is just? The rule is to be laid down that the Civil Servant of the old regime shall in no case get more than the difference between his present salary and the maximum of the class in which he is placed. and how does that work out? One of the old servants goes into the class with a salary running from $900 to $1,200; he was getting $1,100 last year, $50 would be his annual increase bringing him to within $50 of the maximum of his class, and so he can only get $50 out of the $150 flat increase Is there any spirit of fairness in that kind of thing? Look at the $1,100 men standing at the top of the Junior Second Class and you will find that a large proportion of them are men of long service. It so happens that a great number of them are appointees of the late government; many of them have been standing at $1,100 for years and being at the maximum of their class they have had no annual increase in the meantime, and these men are also deprived of the $150 flat increase. I do not think that can be considered fair by just men on either side of the House. Many of these men in the third class, and in the senior second class, and in the junior second class are old servants of the government who have borne the stress of inadequate salaries and increased cost of living, and most of them cannot participate to the full extent in the flat increase of $150. More than that, and I want the Prime Minister to think of this as an added reason, these men not only do not get the full amount of the flat increase, but they are at the maximum of their present class, they are up against a block in that respect, and they will have to wait for long weary years may be before they get a chance of promotion.

But these men of blessed inheritance who were outside the sheepfold, and have these ministers to look after them, get the big increases, get put into the higher schedules, wth years and years of increases at $50 and $100 ahead of them. These things do not appear to me to be fair. Take your first-class men. There is a good man, generally of many years of service, getting $1,900; he is put down at $1,950 for this year. He goes into the class from $1,600 to

$2,100. He has been standing at the top of his old class for years, doing the country's work, getting no $50 a year increase, and now $1,950 is his salary, and the maximum of the class into which he is put is $2,100. He gets his full increase, and then is blocked at the head of the class; he stands there probably for a long series of years before he can get promoted. I think these are glaring injustices, in this rough and ready way the government has taken of managing the increase to the Civil Service of the country. I am not going to elaborate more on that. I am simply going to lay this matter before the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, and before his ministers, and I am going to ask them just to consider if this is playing the game fair. I would like the late Speaker to invite the cabinet ministers, especially those three to whom I have devoted some attention, to a private room, and either sing or recite to them that which I have often heard him recite: 'Play up, play the game, and play it fair.' I think it would have some effect on those hon. gentlemen, especially considering the very excellent way in which the late Speaker used to render the good sentiment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have very little more to say. I cannot help, however, just in the end devoting a few words to how this thing might have been done. The Prime Minister may say to me: You have criticised, but you have not offered a solution. That is not my business. These gentlemen undertook to arrange the Civil Service on its proper basis, and to do the fair thing by the service. It is their business to do it, and it is our business as far as we possibly can to help them in doing it. It is our place to criticise the weakness and injustice of their plan, and to ask them to make it fair and just. But I can see a way in which it could have been fairly done and satisfactorily done. The Minister of Agriculture ought to have trusted his colleagues and his own Civil Service Commission. He ought to have waited, if he had a good case, three or four days, and then taken his good case to his colleagues and to the Civil Service Commission, and rested it upon its justice. If his case was good, would not his colleagues have recognized it? There is ample breadth within the new law to provide for such cases. The Civil Service Commission was the creation of the government itself. I think all this pitiful exhibition would have been avoided if these ministers had trusted their cases to the Commission and their own colleagues after the first of September, 1908. With regard to the classification, I can conceive a tribunal which would have done it, and done it fairly, and which would not have been open to the imputation of a minister seeing one of his own nephews boosted, or a deputy minister seeing that one of his own relatives was boosted. Such things destroy confidence in the department, every man and woman in which knows what is going on there. That would all have been avoided if you had taken a tribunal consisting of your deputy minister and your Civil Service Commission, and let them sit down together and make the classification. Then the men in the departments would have felt that they were getting a fair show. Then this pull-haul exhibition of party influence and official influence would not have taken place. Calmly, with deliberation, after full conference, having a uniform system in sight, with justice as the touchstone, such a tribunal would have gone into the matter of classification, and would have assigned the places and the classes in something like order and upon some basis like merit and efficiency. How much would have been avoided if that had been done. And with reference to those in the outside service, that tribunal could have done just the same. It does seem to me that what was done was a perfect outrage on the spirit of the Act and on the idea of fair play to every part of the service. There again, I think those ministers would have done better if they had submitted to their colleagues their case after the first day of September; and with that kind of an arrangement, that careful conference, that sifting of experience of deputies, and putting along with it the unprejudiced and unpartisan view of the two commissioners, who were gentlemen I believe approved by the country at large for their position, you would have had a classification and an adjustment of salaries without bitterness, without this feeling of unfair play, and much better comporting with the dignity of the service and the dignity of a government than has been exhibited in the operation that has taken place.

Now, I leave this with the Prime Minister. After all, he is the man. He knew that these increases were being made; for they went through his council; he knew that others of his colleagues played fair, and that, although they were pressed from behind by the outside men, who said, others there are getting increases by the dozen, the score, the hundred, and why are we not treated the same? These gentlemen said: It is not the spirit of the Act, and we do not feel disposed to do it. And the Prime Minister sat in the cabinet and allowed three ministers to do so and so, and the others to be left behind, but left behind in a noble spirit and in a good cause. That was not holding the scales evenly. Did not the Prime Minister know that this was being done, or is this revelation of to-day the first knowledge he got of it? Whether it is or not, we depend on the Prime Minister to play up, play the game and play it fair.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture.) Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in the last sentence of his speech, quotes, he says, from the former speaker of the House of Commons the words, play up, the game and play it fair. My hon. friend went back to a few days ago when, he says, he paid me some little compliment which he had now to retract. I am afraid that I must go back a little further, to the last session of parliament, when I myself complimented the hon. gentleman on the fair way in which, as a whole, he had discussed the Civil Service Act of 1908, and on the manner in which he had brought his long parliamentary and administrative experience to the perfecting of that measure. I am afraid, however, that I must to-day follow my hon. friend's example and retract. My hon. friend has spent a good deal of his time to-day in trying to condemn that work in which he took a prominent part last session. At that time, he dealt as a rule, fairly and accurately with the propositions that were made from this side. We were able from both sides of the House, in many cases, to make improvements in the original Bill, and my hon. friend lent his assistance to that work, and in the main we were able to pretty fairly agree. I shall not take the usual stock course of saying that because he did not move amendments and put them to a vote, he therefore agreed with everything in the Act; but, as a matter of fact, last year's Hansard will show that specifically and in words he did agree to many of the changes and amendments to the Bill as brought down. I will go further and say that when sometimes we are not able to acquiesce in his suggestions, he accepted the reasons I advanced against them and ceased his opposition. My hon. friend now, however, has undertaken to scarify that Act. He has undertaken to point out how unjust and inadequate it is, how certain clauses have made it easy to commit great injustice to various individuals and classes in the Civil Service. He has pointed out that the outside service in the city of Ottawa was brought by that Act into the inside service and he complained that that was done in a mechanical way. I would refer my hon. friend to the original Bill. In that Bill the bringing of the outside service into the inside service was not to be done in the mechanical way in which it was afterwards provided to be acomplished. In the original Bill it was to be done by order in council in every instance, giving to the council the decision whether the individual was worthy to be brought in. But my hon. friend, then as now, and as always, eager to search out political motives and impute them to his adversaries, pointed out that that would be an unfortunate power to put into the hands of the government and that it was better that the government and the council should not have that opportunity to discriminate. To-day, however, he condemns the mechanical transfer of the old outside service into the inside service, forgetting that he and his friends on the other side of the House at that time, as well as those on this side, are equally responsible for the change. My hon. friend goes further, and condemns that mechanical transfer, with the men at the old salary which they had previously. He says that is wrong, and that we ought not to take everybody indiscriminately from the outside service and put him in at his old time salary. But when my colleagues and myself undertook to discriminate and pick out the men who ought to get a little better chance, and leave out the others who are not deserving of that better chance, my hon. friend accuses us of discriminating for political reasons and of everything else under the sun except the one thing which did actuate us, and that was to exercise a fair and just discrimination in favour of those deserving of promotion and increase and against those who were not so deserving.

Up to a certain extent my hon. friend praises the Act, but he praises it perhaps a little more by implication than by words. He says it is a good thing to have the whole service on the same footing. In that respect we agree with my hon. friend and that is why we introduced the Act last session and brought the outside service in the city of Ottawa into the inside service. My hon. friend does not point out what is true, that while we had the power for years of discriminating, had we desired to do it, in favour of our political or other friends in that outside service, we deliberately threw away that power and put the outside service out of our reach as regards discrimination. We came into parliament and deliberately threw away what my hon. friend says was to us a most cherished privilege, and we took this large number of employees in the outside service in Ottawa and transferred them into the inside service where they will enjoy the same rights and privileges as the inside service and the same immunity from discrimination on the part of the government and its ministers which the inside service has always enjoyed. If we were so wrapped up in our own desire to show political favouritism, we could have left things as they were and dealt with these gentlemen in the outside service as the hon. gentleman says we desired to deal with them. But, Sir, instead of being imbued with that spirit, instead of wanting to treat the Civil Service in that way, we took a large number of men—my hon. friend has given the figure as over 1,500—and put them into the inside service, so that, in the future, they would receive the statutory increases and the same treatment under the statute as others, thereby, of our own free will and by our own

spontaneous action, depriving ourselves of the opportunity of political favouritism which my hon. friend thinks we cherish so much. It would be better for him, I think, not to attribute these motives to his political opponents, but rather to look to the way he and his colleagues did in the old days in their administration of the country's affairs. He accuses us of having given increases to the members of the outside service before they were brought into the inside service. I would like to deal with that point a little in detail. I have not the figures for each of the departments to show what my colleagues have done, but I have a very intimate knowledge of my own department and I propose to analyse, as far as I can after merely hearing the figures read over and with only a few minutes to look up some of the facts,what was really done in my department and compare it with the picture drawn by the hon. member of what I am supposed to have done. He found in the return that I had laid on the table, and on which he complimented me—he has not yet withdrawn that part of the compliment—by saying that it had been drawn up so that it could be easily understood——

Mr. FOSTER. I will stick to that compliment. The work was done by one of the hon. gentleman's clerks.

Mr. FISHER. But under my direction and according to my arrangement. At all events, the hon. gentleman will acknowledge that I did not wish to hide what I was doing.

Mr. FOSTER. You could not; you had to tell the truth.

Mr. FISHER. Whether I could have hidden it or not, I did not want to do so, and I will show the reasons and will show my hon. friend that he has been hasty in his conclusions as he has been in his study of the facts. He found 146 increases which had been made during the calendar year 1908. That is correct. He went on to say —or, at any rate, to imply;- and I think he absolutely said it—that these increases were given for the purpose of putting these members of the outside service into the inside service in better positions than they would have enjoyed if these increases had not been made.

Mr. FOSTER. I said that in many cases that was done.

Mr. FISHER. I think the hon. gentleman did say that, but when he was harping on it, when he was enlarging, as he does in his elaborate word-painting, upon the sins I am supposed to have committed, he kept repeating over and over again the large number of increases made in the year, and the impression was certainly left in the minds of hon. members that I had given these increases quite recently—before September 1—and that that was the object in view. Now, there were 146 cases. Of these, 108 got their increases at the first of last fiscal year in the ordinary course of salary increases. Of these 108, there were 72 who got increases of $50 each. This is the amount of the statutory increase for the members of the inside service. I have been in the habit, for a number of years, of trying to treat my outside service in Ottawa the same as the inside service, and have given them increases on the same scale—that is, increases of $50 apiece unless there was some particular reason why any particular officer should receive more or should receive nothing. These increases, 108 in number, and given at the opening of the last fiscal year, were given at a time when I did not know what the provisions of the new Civil Service Act would be, when I had not in mind any provisions of that kind, and when I should have had to make an abstruse calculation to find out what the results would be to these outside servants when the Act was passed. These increases had no more reference to the new Civil Service Act and the bringing in of the outside service than had the increases given in a similar way for two, or five, or eight years before. The hon. member has entirely mistaken and misrepresented the facts of this return from which he has taken his information. Of these 108 officers, 36 received larger amounts than $50. There is nothing extraordinary about this; in other years I have given outside servants larger increases than $50, because their services seemed to require it and justify it. In addition to this, a certain number of these 108 officers received increases just before the coming into force of the new Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many?

Mr. FISHER. There were 46 who received increases in August, but I think that some of these officers got no increases at the first of the year. I have not the exact figures. Speaking from memory, I should say that 15 or 16 of these 46 did not receive increases at the beginning of the fiscal year, but 46 altogether did receive increases in August. My hon. friend led me to believe, from the way in which he put it, that the whole 46 received increases in August or a little before.

Mr. FOSTER. I gave the exact dates. I will go out and get the return. Go slow until I come back.

Mr. FISHER. I will not promise to do that, but I will treat the hon. member (Mr. Foster) more carefully than he treated the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) in that gentleman's absence. I have gone over these figures a little hastily, and I may be astray in some of them. I have

had to add them very hurriedly since six o'clock, and one or two—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not a question of one or two.

Mr. FISHER. No, I take that for granted. So, if the hon. gentleman finds me astray a little, he will understand the reason. I desire to deal with those who received increases in August. There were 29 who received increases for the avowed purpose on my part of putting them into a class under the new Civil Service Act which they could not otherwise have got into. I say frankly that that was my object in giving the increases to these 29 officers. I will give a few instances to show the reasons which guided me, but I wish to speak first in general terms. When I came to classify my whole department, I did so under an entirely new classification from the old one that was in force before. We had that classification made up in certain divisions and subdivisions, clearly indicating the character of the work expected of the officers, and the salary of these subdivisions were fixed so that a given class of work, whether done by one individual or another, would be paid for on the same basis.

Now in my outside service, while I have done what I could to give fair treatment, and to arrange my men so that they would be adequately paid for the work they were doing, I had never gone into that matter in the different branches of my department as carefully as I did when we came to bring those people from the outside service into the inside service. And why? Because, when they were in the outside service, if at any time when they were paid out of what I may call lump votes, voted, not for the whole service, if at any time of the year I found that a certain man was not being adequately paid for the work he was doing, if I found that he was showing unusual aptitude, and was more valuable than I had supposed, I could go to my colleagues and ask them to pass an order in council to increase that man's salary. I was not restricted by any statute. The hon. member for North Toronto said on another occasion that I ought to have been restricted by the Auditor General's Report, and that I had no right in one year to increase a man's salary when, according to the Auditor General's Report, he had been paid a certain salary in another year. I take direct issue with my hon. friend. Lump votes were passed for the purpose of carrying on the service; lump votes did not carry with them details of the salaries, or of the officers who were doing that service; and I venture to assert that I was right in maintaining that I had a free hand to give those men such salaries as would best secure the efficient performance of the service they were engaged in. In that way I had a free hand, until the 1st of September, to pay those men more salary than they were getting, when I had evidence that they were worthy of a higher salary. But after the 1st of September, when these men came into the inside service, they were subject to the same restrictions, the same increases, and the same status in their classes, as the old inside service were, and I would no longer have a free hand. Therefore it was incumbent upon me, in justice to these men, to go over their cases more carefully, and to consult with the heads of my different branches and get their views as to the real qualifications of each individual and the salary that ought to be permanently paid to him, as he was formerly getting a temporary salary. Now let me say this, that of all the increases in this list of mine, some 46 in number—not 146 as the hon. gentleman seemed to imply——

Mr. FOSTER. I seemed to imply nothing. I gave the dates of the orders in council, and they will be found in the 'Hansard.'

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman left the impression that all these increases were made for the purpose, the sole purpose, of raising the men to a higher place in the new classification. That is not a correct implication, it is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not responsible for the hon. gentleman's impression.

Mr. FISHER. In regard to these men who did get increases, I did it on the recommendation in every case of the heads of branches, who consulted with me and made recommendations. I did not pick out political friends, I did not pick out individuals. Why did I not pick out political friends, even if I had wished to do so? My hon. friend read lists of the men who were appointed to the service, and showed that they were appointed after 1896. That is right. It was after 1896, in nine cases out of ten, and the reason was that before 1896 the then Conservative government had not that care of the agricultural interests of this country which they deserved and required. The old Conservative government was starving the agricultural interests of this country, and were not paying enough to carry on the work which the farmers demanded at the hands of the government, and the hon. member for North Toronto, who was then Finance Minister, was the man chiefly responsible for it. The men employed in the Department of Agriculture were asking for more money, they wanted to expand the work of the department, they wanted to do more for the farmers, but they could not get the money from the then Finance Minister, and consequently the agriculture of Canada was starved, and the Department of Agriculture was a little one-horse affair, while to-day it is doing a work commensurate with the immense and grow-

ing interests of the agricultural industry of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Minister of Agriculture will exercise his memory and will go back to 1896, or a little anterior, he will find where vote after vote was brought down and supported by myself, on the recommendation of Prof. Robertson, for the purpose of establishing new avenues for that industry. He will find in 1896 that a large vote was brought down for one particular agricultural object, and we tried to get it through, and the men who prevented it going through were my hon. friend and his leader, Sir Richard Cartwright.

Mr. FISHER. I was not in the House at that time, but that doesn't matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Your friends did it.

Mr. FISHER. I assume full responsibility for what my friends did at that time. But my hon. friend is just as accurate in saying I was here and did that, as he is in a good many other of his statements. My hon. friend was then Finance Minister, he had brought down his estimates, he had tried to get his estimates through the House, and he knows just as well as I do that all the estimates were refused, because the parliament of that day had not confidence in the men who were bringing them down. The parliament of that day did not want these gentlemen to handle the money of Canada any longer, and they wanted to get a verdict of the people on the conduct of that administration. Therefore parliament held up the government of that day, and did not allow them to carry through their estimates, but forced them to appeal to the country, and the consequence was the great debâcle which swamped the Conservative party in the elections of 1896. It was not a refusal to give Prof. Robertson a few thousand dollars, but it was a refusal to let the hon. member for North Toronto handle the finances of Canada for the next five years. Let me tell him that while the farmers of Canada had the fullest confidence in Prof. Robertson, and would be glad to see him get tens of thousands of dollars more than he was able to wring out of the then Finance Minister, the farmers of Canada knew well what they were doing when, in the elections of 1896, they drove him from power, and prevented him from handling the finances of this country any longer. And if to-day the present government is still in power, if the hon. gentleman and his friends are still sitting on the left of the Speaker, it is largely because the people of Canada, last October, were afraid that if they allowed the leader of the Opposition to attain to power the hon. member for North Toronto would again handle the finances of Canada. Judging from what we know, most men, even among Conservatives in Canada, will say that Canada was right and they will continue to say that just as long as he is in the position which he now occupies in his party——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER—and is the future Minister of Finance of the Conservative party.

Mr. FOSTER. You will be better now.

Mr. FISHER. It is very much better now and Canada knows it, thinks it, and says it, whenever it gets a chance.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, suppose you come back to your mutton.

Mr. FISHER. I am quite willing to. My hon. friend has himself to thank for the digression. I have told my hon. friend that there were some of these men that I gave increases to in order to put them into their proper classes. I will take a few of the first instances. I cannot over the whole 29, but I will take fair instances. First on the list, there is Mr. W. W. Moore, chief of the market section, who got $200 so as to give him $2,100, thus placing him in the class which goes from $2,100 to $2,800. Mr. Moore is the head of an important subdivision in the Dairy and Cold Storage commissioners' branch. The natural place for a man occupying that position in the department is in that division. He had $1,900 last year. I gave him $200 to bring him up to $2,100 which would give him the position in the classification in which the office that he is exercising was placed. I thought that I was right in doing it. I am quite ready to discuss with anybody Mr. Moore's qualifications and I am going to tell my hon. friend from North Toronto that Mr. Moore was appointed by the Conservative party, was in the department before this government came into office, and was an officer of that Prof. Robertson that I have been talking about. The next is Mr. McNeill. Mr. McNeill is the chief of the fruit section of the Dairy and Cold Storage commissioners' branch. I also gave him $200 to put him in the same subdivision. Mr. Barr is chief of the dairy section or subdivision of my department, and I gave him $300 to put him in the same position. Now I just want to say that Mr. McNeill is so well known amongst the fruit men of this country and so much thought of that I had been asked to make a special branch of my department devoted to the fruit industries of the country, and to put him at the head of that branch. If I had yielded to that Mr. McNeill would not have been in the $2,800 class, but in the $4,000 class. I think I am justified in having given him $200 which will place him in the next division below that to which he might have been advanced. Mr. Barr is a dairy expert, well

known to many hon. members of this House, whose position in the dairy world and in the department as chief of the dairy subdivision requires that he should be put in the division to which he has been advanced. Therefore, he was put up to $2,100 in order to place him in that subdivision. The next I come to is Mrs. Henderson, a clerk. Mrs. Henderson is an old employee. She had been receiving $700. The subdivision which she would have gone into would have been subdivision B of the third division. She was such an industrious, painstaking and competent clerk, that the head of the branch in which she is employed recommended that she ought to go into the higher subdivision of the third division, and I gave her $200 to put her at $900. This enabled her to get into that subdivision. The next is a stenographer, Miss Robinson, and she was advanced just in the same way. The next is Mr. Charlan, who is the chief of the tobacco division of my department. This is a gentleman of scientific attainments, whom I was able to secure, a short time ago, from the French government. He was an expert in tobacco growing in the Department of Agriculture of France, and I brought him out to Canada on purpose to help to increase and encourage the tobacco growing industry of this country. Mr. Charlan has made good in an eminent degree and yet, when he first came, he did not know the English language well enough to be of a great deal of use in the English speaking parts of the country. But he has learned the language so well that to-day he is of just as much service in the province of Ontario and in the west as in the French parts of the province of Quebec. He has been placed in the division which begins at $2,100 and goes up to $2,800. At first he was given a tentative salary until we could find out what he was worth to the country and under these circumstances I have given him an increase of $400. I am ready to stand up and justify it from one end of Canada to the other. These are some of the instances that I take at the beginning of the list.

Now, I shall take one or two at the end of about the same character, although, in some cases, the amounts are smaller. There is one which I think my hon. friend mentioned which is a very big one. I gave a gentleman $600 and I did not do it to put him in another division. He got that increase on the 22nd April last and just for this reason: He had been studying veterinary science. He worked for us at $600 a year during his vacation. He was getting $600 last spring. He obtained his degree as a veterinary and then came back and asked me to employ him. Having qualified himself, having got his degree as a professional man, he came back into the department and I naturally and properly doubled his salary and gave him the same salary that other veterinaries employed in the department had been getting. If I had not done so I would not have done my duty to the department or to Mr. Laidlaw. I have another case, that of Mr. Spencer. Mr. Spencer is in charge of the live stock division. He was paid $1,950. He has charge of one of the most important sub-divisions in my department. I gave him $150 so as to put him in the $2,100-$2,800 class. Mr. Spencer's work, his knowledge, his reputation in the country, amply justify putting him in that class and I would not have been doing that which was due to myself and to the department if I had not done so. These are specimens of those for whom I did this. I do not conceal it and I do not desire to conceal it; on the contrary, I boast of it, because it is a recognition of men who have done good work for the country, of men who are doing good work, of men who ought to be encouraged to do good work and whose positions in the department I wished to recognize by placing them in higher subdivisions than they would otherwise have been in. I did that before the first of September for that express purpose and I do not deny it. I repeat that I do not wish to conceal it and that I was only doing my duty by the men, by the work and by the department in doing what I did. These are instances which show that the conclusions reached by my hon. friend from North Toronto are entirely wrong in dealing with the list which I have given him. Instead of his showing me up as one who has taken advantage of the law to do what I had no right to do, I have shown that I was simply carrying out my duty to the men who were in my department, and preparing for the proper exercise of the new law which brought these people into totally new circumstances and new conditions as distinguished from the conditions under which they had been in the old work and under the old regime. My hon. friend says that these men are all Liberals.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. FISHER. Or that they are all late appointees.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman read the dates of their appointments and talked about them as appointments which had been made after 1896.

Mr. FOSTER. The dates show when they were appointed.

Mr. FISHER. Quite so, and I want to say that the reason of that is that these divisions were not in existence before.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the poultry division in existence?

Mr. FISHER. The one at the farm was. Does my hon. friend know who got any increases in the poultry division ?

Mr. FOSTER. I know who did not.

Mr. FISHER. Who did not ?

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has the papers and can look.

Mr. FISHER. The papers only show those who did; who did not ?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't think you gave Mr. Gilbert much of an increase.

Mr. FISHER. No, I did not; he was at the limit of his class.

Mr. FOSTER. How long has he been in the service ?

Mr. FISHER. About twenty years.

Mr. FOSTER. What salary is he getting?

Mr. FISHER. I think it is $1,200 or $1,300, but I cannot say off-hand. I gave Mr. Fortier his assistant the $50 statutory increase last spring and he did not get any increase afterwards, but Mr. Gilbert was at the head of his class and did not get it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Gilbert did not seem to get any special increase.

Mr. FISHER. Quite true; perhaps that is the reason my hon. friend has made this tirade.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) implies, although he did not say it, that the men who got increases have been picked out because of political or personal favouritism. Well, in many of these branches the whole staff have been appointed by me personally and I did not give the whole staff increases. Of course I gave them all the statutory increases at the commencement of the fiscal year, but when it came to give the increases when this new Act was to come into force it was my officers at the head of the divisions who picked out the men who seemed to be specially worthy. My hon. friend has complained of discrimination, but he has overlooked one point. Supposing we had done as he wanted and brought these men in at their salaries before the 1st of September, after the 1st of September we either had to give them their statutory increase or promote them to another class. In some instances we gave them enough increase to give them promotion before they came in. In other instances where they were given an increase that did not promote them we would have been tempted to, and probably we would have promoted them after they came in and given them a larger increase because they deserved exceptional recognition. But if the recommendations of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) were carried out and we waited until after the Act came into force and had then gone to the commissioners, the commissioners could only have given them a certificate for promotion and they would have had to get that promotion, and that promotion in some cases would have been far greater than the increase they got before they were brought in. The result would have been that the cost to the country would probably have been greater than under the arrangement we made.

My hon. friend speaks about the competence of the old inside service. I myself have stated on a former occasion that in 9 cases out of 10 and probably more, the old inside servants were competent and did their duty faithfully. But when they once got in at the bottom of the old inside service they rose step by step simply by seniority on their statutory increases, without picking out any of the good to put above the less good. The men in the outside service were not in that position. They could be raised without regard to the statutory increase. They could be picked out by the chiefs of their branches and given special increases because they were deserving of them. The men who got this particular favour at my hands before the 1st of September last were so picked out by their own chiefs, and on the recommendation of their chiefs I did what I did. For years back there has been more discrimination and more promotion for merit in the then outside service in Ottawa than there was in the old inside service under the old regime, because the minister and his chiefs had free hands and could do as they thought proper. The men who are at the head of these outside branches of my department are all of them without exception enthusiasts, earnestly having at heart the work of their branch. They were appointed for that reason; they were appointed as special technical experts; they were picked out of the best men among the agriculturists of Canada, and during the years they have held their positions compliments have been showered upon them by Conservatives as well as by Liberals. They have had the commendation of the Committee of Agriculture of this House over and over again, year in and year out. And these men having at heart the good of the service and wishing to make their branches as perfect as possible were more likely to recommend the good men than to recommend the bad, and to take merit as the sole ground upon which to recommend for promotion. I venture to say, with regard to the increases of the salaries of the outside servants that merit was the only guide. So far as I am personally concerned and I can only speak with certainty for myself, every one of these increases was given upon the recommendation of the head of the branch, and I know some of these officers ; in nine cases out of ten, I do not

know what they look like. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) talked about 1,574 being in this class, as if the whole of these outside servants got special increases.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say so.

Mr. FISHER. No, but when the hon. gentleman was dilating upon the evil he said that 1,574 of these people——

Mr. FOSTER. I said 1,577.

Mr. FISHER. Well that difference is not of much consequence. I may say that the figures given by the hon. gentleman are not the same as those I have had given to me by the department. He spoke about these 1,577 as being all brought in from the outside service, but in my own department 21 of these who were brought in from what appeared to be the outside service and made permanent, but had been previously paid out of civil government contingencies and were really in the inside service although they were not permanent.

Mr. FOSTER. They were not on the establishment.

Mr. FISHER. They were not on the establishment, but they were temporary clerks under the old Civil Service Act, had passed the qualifying examination and were paid out of civil government contingencies.

Mr. FOSTER. Some of them do and some do not.

Mr. FISHER. All of mine had passed the Civil Service qualifying examination, were paid out of civil government contingencies, and belonged to the inside service, although they were temporaries; and this Act has made them permanent. Now, I venture to think that the discrepancy which occurs between my hon. friend's figures and the figures which I gave to the House some time ago, is due to the fact that he has taken all of those who are made permanent under the new Act, and calls them the outside service. Judging by my own department, where there were 21 in the inside service who are made permanent, and I take the rest of the departments as about equal—

Mr. FOSTER. The whole number paid out of civil government contingencies was about 89.

Mr. FISHER. That would be taken off the figures of those who were brought in. When I gave the figures, however, I did not include the staff of the House of Commons and the Senate. I suppose my hon. friend has included them?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. FISHER. Then, I cannot account for the discrepancy. I have no means of knowing where my hon. friend got his figures.

Mr. FOSTER. Take the estimates.

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend has taken the estimates, he is all astray. They provide for the increase in the service during next year, and a great many of those will be new additions.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend speaking about the number of salaries ?

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend will find in the estimates the number of those who were brought in from the outside.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there is some discrepancy between those and the returns as brought down ; but I have taken the estimates as likely to be correct.

Mr. FISHER. The figures I have I got from the Finance Department, which made out the estimates and gave me the figures a few weeks ago, and there has been no change since. The figures were 2,695 in the whole service. My hon. friend gives 2,800 and something. He says that of these 1,577 came in from the outside. That would leave only about 1,300 of the old inside service. I have not here to-night the information on which I based the statement I made last year, when the Act was going through the House, that there were from 1,500 to 1,600 then in the inside service, and that the probability was that the Act would bring in 800 or 900 from the outside, making the total about 2,500. According to the figures given to me by the Finance Department, that number has been exceeded by about 200.

My hon. friend talked very much about injustice to those who were at the maximum of their class, and who may have to wait for promotion. That has always been the case in the Civil Service, and it must always be the case so long as we have a classification. Men who reach the maximum of their class have to stay there until they are promoted. As a general rule, the good clerks, the best clerks, get promoted. Those clerks who are being paid all they are worth, when they get to the top of their class, stay there, and it is just because they are being paid all they are worth that they they do stay there.

My hon. friend seems to think that we have been guilty of a gross and glaring injustice in this respect; but what is the fact? The fact is simply that we have increased the maximum of all the classes, all except one at any rate; so that we gave to the clerks who have been for years at the maximum of their class, an opportunity of going higher and getting an increase to their salaries. Is this an injustice for which we are to be blamed? Have we done this to injure these people? My hon. friend points out that it is chiefly the old clerks, who I suppose were appointed by himself and his friends, who are suffering this so-called injustice. All I can say

is that if any of his friends have remained for any length of time at the maximum of their class, they must have been inferior clerks, and not those who would certainly get promotion if they were very long at the head of their class.

My hon. friend criticises the flat increase. I do not know that it is right to discuss that on this occasion, because we have a Bill before the House in regard to it. I shall only say that while my hon. friend condemns the flat increase and considers it a very improper method of dealing with the service, the representatives of the service themselves state that they are thoroughly satisfied with it. We did not adopt the flat increase hastily. We recognized that the old Civil Service Commission had recommended a percentage increase, and we tried to work that out on various bases; but we found great difficulties and inequalities in the way. We found that the percentage basis went in a different direction from the sense and spirit of the recommendation of the commissioners, which was that those in the lower ranks of the service should get a greater increase than those in the higher ranks with large salaries. Under these circumstances we believed that by giving a flat increase of a certain amount, a larger percentage of increase would go to those whose salaries were low than to those whose salaries were high; and this was recognized last year in the representations made to the government. In the discussion of the question before the commission; and otherwise, it was pointed out that it was the middle and lower ranks of the service that needed the increase more than those receiving high salaries ranging from $3,000 to $5,000 a year. Under these circumstances we decided to give the flat increase. There is a Civil Service Association in Ottawa which is thoroughly representative of the service, over 90 per cent of the whole inside Civil Service belonging to it. That association chose a delegation to go to the Prime Minister and discuss this question of an increase of salary. They made several propositions, which we discussed and tried to work out; and eventually in a final interview between that delegation and myself, to whom the matter had been turned over by the Prime Minister, as I was in charge of the Bill, we made the proposition of a flat increase, and after the delegation duly nominated for that purpose by the Civil Service Association, had taken the time to discuss and think over the proposition, they agreed to it without hesitation, and gave me authority to use their personal names, if I chose, as evidence of their agreement. But they went further than that. As a result of that agreement the Civil Service Association, composed of over 90 per cent of the whole force in Ottawa, discussed the question at a meeting of its executive committee, and passed a resolution endorsing the action of the subcommittee which had conferred with the government regarding the reorganization of the service and the proposed general increase. Here is a paragraph from a letter addressed to myself from the secretary of the association:

> I have also to state that a cordial vote of thanks to yourself for your action on the matter was unanimously passed by the executive at the same meeting, and that I am instructed to convey the same to you, together with an expression of the appreciation of the sub-committee for the kind manner in which you received its representations.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the date of that?

Mr. FISHER. The date of the letter is January 27, 1909 and of the resolution January 21. I may say this—and I have no doubt it is partially the inspiration of what we have heard to-day from the hon. gentleman, that an anonymous communication, typewritten, was sent to me and many others complaining of the flat rate, but evidently whoever wrote this anonymous communication had not the pluck to sign it. I have here a letter from the secretary of the Civil service Association in which he says:

> Mr. McGiverin has just written to me with regard to an anonymous statement which he and several members of parliament have received in which complaint is made of a feature of the proposed increase and he suggests that it might be well to advise you as well as himself in the matter.
>
> The statement in question has also been sent anonymously two or three times to the officers of the association. It does not represent in any way the attitude of the association. That attitude remains, as defined to you by our subcommittee and in my letter to you of January 27, which was written after the publication of the resolution.

That letter is dated March 9. Mr. Coates goes on to speak of the thirty-five who receive no increase either under the reclassification or the new Bill and asking if possible to provide for such cases under the reclassification. I may say that when we came to work out this question of a flat increase, I was agreeably surprised to find that there were only thirty-five in the whole service at Ottawa who got no benefit under that proposition, and also surprised to find that when you take the whole amount paid and the number benefited, the average percentage of increase comes to almost exactly what the Civil Service Commissioners recommended, or about 12 per cent. That is a most extraordinary working out of the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission. Although we proceed on slightly different lines, we get to the same point and same result, and I believe it to be an abundant justification of what we have done and the manner in which we have done it.

I dare say I have omitted some of the many points my hon. friend has taken up, but I think I may safely say that I can just as satisfactorily answer them as I have been able to reply to those of which I took a note. In the work we have done during the last year, we have placed the Civil Service in a much better position than it ever enjoyed before. We have put a large number into the inside service who deserved to be there and who ought to be permanent and get any benefit derived from being in the inside service. Their work in Ottawa was practically the same as the work of those in the inside service, and it was unjust that they should be working side by side, doing similar work, under a different regime. We have given the service a better status, we have given them an improvement in their classification, and we propose to give them a flat increase in salary to rectify the great difference in the cost of living to-day compared with what it was some years ago. In my investigation I found that in 1857 the permanent officers began at $500 just as they did last year, and this is an evidence that a change was required in the system. In doing this for the Civil Service, I believe we have acted in the interests of the country. My hon. friend began by pointing out what a great army of civil servants we have and what a large sum of money is paid them. That is true. And he compared it with the militia and armed forces of Canada. Well, I venture to think that the men on whose honesty and efficiency we must rely in the transaction of the business of Canada, deserve just as much consideration as those who may happen to take up their rifles and serve their country under arms. I do not want to minimize what these do but merely to point out that both are working in the interests of their country. If our public administration is to go on in an efficient and successful manner, it must be conducted by men who are satisfied with their lot, who take a pride in their work, and who are properly and fairly recompensed for the work they are doing. I think I have been able to justify the work I have done in my own department. Of course, we cannot expect sympathy and support from gentlemen opposite, but I am satisfied that we are getting that sympathy and support from the great majority of the people who have sent us to parliament to represent them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr Speaker, as the subject under consideration has been gone into so thoroughly, very little remains to be said. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) was somewhat apprehensive lest he had omitted some points. Let me say that I do not think he did omit any points. There is one thing which he certainly did not forget, one which he very seldom fails to remember, and that was to pay himself a series of graceful and somewhat extravagant compliments on his management of his department. I do not think I have ever observed my hon. friend take the floor when he did not make that point good before he concluded. I have not always observed, however, that he makes any special reference to those celebrated chicken fattening stations in which the cost was so much greater than the revenue. He was good enough, in his somewhat discursive remarks, to make some personal references to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), going back for this purpose as far as 1896. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) surely knows what was the issue in 1896—

Mr. FISHER. I certainly do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was a prohibition plebiscite. Even before I could name it, the hon. gentleman sprang at the subject.

Mr. FISHER. And we carried it out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And I want to tell the hon. gentleman that the reason why the country was so satisfied with this government last summer was that the government had so thoroughly and faithfully carried out their pledge in that regard. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher)—I think it was in 1898, after the vote was taken, and after he had kept silence for some weeks during the session—rose in this House in my presence and said that there had been rumours throughout the country that he was going to resign, rumours around the corridors of this House that he was going to resign, rumours among members of parliament that he was going to resign, because the prohibition pledge had not been carried out, as he knows it was not carried out. And he gave the House the assurance, which was absolutely and wholly unnecessary, that he was not going to resign—every one knew it.

Mr. FISHER. My political opponents have had several opportunities since then to turn me out if they could.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That day will come, perhaps sooner than the hon. gentleman thinks. I do not think that there is really very much to say so far as the hon. gentleman's department is concerned, because he has practically admitted the whole case. I never have listened in this House to a more extraordinary confession of faith from the mouth of any minister of the Crown, who is supposed to have some regard to the trust he owes to the public of this country, than the hon. gentleman's statement with respect to his exercise of the power of patronage. The hon. gentleman's answer to the charge was that, instead of making 146 appointments in August in defiance of the

spirit of the policy which he announced in this House last session, he had only made 46 such appointments. He had violated the terms of his own policy 46 times, instead of 146 times. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) shakes his head; I will not make the usual response to that. What was the whole spirit of the policy of this government, as announced with some boasting last session by the hon. gentleman himself, and with very great boasting in the Liberal press of this country on his behalf? The spirit of it was this, that from the day the Act was passed—from the day the announcement was made in this House—Civil Service reform, so far as the officers embraced within this statute were concerned, was a thing accomplished, and that the government deserved the gratitude of the people for having brought about that reform.

Look at the hon. gentleman's excuse in the light of this boastful announcement. There were officers in his department with whom he could deal as he saw fit in the course of any year, because of the elasticity of the votes under which they were paid. If he found an officer not receiving fair compensation for his services, he could remedy that wrong without coming to parliament. If I am wrong in my statement, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) will correct me. He does not correct me, therefore, I have stated the case fairly, as I intended to do. Now, on the very eve of this Act coming into operation, while these men were receiving salaries that the hon. minister must have found ample for the work they had been doing for the public, on the eve of the time when it would become the duty of the Civil Service Commissioners to judge of the men's qualifications, the minister committed a fraud upon his own policy by doing that which the Civil Service Commissioners should have been allowed to do. The hon. gentleman's answer to the charge has been made and a more utterly absurd answer, a more unworthy answer, it seems to me never proceeded out of the mouth of any member of this House. If he had allowed this matter, which had been standing in the same way for months if not years, to remain for two or three days longer, it would have come within the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commissioners. But, in order that he might cheat the statute which he himself had framed he passed these orders in council and made these advances. And he boasted of it—actually stood on the floor of this House and boasted of it. And more than that, he has the—I was going to use a strong word, but let me say—audacity, and foolishness as well, to taunt my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) with inaccuracy. This hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher), who stated from his place in this House that he had written assurance from the government of Japan as to a certain matter of policy, and who, three years afterwards, was obliged to stand in his place and say that he had received no such assurance,—this hon. gentleman ventures to taunt my hon. friend from North Toronto with a supposed inaccuracy which did not exist. He says my hon. friend from North Toronto was scarifying the Act which he had assisted to pass last year. Any hon. member who was present last session during the debate upon this Bill knows that the hon. member for North Toronto, in a thoroughly non-partisan and patriotic spirit, assisted the Minister of Agriculture, in no small measure, to have this Act passed. Every hon. member who was present on that occasion, will willingly bear testimony to that. There was no partisanship in it from first to last; hon. gentlemen on this side stood by the Minister of Agriculture; and there is very grave doubt whether the Act could have been passed if it had not been for the strong support it received on this side. The hon. minister (Mr. Fisher) says that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) now seeks to scarify the Act. My hon. friend did not attack the Act, as I understood him, but he did attack the administration of the Minister of Agriculture, of the Minister of the Interior, and of the Minister of Public Works under this Act—or, rather, under the Act which was upon the statute-book before this Act came into force. The Minister of Agriculture takes credit to himself and boasts of his conduct in this respect. What about the Postmaster General, the Minister of Railways, the Minister of Marine and other ministers of the Crown, who thought it their duty, as this Act was coming into force, to hold their hands and let the men appointed for that purpose, the Civil Service Commissioners, do their duty under the Act?

Were these men doing something of which they should not boast, and was the Minister of Agriculture, in doing what was virtually a fraud upon this Act, accomplishing something of which he had any right to boast? I venture to think not. I do not quarrel with the advances to any of these men, I do not quarrel with their qualifications, I am not prepared to dispute anything that my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has said as to their qualifications. I have no knowledge which will enable me either to affirm or deny anything he has said in that regard. But what I do say is that the commission appointed for that purpose by this parliament last session should have been left to do the work, and if the minister's statements can be made good, every one of these men would have received at the hands of the commission, exactly what the minister has given him. This commission has been appointed just for that purpose, and every one of these

officials could have received the advancement from division to division, from subdivision to subdivision, which was necessary in the public interest, upon the recommendation of the Civil Service Commissioners. I repeat again that to bring about, at that time and in the manner adopted, these changes in the administration of this department, in the administration of the Public Works Department, in the administration of the Department of the Interior, was unworthy of the hon. gentlemen who preside over those departments; and I commend rather to the approval of this House and of the country the attitude and the action of the other ministers of the Crown, who thought it their duty to leave those matters to the adjudication and the judgment of the Civil Service Commissioners appointed for that purpose. The Minister of Agriculture has admitted the whole case put by my hon. friend from North Toronto this afternoon. I venture to hope that the administration of this Civil Service Act will be carried out in a fair spirit in the future. No Act can be made perfect, no Act can be put upon the statute-book, which will not leave something to the administration of the heads of the departments; and if this Civil Service Act is interpreted, if it is carried out, in the spirit so definitely boasted of by the Minister of Agriculture this evening, then all I can say is that this Act will prove to be of much less benefit to the Civil Service and to the public of Canada than we believed it would be when we passed it last session. Under the circumstances I think my hon. friend from North Toronto was thoroughly justified in bringing this mater to the attention of the House, and in pointing out very forcibly the abuse which has been perpetrated by the heads of no less than three departments, upon the very eve of the coming into force of so important a statute as this.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I shall occupy the attention of the House for a few minutes only, because my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has so thoroughly justified, as it seems to me, the action of his department and that of the Minister of the Interior, based upon the general powers which were given to the departments of the Civil Service Act, that it is scarcely necessary for me to make any further argument in support of what we have done. Now if the leader of the opposition will pardon the suggestion, I think it would have been much better for him to confine his remarks to a discussion of what the various departments have done under the Civil Service Act, rather than to deal with matters relating to the elections of 1896 and subsequently.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Let me remind my hon. friend that I did not introduce that question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then if he did not introduce it, he went one better than the Minister of Agriculture. However, I suppose my hon. friend is to be pardoned for still entertaining some feelings of discomfort by reason of what took place last October. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to affirm that in my judgment the departments which were called upon to deal with the men and women who were in the outside service and who, under the statute were to be brought in to the inside service, simply discharged their duty when they fixed the status which these officials should occupy upon coming into the inside service. That, I apprehend, was our duty under the Civil Service Act; and if my hon. friends had intended to raise any objections to the heads of the departments taking that course the time to raise the objection was when the Civil Service Bill was before parliament last session. What, Sir, was our duty? Let me turn to section 8 of the Civil Service Act passed last session, and which provides as follows:

> 1. As soon as practicable after the coming into force of the Act, the head of each department shall cause the organization of his department to be determined and defined by order in council, due regard being had to the status of each officer or clerk as the case may be.
>
> 2. The order in council shall give the names of the several branches of the department, with the number and character of the offices, clerkships and other positions in each, and the duties, titles and salaries thereafter to pertain thereto.

Now what was I called upon to do as head of my department? I found that I had about 36 officers who came within the provisions of the old Civil Service Act; I had about 170, or perhaps more, who, although they had been for a long time in the department, performing work just as important, performing work of just as permanent a character as that which they would have performed if they had been within the old Civil Service Act, still remained there as temporary employees, although many of them had been there ten, twenty, twenty-five and thirty years, and had to be appointed year after year, and their salaries to be determined by order in council. Now in organizing my department, in acting under the requirements of section 8 of the Act, surely it was my duty to have regard to the services which those officials were performing, it was my duty to have regard to the efficiency with which they performed their duties, to the length of their service, to the value of the service they were giving to the country, to the number of people who were qualified to enter upon the dif-

ferent classes which it was my duty to organize under the Civil Service Act. Well, what did I do? I asked the deputy head of my department to do what the statute says he should do, and that is to take into consideration the number of people who were in the department, the services which they were performing, with a view to asking the Governor in Council to fix their status, and to fix the salaries which would pertain to the positions they would be called upon to fill under the Act. Now, probably I knew even less of my officials than other ministers who had been in charge of their departments for a good many years. I did not know the capabilities of those different officials. I would not have the same knowledge of the value of the services which they are performing, as the deputy head of the department. It is his duty to keep in touch with all the officials of the department, and I asked him to take the matter up, and to devote to the subject the greatest possible care, to see that every official who was being brought in from the outside service, received due recognition, and that in placing him in the one class or the other, a most earnest attempt should be made to do simple justice to him, without doing any injustice to any other official. Not days alone, but weeks and weeks were occupied by the deputy minister in the discharge of that duty. He consulted with the heads of the different branches, and I have reason to believe that he discharged that duty conscientiously, with a sincere desire to carry out the terms of the Act, and to discharge the duties which devolved upon him under the provisions of the Civil Service Act. Now what did we do upon his recommendation? Having regard to the different classes which the Civil Service Act declared should be established, we provided that in sub-division A of the first division there should be a certain number of the higher officials of that class. There would be some who were within the Civil Service Act already, and there would be others who would be brought in under the Act on the 1st of September. We selected those officials who were performing the highest duties in the department, and recommended that they should be placed in sub-division A of the first division.

Let me call upon the hon. member for North Toronto, who says that a grave injustice has been done to the old members of the Civil Service, to those who have been under the old Civil Service Act, to take the classification which was passed in council, and which, upon his own motion, was submitted to parliament, to point to a single instance where an injustice had been done to those who were formerly under the old Civil Service Act and who have been placed in subdivision A of the first division in my department. At the best he might perhaps have been able to make the point that there had been some error and that some injustice had been done, but my hon. friend has not ventured to do that, and I may say that if he attempts to do that he will fail in showing to the House that such has been the case. I have never heard that any one of the gentlemen who have been in my department, those who came under the terms of the old Act, have uttered any complaint as to the mode in which they have been treated by the classification which has been made and by the salaries which are to be paid to the various officials who are classed in subdivision A of the first division. Then, we have subdivision B of the first division, and, having regard to the various officials in my department of the outside service as well as the inside service, it was the duty of the deputy minister to consider all these officials, the duties which they were performing, the efficiency with which they were discharging their public duties and, having regard to those who ought to go into that division I, upon his initiation, recommended to council that a certain number of officials should be placed in subdivision B of the first division. That was in order to recognize the merits of a large number of the officials and to place in that subdivision those who we thought would be fairly entitled to be placed there. If you will look over the classification which has been made by the Governor in Council upon my recommendation as the head of the department based, as I have said very largely and almost wholly upon the recommendation of my deputy minister, the permanent head of the department, it will be found that we have provided as best we could and according to our best judgment for these various officials both in the inside and the outside service whom we were called upon to place and to whom it was our duty to give the requisite status pursuant to the classification which was made and which is now before the House. As I have said, if my hon. friend could take that classification, if he could take the different officials who have been appointed to these various offices in my department and show that any wrong has been done, that any injustice has been done to any one of these employees, whether those who had been formerly in the Civil Service or those who had been long in the department, although employed in the temporary organization which was instituted a great many years ago, he would be able to make some point against me in connection with this part of the management of my department, but my hon. friend has utterly failed to do that. I recognize that it was my duty, as I assume the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) recognized that it was his duty, to provide for the classification of the various officials in the department, to specify the number of

officials who would be respectively in the different classes, and I assume that it was his duty as it has been my duty to have regard to the various officials then in the department and to the services which they were performing as well as the faithfulness with which they had discharged the duties that they owed to the public. In doing that I endeavoured, and I have no doubt that my deputy endeavoured, to so arrange the classification and to so provide for the placing of the different officials as to do complete justice to the officials having regard to their service, the length of their service and the efficiency with which they were discharging their duties.

Just a word with regard to what I thought was an unfair or undeserved insinuation of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that there had been some favouritism and that some officials who had been appointed by the previous government had been discriminated against. As far as my department is concerned I can assure my hon. friend that there is no warrant for making—not the statement—but for throwing out such an insinuation as that which was conveyed in the statement of the hon. gentleman. I find that one of the most important officials of my department, to whom there was an increase of $400, was appointed on the 20th March, 1891, under the government of which my hon. friend was a distinguished member. I find that the next gentleman to whom there was an increase of $650 was appointed on the 2nd of March, 1886, also under the former government. Another one occupying a very important position to whom an increase of $300 was given was appointed on the 13th July, 1882; another one to whom an increase of $200 was given was appointed on the 11th April, 1888; and another one to whom an increase of $200 was given was appointed on the 4th December, 1886. And so, if my hon. friend will take this statement which was brought before the House on his own motion and go over the names of those gentlemen who have received an increase, he will see, I am sure, that he has no warrant for making the suggestion that there has been any discrimination as between officials who have been recently appointed and those who have held office in my department for a great many years.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the hon. gentleman give the names of those to whom he has just referred ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be very glad to. There is Mr. Adams who received an increase of $120; he was appointed on the 1st May, 1886; Mr. Chassé, the law clerk. who received an increase of $400, was appointed on the 20th March, 1891 ; Mr. Coleman, clerk in charge of returns, who received an increase of $300, was appointed on the 13th July, 1882; Mr. Cusson, assistant keeper of the records, who received an increase of $200, was appointed on the 11th April, 1888; Mr. Delaney, assistant photographer, who received an increase of $250, was appointed on the 4th December, 1886; Mr. Desautels, clerk of attendance book, who received a small increase, was appoined June 22, 1886 ; Mr. Lefleche, registration clerk, who received an increase of $200, was appointed on the 8th September, 1887. These are a few illustrations of the truth of what I have stated. So that they apepar to have received the benefit of the increase entirely irrespective of the dates of their appointments. I am sure that an examination of the return which has been submitted to the House will verify the statement which I unhesitatingly make that in the increases which were given in my department, in the classification which has been made and in the number of officials who have been respectively assigned to each, there has not been the slightest favouritism and that no one has received any increase by reason of the position he may have occupied politically prior to his becoming connected with the department. I have not allowed, and I do not think that the deputy of my department has allowed, political, or party, or personal considerations to enter into the matter in any way, shape or form. We have simply endeavoured to do justice to all ; we have endeavoured to recognize the merits of the different officials and to treat them as we have felt they ought to be treated, and in doing what we have done I challenge my hon. friend himself to show that we have done other than what it was our duty to do under the Civil Service Act.

It was our duty under section 8 of the Act to arrange for the classification of the departments, and in doing that it was also our duty to have in view all the different officials who were in the outside as well as in the inside service, and who under the terms of the law were to be brought within the Act, and to have regard to the salaries which they would receive because their salaries as of the first of September would fix their status under the Act. In doing so we simply acted within the powers conferred upon us by the Act. The hon. gentleman asks why we did not leave this for the Civil Service Commissioners to do. Well, the Act gives them no power to do what we have done in justice to these officials. The Act does not give the commissioners the power to arrange the classification ; the Act does not give the commissioners the power to say whether in the first division or in the second division or in any other division there shall be twenty officials or ten officials. That is a duty which rested upon the heads of the departments and upon the Governor in Council. It is a duty we could not relegate to the

Civil Service Commissioners ; we could not ask them to discharge a duty which parliament had imposed upon us. It was our duty to say how many of our clerks and which of our clerks should be placed in a certain class, and having regard to the services which they performed and to the claims which they had, it was our duty to fix their salaries so as to do complete justice as between the outside servants and the officials who were within the Civil Service Act, starting everything as from the first of September and after that leaving the working out of the Act and the matter of promotion and of salaries to the commissioners. We have done our duty; we started them under the Act on the first of September and hereafter it will be for the Civil Service Commissioners to perform their duty under the terms of the statute.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Might I ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) a question as I am not perfectly certain that I understood the point of his remarks. He appears to claim that the action of the Minister of Agriculture, and of the Minister of the Interior, and his own action was based on the authority of section 8 of the Civil Service Act. That was his whole case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not my whole case; that gives the authority.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I may say that I differ entirely from the conclusion of the minister, but that it is so absolutely immaterial in view of another clause of the Act that I shall not waste time discussing it. Section 8 is:

As soon as practicable.

Not after the prorogation of parliament, not after July 20, but:

As soon as practicable after the coming into force of this Act.

And when did it come into force. Section 48 says:

This Act shall come into force on the first day of September.

And therefore, it is as soon as practicable after the first day of September. Surely a more monstrous proposition was never addressed to an astonished House than that of the Minister of Public Works who carefully tells us that the ministers in promoting these men and in increasing their salaries, acting like a shah, or a sultan, or a rajah or any other oriental despot, did all that by virtue of the power given them by section 8 of the Civil Service Act which says, that after the first day of September they are to call their deputies together and do so and so. But, the minister tells us that he did it before the first day of September so as to avoid the very effect which parliament intended should have been produced had he done as he was bidden by parliament after the first of September.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend pardon me; I think he misunderstood me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just wait a moment; I did not intend to say and I do not think I did say that we completed the work of classification until after the first of September. What I did say was that in my department for weeks before that we were preparing and arranging for the classification of the various clerks and then when the law came into force on the first of September, we had the matter arranged as we thought equitable and fairly, and they were placed under the various classes pursuant to the terms of the Act. That is what I intended to say.

Mr. FOSTER. You were caught that time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all.

Mr. NORTHRUP. If the ministers did what they say they did before the 1st of September, they did not do it in pursuance of the Civil Service Act, for that Act says they are to do it after the 1st of September. At all events the result of what they did was to bring about a state of affairs that would not have been brought about had they obeyed the Act and did it as soon as practicable after the Act came in to force. We therefore have the extraordinary result that a certain number of favoured individuals had their salaries increased before the 1st of September in order that they might get benefits which the law did not contemplate they should get. In my opinion everything so done by the ministers was wholly illegal. Is it not a rather singular ilustration of retributive justice that the gentlemen who began to reform the Civil Service by acting in defiance of the statute should now come down to this House with a further measure of reform to add $150 to the salaries of other civil servants in defiance of another statute of this country. I mean the election law. Has any one in this country the slightest doubt that this resolution granting $150 to the civil servants is the price deliberately paid by the government for the seats of the city of Ottawa? Is there a person in this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific who does not know that the government had dispaired of carrying Otawa and had to abandon the candidates nominated by a duly qualified party convention? Is it not known from the Atlantic to the Pacific that when even the Prime Minister was brought to Ottawa—and I do not think it was paying much of a compliment to Ottawa in view of the fact that he would not declare he would sit for Ottawa if elected—despite the appeals made on the ground of the wonder-

ful favours conferred by this government on Ottawa, they found that even he could not be elected for Ottawa in the face of the feeling which existed amongst the civil servants, until his colleague gave a promise, supported and backed up by the Prime Minister, that if—to use plain ordinary everyday Anglo-Saxon—if Ottawa did the square thing by the Prime Minister they could depend upon it that the Prime Minister would do the square thing for the Civil Service. And so we see how one wrong step leads to another, and that these hon. gentlemen commenced to carry out this measure (which last year was heralded throughout the land as such a marvellous system of Civil Service reform) by very carefully violating it so as to bring about results that could not be attained if they did not violate the statute, and then to complete their work, they had to bring down this measure to carry out the promises which everybody in Canada knows were relied upon by a large section of the civil servants in Ottawa when they voted for the Prime Minister. While I have a great respect for the Civil Service of Ottawa, while I feel that many a member of it is sadly underpaid, and while I would be willing to go as far as any member of this House in doing justice to the hard-working and worthy members of the service, I feel like voting against this resolution, for two reasons; first, because I think it is an insult to parliament to ask us to carry out that illegal promise made during the last election, and secondly, because I believe it is an insult to the intelligence of parliament to ask us to remedy a wrong, which it is admitted has existed in the Civil Service for years, in so haphazard a fashion as giving an increase of $150 all round, irrespective of the salary now received, the length of service, or the ability shown by the recipient—irrespective of everything except the promise made last session to increase the salaries of the Civil Service. Surely there is another and a better way than that; and if this matter comes to a vote, I for one, will vote against the resolution—first, because I decline to be a party to carrying out that illegal promise, and secondly, because, instead of doing justice to the service, it is making a hodge podge of them, and increasing the salaries of many who should not be in the service at all, but should be turned out on the first opportunity. If this were done and the money thus saved were divided among the rest of the service, we would have a far more useful and efficient service than we have.

Mr. H. B. McGIVERIN (Ottawa). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat was probably not in the House earlier in this session, when the matter to which he has referred was brought up by the hon. member for North Toronto. I refer to the so-called promise that was made during the last election. The statement that was made by me in regard to the increase of salaries to the Civil Service, was simply in accordance with the intention expressed in the House last session by the government of carrying out the recommendations of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Civil Service. The only promise that was made by me was that I would use my best endeavours to have those recommendations carried out.

Mr. LENNOX. What about the letter?

Mr. McGIVERIN. That is exactly what the letter contained, and no more than that. That letter is in 'Hansard,' and if the hon. gentleman who has interrupted me had taken the trouble to look at it, he would have seen that there was no improper promise of any kind. I do not hesitate to say that the government, in putting through the Civil Service Act of last session, has taken a great step in Civil Service reform, and so far as I am able to judge in the city of Ottawa, the government and the commissioners are carrying out that Act fairly and honestly. There are no appointments being made that are not made in accordance not only with the letter but with the spirit of the Act; and when the hon. gentleman who has just sat down says that the government, in bringing forward a measure to grant the Civil Service a flat increase of $150, is not carrying out their policy of last session, I take issue with him, and will strongly support that measure. It is in no way a bribe, but is simply carrying out what was intended last session, and what, owing to the lateness of the session, it was impossible to carry out then. I had no intention of taking part in this debate, because I understood, from what had been said, that no fault could or would be found with the increase that is proposed; and I for one, knowing that the Civil Service Association are fully in accord with this proposition, give it my most hearty support.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Dominion buildings, rents, &c., $200,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This item stood at the request of one or two hon. gentlemen who were desirous of seeing the leases of buildings in Ottawa. Those leases were shown to them, and I would like to have this item considered. I might say, in answer to a remark made by one hon. gentleman, I think the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) that I am quite sure that if he makes

inquiry he will find that the observations he made in regard to the rent being paid to the Imperial Realty Company of Ottawa were entirely without foundation. The hon. gentleman stated that the building was worth something less than $200,000, and that an enormous rent was being paid for it, no doubt to party friends of the government. I have made inquiry, and I find that some time ago bonds were issued on the building to the Royal Trust Company of Canada, and it was valued by valuators chosen by that company at $400,000. As to the building being owned by party friends of the government, I have taken occasion to look into the list of directors of the company, and I find that one is Mr. J. W. Woods, another is Mr. Finnie, manager of the Bank of Ottawa, and another is Mr. E. B. Osler, of Toronto, a gentleman very well known to hon. gentlemen opposite, and a very distinguished member of this House. I am sure that my hon. friend, if he were here, would be the first to withdraw the suggestion he made.

Mr. STANFIELD. A member stated to me to-day that he had spoken to Mr. Osler and Mr. Osler denied the statement that he is a director of this realty company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is my information.

Mr. STANFIELD. He denies it.

Mr. PRICE. As the hon. gentleman says that Mr. Osler denies that he is a director of the company and as two or three members are absent who would like to say something on the subject, it is only fair to put this item off for another night.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not like to refuse my hon. friends when they make a request, but I am sorry we have to put this item off. Of course I accept at once the statement, if Mr. Osler authorized it to be made, that he is not a director. My information is that he is, but no doubt, I am misinformed. However, I am quite willing to take up the Nova Scotia items.

Avonport pier—Repairs, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The length is about 65 feet. The wharf became badly dilapidated. This is done by days' labour.

Baddeck wharf improvements, $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the improvements to the wharf and also to level up the land and drain it. The original cost was $14,709.

Mr. MADDIN. What was the cost of the site and was the work let by tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The lot is 107 feet wide by 306 feet deep. The lot and the wharf, including building, was purchased for $3,000 from Mr. Alex. Macdonald.

Mr. MADDIN. Was the work let by tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the contract was let for $11,709.

Mr. MADDIN. Will the $1,500 complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. What is the balance due on the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to finish up the total expense. I do not know whether it is all in the one contract or not.

Mr. RHODES. Would this be for extras?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I find there is some extra work required, such as levelling up and draining. The appropriation last year was $3,500. The crib-work retaining wall is estimated to cost $696; filling in old work, $114; filling in space between warehouse and old work, $42; levelling ground, $111; repairs to the old warehouse, $120; new warehouse, $200; fitting up office, $200; superintendent, $350; due the contractor, $400—making a total of $3,500. That will exhaust the $2,000 used out of last year's vote and the $1,500 we are asking for.

Mr. RHODES. Was the warehouse built by the man who secured the original contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. RHODES. I find in the report of the Department of Public Works of 1908 that in addition to the construction of the wharf, an agreement was entered into with the contractor for the construction of two boat landings. May I ask if the contractor for the warehouse also built the two landing stages?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no memorandum on that point.

Mr. RHODES. I am reading from the report of the engineer contained in the minister's report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In looking at it, it is evident that the landing stages would be included in the $11,709.23.

Mr. RHODES. So, the landing stages would be an extra. Were they constructed by the contractor who built the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I take that to be the case.

Mr. RHODES. Can the minister give me the name of the contractor who built the wharf, or, if not, can he give the name of the man who built the warehouse?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not a memorandum on that point.

Mr. RHODES. I feel like asking the minister to furnish the information. I can find in the Auditor General's Report the name of the man who built the wharf and

also the name of the man who built the landing stages, and I would like to know if it is the same contractor who built the warehouse.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will instruct the deputy minister to get that information, and, later, when we consider the general vote, my hon. friend (Mr. Rhodes) will have an opportunity of discussing it. Will that be satisfactory?

Bay St. Lawrence harbour, $5.800.

Mr. AMES. How much was spent there last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract. There was expended, up to the 30th December, to the contractor $20,890, and to the inspector $283.75—a total of $21,173.75.

Mr. AMES. What is the nature of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Providing a safe boat harbour by opening a channel about 360 feet long, with a width of 60 feet at the bottom and a depth of two feet at low water. This is made through the beach which separates the pond from the sea. There is also pier work on either side and protection of the channel on the inside.

Mr. AMES. What will be the depth of water at high tide?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nine or ten feet, probably; I think the tide rises there about seven feet.

Mr. AMES. Does the engineer give it as his opinion that the sand will not fill up the channel?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The belief is that building the protection work will have the effect of preventing the channel filling up.

Mr. AMES. This does not make a harbour of refuge, as I understand it. I suppose it is only for the fishing fleet that fishes off the north end of Cape Breton?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is only for small boats, drawing nine or ten feet of water.

Mr. AMES. It is a large expenditure for that purpose.

Big Bras d'Or wharf—close piling and repairs, $2,000.

Mr. RHODES. Is creosoted timber used there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. The old piling is destroyed. This is a revote.

Blue Rocks harbour—improvements, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote also. It is to provide funds for the construction of a dam at the eastern end, and a breakwater at the western end of the harbour.

Mr. AMES. Is this being carried on by day's work?

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, by contract given after public advertisement and tender.

Mr. AMES. Will this amount complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is expected to complete the work.

Breton Cove—extension of breakwater pier, $600.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a work of diversion of the mouth of the stream to the north of the wharf. It is a revote. The work is under contract.

Mr. AMES. What is it expected to accomplish?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to prevent gravel from washing around the end of the wharf and so interfering with the boat landing.

Mr. AMES. How extensive are these works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amount is $5,788. This vote is to pay the balance.

Mr. AMES. What will the works consist of when completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. An extension of the present breakwater pier, 120 feet out to deeper water.

Mr. AMES. I doubt very much whether the work will stand. There is a tremendous sea there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We hope it will stand; and the engineer thinks it will.

Mr. RHODES. Is creosoted timber used there also?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Cheverie breakwater—extension of, $4,500.

Mr. JAMESON. When was the contract entered into?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the 16th of December, 1908.

Mr. JAMESON. How many tenders were received?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Four, ranging from $4,295 to $5,270. There were four tenders between those amounts.

Mr. JAMESON. When were the tenders called for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About a month previous to that time. It is expected this will finish the work.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the extent of the extension?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Eighty feet.

Mr. JAMESON. Is this work being done with creosoted timber.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think this is creosoted timber.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the policy of the department, and on what principle does it use creosoted timber in some works and not in others ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Creosoted timber would be used in localities where the worms are found to be very destructive.

Church Point—repairs to wharf, $600.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to finish up the work.

Mr. JAMESON. Would the minister define what he means by conductor of works and sub-conductor ? I see that both of these titles appear in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A conductor, my deputy informs me, is one who performs the functions usually performed by a foreman. A sub-conductor would be a labouring man who had an oversight of the work under the foreman.

Mr. JAMESON. I see elsewhere in the Auditor General's Report that the terms foreman and subforeman are used in public works. Are these synonymous with conductor and sub-conductor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so.

Mr. JAMESON. Is not a conductor merely an inspector, so to speak ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I think a conductor actually works himself.

Mr. JAMESON. On this item I would like to refer to the landing pier at Westport, in the county of Digby, with regard to which I asked the minister a question a few days ago. In the estimates of last year was an item of $3,000 for the purpose of beginning the construction of a public landing at Westport, and the minister informed me that nothing had been done, and it was not intended to go on with the work during the present year. Some time later when the matter of these deferred public works generally was under discussion, the minister made a statement of his policy in reply to a question. I will quote from ' Hansard ' page 1348 :

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the minister also give us the assurance that those public buildings which were in the estimates last year and which now are unfortunately discontinued, will be preferred and gone on with before other public buildings of a similar kind are initiated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that is a very fair question. I feel that is the course that I should pursue as Minister of Public Works, and will certainly recommend to my colleagues. Of course there may be other cases arise, such as a public building being burned down or a wharf being carried away, which might create an exception, and we might have to include these new works, but as a general principle I am and would be committed to those works which parliament was asked to sanction last year.

Mr. JAMESON. Does that apply to breakwaters and wharfs as well as to public buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Of course, if I were convinced that any work was not necessary I would have to think the matter over, but as at present advised I would adopt that course.

Mr. JAMESON. I am referring to the items which were in the estimates last year and which are stricken out of the estimates of the present year, and which of course would not be placed in the estimates last year if the ministry did not consider they were justifiable.

Now I would like to ask the minister, because I am in receipt of many inquiries from Westport, whether he considers this public landing at Westport would be a work which, under the policy here stated, would be proceeded with next year. I may say that there is great need, and has been for many years, of a public landing at Westport. Westport is an important town where a large business is carried on, and which a large fleet of fishing and trading vessels frequents. It has steamboat connection with St. John, but owing to the extreme rise and fall of the tide there the people of that port and the travelling public generally, are very much incommoded from the lack of a proper landing place for vessels. In fact matters have come to such a pass that the steamer which calls from St. John is obliged to lay off in the stream at certain periods of the tide, and the only way the people can land is to wade through the water and mud to the shore, or to climb ashore by means of lobster crates and devices of that character. I would urge upon the minister the necessity of the construction of that landing. It was promised last year and was included in the estimates, but owing to the straightened financial condition, he has not considered it advisable to go on with that work the present year. May I ask him if, under these circumstances, it will be one of those works to which preference will be given, and that the people in that district may look for the beginning of the work next year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I regret that I am not able to give any assurance with regard to this work, or with regard to other works, specifically. I have nothing to add to the statement I made upon a previous occasion. Of course if I have to determine as between different works in the estimates, I might take up some works in preference to others according to the public necessity. But it did not follow from the remarks I made that all of the works in the estimates would be taken up at the same time. Some may have to stand over. Therefore, I hope my hon. friend will not ask me to give any specific promise as to this work. He will simply have to rely upon the statement I made of a general character on a previous occasion.

Mr. JAMESON. It must have been recognized by the minister that there was a pressing necessity for a public landing at Westport when he included in the estimates of last year an appropriation towards its construction. Taking that as a basis and recognizing the necessity of the landing I will not ask whether it will be given preference over other works of a similar character which have been deferred, but I will ask whether it will not be given preference over new works for which there was no appropriation in last year's estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give my hon. friend any assurance, because it may be that when the time comes to provide for further works some will be brought to my notice of a much more pressing character than the particular work to which he refers.

Mr. JAMESON. Then does the minister wish me to understand that he does not consider that this is a work which was necessary and that the appropriation which was made last year was made, not with the intention of going on with the work, but for some other purpose; or, does he believe that the work was necessary and that the appropriation of last year was honestly placed there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amount that was placed in the estimates last year was placed there in good faith and with the sincere belief that the works were a public necessity. I do not at all wish to withdraw a single word which I uttered in this chamber on a previous occasion with regard to this. My hon. friend must see that where some $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 have been struck off my estimates the time will soon come when parliament would feel like providing for a portion of that amount. I might have half the amount placed at my disposal and then I would have to discriminate between works which might stand over and works which were more imperative. There might also be new works which would be of the most urgent character. Under these circumstances I could not be expected in any way to bind the government or parliament as to what appropriations would be passed upon a future occasion. The very best I can do is to rely upon the statement which I made and which is fully reported in 'Hansard.' As to giving individual promises that this or that work will be undertaken, I must decline to do so. I could not with any degree of propriety give any assurance as to what action may be taken by the government at the next or any subsequent session.

Mr. JAMESON. The necessity for a public landing is greater and more urgent today than it was when that amount was placed in the estimates and the only changed condition, as far as Westport and the county of Digby generally is concerned, is that a Conservative and not a Liberal is now representing that county in this parliament. I trust that that is not the reason upon which the minister is basing his remarks. I trust he will not allow a trifling matter of that sort to cause him to discriminate against Westport. Westport has always been very faithful to Liberal traditions. Westport has always given a large Liberal majority. Westport has never had any assistance of this character from the public exchequer since 1896. Last year, when the election was imminent and when the people of Westport were beginning to be restive and suggested that they might not always support the Liberal policy, the promise was made to them that a public landing would be provided and an appropriation was placed in the estimates for its construction. Then the people of Westport did as they always have done in the past —walked up to the polls and gave a very good majority for the Liberal candidate. But the county generally did not follow their example and the Liberal canddate was unable to secure a majority in the county. But, I do not think that should be any reason why the people of Westport should be deprived of their share of the public moneys or why the minister should refrain from giving them any assurance that, so soon as the public funds will permit the construction of this work it will be proceeded with. I do not think it is unreasonable to ask the minister if he has changed his mind with regard to the necessity of the work. I think it is only right and proper, in view of the fact that this item was stricken out of the estimates and people have been told that the work will not be proceeded with now that they should be given the reason why this has been so stricken out and that they should also be given some assurance as to whether the work will be proceeded with when the public funds permit of the undertaking being carried on.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have neither changed my mind nor have I seen any reason for changing my mind. But, as to giving any assurance, I do not feel that my hon. friend can properly ask me to do that.

Mr. STANFIELD. How much of the $1,200 voted last year was spent on the Brulé wharf and how much of the $1,000 voted last year was spent on the Economy wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not in the estimates. If my hon. friend will be good enough to put a question in the House I shall be glad to answer it. The information I have here appertains to the estimates that I am asking the committee to vote.

Mr. STANFIELD. I thought your officers would know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They would not carry these things in their heads.

Mr. STANFIELD. The information I have got is that none of this money has been spent. As I stated some evenings ago, I suggested the appointment of men to look after the work to be done by day's work, but my men were not taken on. Of course, I know there was an election on last year and there will probably not be another for four years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps I am responsible that my hon. friend has not been further consulted with regard to the em-employment of the men because I really thought it would be imposing a burden on the hon. gentleman that he would not like to assume.

Mr. STANFIELD. If I had been consulted the money would have been spent honestly, and not stolen as it had been in the past. As to the Economy wharf it is known as the camel back wharf and I took a snap shot of it, but unfortunately when I developed the plate it did not turn out very well.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did it break the kodak?

Mr. STANFIELD. Well not quite. The approach to the wharf runs in a semi-circle so that a team can hardly drive on to it. I cannot understand why for the sake of $1,000 the wharf is left in that condition. It would seem that wherever a Conservative is elected there is no money to be spent.

Mr. FRASER. I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the work at Naufrage pond, Prince Edward Island. At page 1347 of 'Hansard,' in reply to Mr. Ames the minister states that in the month of December the government made up their mind to drop certain public works for which tenders had been called. Further on he was asked by Mr. Foster to give a concrete instance of a public work for which tenders had been advertised but which would not be proceeded with, and the minister says:

> There was the case of the Naufrage pond in Prince Edward Island. The constituency had been asking for this for a considerable time but the amount was large, and although we asked for tenders we concluded that we might allow that to stand for another year. The matter was referred to the chief engineer and he reported that he did not think the public interest would suffer if it were allowed to stand for another year.

Now, notwithstanding that statement of the minister I find at page 64 of the estimates for the coming year an item of $14,-500 for protecting works at the entrance of Naufrage pond. There seems to be a discrepancy between the item in the estimates and the statement of the minister, and I would now ask him if it is the intention of the government to go ahead with the work this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be more convenient if the hon. gentleman would ask me the question when we come to that item.

Clark's harbour—protection works, $800.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the nature of the work at Clark's harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The construction of beach protection works to protect the houses, stores and boat landings from danger of encroachment by the sea.

Mr. JAMESON. What has been expended previously on that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $4,500.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the extent of these beach protection works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 926 feet long and 3 feet high.

Mr. JAMESON. Does it run along a roadway or along private lands ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. JAMESON. It is very material that we should know that. There is a distinction between protecting public property, private property, and government property. Will this be for the protection of government property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It protects the property of quite a considerable number of people.

Mr. JAMESON. Was there a petition in favour of this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think there must have been.

Mr. JAMESON. This item should stand until the minister can tell us whether this work is to protect the property of some private individual or whether it is to protect work along some highway.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no question but that it is to protect such a number of properties as to make it of an entirely public nature. It is in no sense to protect the property of a private individual in the sense my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. JAMESON. Well, it must either be for the protection of public property or of private property.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When you get a large number of people whose property is to be protected the protection becomes of a public nature.

Mr. JAMESON. I am moved to ask these questions because some time ago the department was asked to protect property which is partly owned by the government, in Digby. I refer to the property locally known as Battery Point. It was protected many years ago but the protection work

has fallen into decay and the bank has tumbled down by the erosion of the tides, and has fallen into the harbour. The town of Digby has gone to very great expense in protecting the beach and foreshore generally, but they do not feel they should protect this particular government property nor indeed are they financially able to do so. If the minister thinks a policy of protecting the property of individuals is justifiable, is it not more obviously necessary to protect the property of the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is the duty of the government reasonably to protect its own property.

Mr. JAMESON. Then will the minister make a note of this so that he may make provision for the protection of this property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will make a note of it with pleasure.

Cow bay—Port Morien—harbour improvements, $5,000.

Mr. MADDIN. How much was spent on that breakwater in the year 1908? $18,000 was voted, and $2,500 is re-voted now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would leave $15,500 as our expenditure to the 31st of this month.

Mr. MADDIN. There would be no expenditure during the months of December, January, February and March on a breakwater at Cow bay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know that that would be the case. I should think material could be got out during that time.

Mr. MADDIN. In the fiscal year ending March 31, 1907, the material that was used in those months was a little hardware, some white duck and some cement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Could they not manufacture concrete blocks in the winter?

Mr. MADDIN. No, they could not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have an impression that they could. They do.

Mr. MADDIN. They do manufacture concrete blocks two feet square for the purpose of erecting buildings; but they do not make concrete blocks for breakwaters of the dimensions mentioned in the report of the Minister of Public Works. These blocks are not made and then transported and dumped into the harbour. They are erected in the water at low tide, and that could not be done in the winter time. Were tenders asked for this work in 1907 or 1908?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. The opinion of the chief engineer was that this work latterly had better be done by day work.

Mr. JAMESON.

Mr. MADDIN. Would the minister consider that the man in charge of building a breakwater of this character should be a man having a special knowledge of the building of breakwaters, the mixing of concrete and that sort of thing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should say he should have a thorough knowledge of it.

Mr. MADDIN. Is the minister aware that P. J. Leslie, who did the work in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1907, who used 2,513 barrels of sand and 1,873 barrels of cement, and who superintended the work at $3 per day, is a lobster packer, who packs his catch at Port Morien in the summer time and lives at Halifax in the winter months?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of that.

Mr. MADDIN. Is the minister learning that for the first time now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the first time I have heard of it.

Mr. MADDIN. Who recommended Mr. Leslie to the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The inspector is always approved of by the engineer in charge.

Mr. MADDIN. Who was the engineer in charge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Millidge is, I think, the resident engineer there.

Mr. MADDIN. Who was in charge during the last fiscal year ending the 31st of March of this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think Mr. Leslie is still in charge, but I am not quite sure as to that.

Mr. MADDIN. Does the minister know as a matter of fact who was in charge during the expenditure of the sum of $15,500?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My memorandum shows that Mr. Leslie is still in charge; but if my hon. friend says that he was not, I will look it up.

Mr. MADDIN. Is the minister of Public Works aware that the man who succeeded Leslie and had charge of that work during the summer and up to October, 1908, was a butcher of the name of McLeod, who if building a flue or a foundation to his House, would hire a mason?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of that.

Mr. MADDIN. Will the minister tell me who recommended the person in charge of the work for the fiscal year 1908-09?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry to say I have no memorandum in reference to that.

Mr. MADDIN. In view of the fact that this breakwater is of considerable importance to Port Morien, that it was built by

the Gowrie, Blockhouse and Coal Mining Company previous to 1873, that it originally extended a distance of 1,374 feet, practically a quarter of a mile, to 17 feet at low water or to 23 feet at high water, and was about 44 feet in width; that the property was subsequently transferred to the Dominion Coal Company; that part of the breakwater was destroyed by the August gale of 1873; that the present structure is 1,114 feet long, that is, 160 feet shorter than it was when the Gowrie Blockhouse and Coal Mining Company constructed it; and in view of the development of mining areas there by their successors, the Dominion Coal Company, and the recently commenced developments of the North Atlantic Colliery Company, which would indicate that a great deal of shipping would be made from that port; in view also of the fact that $15,500 has been spent on this breakwater in 1907-08 and $11,500 in 1906-07, and that $5,000 is to be expended in the incoming year, making a total expenditure of $32,000 in three years; does it not appear to the minister that it would be wise to have this money spent by some one who understood the construction of breakwaters, under the circumstances that obtain at that particular point, where the gales have carried away from time to time considerable portions of this breakwater? The minister's own report says that in 1895 it was torn to pieces.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose it was not being as well constructed then as it is now.

Mr. MADDIN. It has been going to pieces again in 1908, and it will continue to go to pieces so long as butchers and lobster packers dump concrete cement in canvas bags on that coast in the month of October. I submit, in view of the necessity of this breakwater, that a survey should be made and estimates obtained for the purpose of building a permanent structure. The expenditure of such large sums should be made through contractors under tender and give to that harbour a permanent structure instead of expending money in such a manner as cannot give permanent satisfaction. In 1907-08, when $11,509 were spent, that expenditure covered a period of over 180 working days during which 12 men per day on an average were working. It is common knowledge to any one familiar with that coast that in the months of April and May, with high spring tides and strong winds from the north-east, and drifting ice hanging about that part of the coast, especially in 1907, when that harbour was ice-bound until the 7th June, it must be manifest that the suspension of canvas sacks down the side of the breakwater and filling with cement is not calculated to make a permanent structure, such as a breakwater. Is it the minister's intention to have the further sum of $5,000 spent by some butcher or lobster packer or by someone who has some knowledge of the work the government purposes to undertake?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman give me the assurance that the inspector is not a practical man in concrete work ?

Mr. MADDIN. I would say that Mr. Leslie is not a competent man to undertake the repairs of a breakwater of this kind. He has no experience either in stone work or concrete, and the man who succeded him is if anything more incompetent than Mr. Leslie, not having had the experience at the expense of the government which Mr. Leslie had.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad the matter has been brought to my notice. I shall have inquiry made to ascertain if the inspector is not a practical man having practical knowledge of concrete work. It is important he should be, because it is work which depends greatly on the quality of the cement used and the mode of mixing it. I shall have inquiries made at once, and if I find that the inspector is not a practical man, I shall see that one is put on the works. The instructions given to the resident engineer are always to find out whether the man suggested as inspector is a practical man.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What are his political affiliations?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That does not concern me.

Mr. AMES. Is the same letter issued to the resident engineers in Nova Scotia as is issued to those in Quebec, instructing them to apply to the local member for foremen of their various works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The same letter.

Mr. AMES. The department sends a letter from Ottawa to the local resident engineer telling him to appoint no foremen except on consultation with the local Liberal member.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think these are the terms of the letter, but if my hon. friend has it he can correct me. What is done is that the resident engineer is instructed to confer with the member as to the employment of the foreman, but his positive instructions are not to engage any man in special work of this nature unless he is a practical man and has practical knowledge.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Would the minister produce a copy of the letter sent by the department so that we may have it on record?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If there is a motion made in the regular way the letter will be brought down.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is it not the rule of the House that if a minister refers to a document he must produce it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The reference was made by the hon. member for St. Antoine. What I said was that any letters sent out to the other provinces were not different from the ones sent to Quebec.

Mr. MADDIN. Adverting again to Mr. Leslie at Cow Bay, in view of the fact that the lobster season begins in the latter part of March and continues to June.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the hon. gentleman opposed to the item passing?

Mr. MADDIN. Certainly not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then it might be as well for him not to obstruct it.

Mr. MADDIN. I am not opposed to the expenditure. If I have any fault to find it is that the break-water is inadequate. What I am opposed to is the system of expenditure. We could have a better break-water there if the money had been judiciously expended. In view of the fact that the lobster packing begins in the spring, is it proper that Mr. Leslie should draw $3 a day for inspecting the work on the breakwater when he is at the same time superintending the packing of lobsters when he employs a large number of people. In other words, does the Minister of Public Works think it advisable to encourage a man like Mr. Leslie to try to serve two masters?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that, if he is appointed inspector he should be there.

Mr. CROSBY. I do not think there is any desire on the part of anybody who knows this work to obstruct the expenditure. I know Mr. Leslie, the gentleman who has been referred to, to be a decent, respectable man. I know that he does not live in this place, but he lives in part of the Spry Bay and Port Halifax and Halifax City.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where does he live in the summer ?

Mr. CROSBY. For a few months in the summer, he is in Cow Bay packing lobsters as the minister has been informed. I should judge from the information that we get from the minister that he did not know much about Mr. Leslie, but he is bound to make inquiry and to remove any wrong. The expenditure on this breakwater is one that is required; I know the locality well, and I know that this is an important work. But the minister, I am sure, will not complain when we try to give him information that will assist in the best expenditure of this money, because we wish the money to be spent to the best advantage, as I am sure the minister does also. If, even at this late date, he finds that the man in charge of the work should not be in charge——

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does the hon. member (Mr. Crosby) think of Mr. Leslie?

Mr. CROSBY. I have said he is a decent, respectable man, and a good citizen. If he has a fault, it is that he is a strong Liberal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman think that Mr. Leslie is competent for this work ?

Mr. CROSBY. I think he knows no more about concrete work than does the hon. gentleman who is now addressing the committee—and that is not much.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will look into it at once.

Mr. CROSBY. The minister should see to it that proper men are put in charge of the work.

Mr. AMES. I think the point raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) is a very important one. A great deal of money is expended on operations done by day's work under the Public Works Department, and it is to be expected and desired that the persons in charge of these works should be compentent men, selected by the engineer without outside interference, and purely because they are able men for the work. In our province, there has been a system of applying to the local member, not for advice, but for the absolute choice of the man who shall be placed in charge of each of these works. Here is a letter, dated May 4, and addressed to Mr. J. C. Tache, resident engineer of the Department of Public Works at Chicoutimi, and the question I was putting to the minister a few moments ago is whether a similar letter is sent to the resident engineers throughout Nova Scotia, and whether a similar system is adopted in the choice of a foreman to overlook day's work in that province. This letter is written by the chief engineer at Ottawa to the resident engineer at Chicoutimi :

I am directed by the hon. the minister to authorize you to proceed, by day labour, with the works at the following places, for which appropriations have been granted by parliament during the session just ended. Will you please apply to the persons mentioned for the names of competent foremen, or for any other information which you may require in connection with the works in their respective counties.

And the name given here is that of Joseph Girard, M.P., for Chicoutimi and Saguenay. The letter proceeds :

You will please bear in mind that the above-mentioned sum must on no account be over-expended, and I would ask you to give positive instructions to the foremen to that effect. The foremen are to be paid at the rate of $2.50 per day, unless you are otherwise instructed.

There is absolutely nothing in that letter from the chief engineer, acting under

the minister, demanding that the resident engineer shall choose competent men and men who have knowledge of the work under their charge. The only thing he is told to do is to apply to the local member and put on the job whomsoever he recommends.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It says 'competent foremen.'

Mr. AMES. But the judging of their competency is left to the local member.

Mr. PUGSLEY. By no means.

Mr. AMES. Is it under this system that the lobster packer and butcher have been chosen to superintend the work at Cow Bay, where we are spending from $10,000 to $15,000 a year ?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I would point out that my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) is hardly fair or candid in dealing with this subject when he attempts to misconstrue the letter to which he has referred so as to lead the committee to believe that it did not rest with the engineer to determine the competency of the men who might be recommended by Mr. Girard. The ordinary rules of grammatical interpretation of any document must show us that the letter calls for competent men who may be recommended by Mr. Girard, and that as to their competency, the resident engineer himself is to determine. And the minister informs me that there were special instructions besides. The engineer was asked to secure, on Mr. Girard's nomination, competent men. That could not be determined by a member of parliament but was to be determined by the engineer responsible for the work. The naming of the man would be for the member, but the judging of his competency would be for the engineer. I do not think that the hon. member (Mr. Ames) is so innocent as not to know that this system of getting members of parliament to recommend men who might be employed in matters of this kind has been going on since confederation. It is no great discovery to make in this forty-second year of confederation that men are recommended for employment by members supporting the government. Is there anything new, or anything very wrong about it?

Mr. AMES. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' And what kind of men do we get?

Mr. MACDONALD. As good men, and in many cases better than those the country had when my hon. friend's friends were in power. Who are the best judges of these men unless it be the representative of the county? And who knows the men better than the man who represents the county?

Mr. CROSBY. That is Mr. Maddin.

Mr. MACDONALD. Apparently, he does not want it, and besides he is not in the confidence of the government.

Mr. CROSBY. The hon. gentleman said 'representative.'

Mr. MACDONALD. In this case I was discussing what my hon. friend from St. Antoine had said with regard to Chicoutimi and Mr. Girard, and was dealing with this case as one illustrating the general principle. The question of recommending to the government a man to have charge of an expenditure is not a question of competency only. A man might be competent but not honest; he might not want the government instructions to be carried out, and certainly the government would not want to be responsible for a man who is not recommended by one in whom they have confidence. Is this a new doctrine? Why do these hon. gentlemen prate about a thing that their friends did when they were in power, and would do again if they came into power to-morrow? We might as well be frank about this. No government would accept the recommendation of a man who did not have their confidence. Only yesterday, my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) started a discussion which took the whole afternoon about an expenditure in Nova Scotia. But if the Conservative candidate in that riding had been elected and sat here as a representative even if he had not recommended the man in charge, they would not have raised any question about that expenditure. If recommendations of the men who are to be inspectors were left in the hands of the opponents of the government, what a nice time hon. gentlemen opposite would have criticising the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. AMES. I should be sorry to believe that the ideals which the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) says are shared by all, are likely to be the ideals which are forever to obtain in this country.

Mr. MACDONALD. Is my hon. friend any better than his party, when he is claiming high ideals? Any better than Sir John Thompson, or Sir John A. Macdonald, who led his party before him, and who instituted that system?

Mr. AMES. I would think that the practice the Minister of Public Works should adopt would be for his chief engineer to secure, in the first place, a competent resident engineer, and then let him choose the most competent man to be found in the neighbourhood as inspector of the construction of the public work. Then I think we would get honest work done, work that was worth 100 cents on the dollar.

Mr. CROSBY. We are here discussing a question of expenditure, because we have

reason to believe that there has been waste in connection with it. I know this Mr. Leslie, he is a councillor in the municipality of Halifax. I do not know whether he understands the kind of concrete that should be used in this breakwater, but he may understand some other kind of concrete he gets from the government. He is not a man I would select to superintend the building of a concrete work. In the county of Cape Breton there must be somebody that knows just as much about concrete work as Mr. Leslie; therefore it is strange that he should be appointed to a position of that kind, when he is not a resident of the county, does not live near the county at all, but only visits there during the lobster season, which lasts only about six weeks in the summer. I would have no objection to the appointment of a Liberal if he was suitable for the work.

Mr. AMES. The minister has not answered my question as to whether a similar letter is issued to his officials in Nova Scotia?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not seen any letter issued in Nova Scotia, but I have no doubt similar instructions are given to the resident engineers.

Mr. AMES. The member for Pictou has intimated that there are other instructions which go with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are in touch with the resident engineers all the time, and they understand that it is their duty not to accept as inspector any man who in their judgment is not thoroughly competent to inspect the work.

Mr. AMES. I understood the minister to say that written instructions accompany the letter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They have their general instructions, they understand that in no case shall they accept an inspector who is not thoroughly competent.

Mr. AMES. Then will the minister lay on the table to-morrow any letter of this character which is issued to resident engineers in Nova Scotia, together with any other instructions which may accompany the same?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, to-morrow, or at an early date, if there are such.

Mr. HUGHES. Can the minister mention an instance where the resident engineer has declined to accept the nominee of the party?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at the moment, but I know it has happened.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. There are a number of constituencies in Nova Scotia that are not represented by members supporting the government. I would like to know upon whose recommendation, in those constituencies, the resident engineer appoints an inspector?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The instructions in that case were to confer with the gentleman who had run in the interest of the government. That is the course which has always been pursued.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. In view of this statement by the minister, it is a question whether we should proceed any further with the consideration of this vote. It seems to me a shocking statement for a responsible minister to make to this parliament, that the government should adopt so low an ideal, that they should place in the hands of a defeated candidate the appointing power, no matter how small may be the number of electors who voted for him, and no matter what his standing in the community may be.

Mr. MACDONALD. What would the hon. gentleman say if he was defeated by a bogus telegram?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I was saying when the hon. gentleman so rudely interrupted me——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is not in order to attribute rudeness to an hon. member.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The Chairman reminds me that it is not in order to describe the remark of the hon. member, but I would like to say that it is much more an offence for any hon. gentleman to be rude to a member who is addressing the House than it is for the member who is on his feet to express his view of the interruption. But, since the falsifying of a telegram is introduced into this discussion I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who has interrupted me why he does not first pay attention to his own household, why he does not first have an investigation into his own Department of Justice which is much closer to him than the location of the despatch to which he has alluded. I would like to call his attention to the——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do you not think, Mr Chairman, that instead of discussing William Miner we might take up this item?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. —falsification of the telegram addressed to the Department of Justice and ask if these hon. gentlemen have taken any precaution to investigate that. I say that until they do take that precaution it ill becomes them to refer to any other despatch of that nature. Apologizing for this digression, made in answer to the unseemly interruption of the hon. gentleman, I would like to return to the subject which brought me to my feet and say that I do not think we should subscribe to the extraordinary doctrine laid down by the Minister of Public Works that he should

accept the advice of persons outside of this parliament, who have been rejected by the electors of any constituency, who have been turned down and whose places have been taken by the men who sit in this House. We should not subscribe to the doctrine enunciated by the minister that he should take their advice in preference to ours. That is a doctrine which is offensive to the dignity of this House, one to which this House should not assent, and the fact that it has been laid down by the Minister of Public Works on this occasion is a sufficient ground for us to declare a halt in these proceedings and ask for the adjournment of this committee so that we may take into consideration whether or not the parliament of Canada subscribes to a standard so low.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. We all recall the words of the minister earlier in the session when he stated that the patronage list had been entirely abolished. Has the minister issued fresh instructions since then to the responsible engineers asking them to discontinue the old system of making appointments and to select only the best men.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been no change in the instructions which have gone to the engineers as to the appointment of foremen and the selection of their men.

Cow Bay Run and Osbornes—breakwaters, $1,200.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote to complete the work.

Cribbin's Point wharf—part renewal of superstructure, $3,300.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote to complete the repairs.

Digby harbour — improvements, including repairs and additions to pier, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract.

Mr. JAMESON. Who has the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Messrs. G. E. and A. Bigelow.

Mr. JAMESON. What are the terms of the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The date of the contract is the 22nd of May, 1908, and the date of completion is the 22nd of November, 1909.

Mr. JAMESON. What will be the rate of remuneration?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The foreman on the works according to my memorandum is to get $2.50 per day.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the amount of the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $17,900. This will construct the spur pier. It does not include the taking down of the old pier and rebuilding it with creosoted timber.

Mr. JAMESON. Does this include anything for the reconstruction of the old work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will require about $30,000 more to finish up the whole work.

Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia—harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a general vote.

Mr. CROSBY. Is there anything included in this for the construction of a wharf at Spry bay, Halifax county? Was it not commenced last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we spent $269 last year and if any small amount is required we can take it out of the general vote for this year.

Mr. CROSBY. The work that was done there was very small and in order to make it of any service it will be necessary to have some further work done there this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No doubt that will be considered by the engineers.

Mr. CROSBY. There is a wharf in Halifax county at Peswick near Musquodoboit. There was a wharf constructed at the head of the harbour. While it serves a good purpose there it would have been of greater service if it had been constructed nearer the mouth of the harbour on the west side. There should be a further expenditure of $1,000 to build a block for the use of the fishermen at the mouth of the harbour. I would like to bring that to the notice of the minister and I would be glad if he would ask his engineers to make some inquiry about it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have an inquiry made.

Mr. RHODES. Will the minister explain the reason for inserting the word 'bridges' in this item ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That has no application to Nova Scotia but it is a general term used in reference to the other provinces where there may be inter-provincial bridges.

Mr. STANFIELD. It might apply to the bridge the minister built at Tatamagouche Bay about a year ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was a wharf.

Mr. STANFIELD. The photograph shows it is a bridge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The province built the bridge.

Mr. STANFIELD. Well, it has dropped down about 18 inches and is in need of repair.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is worthy of attention.

Mr. JAMESON. I wish to refer to the Sandy Cove breakwater which was built by the government in 1904. The minister, in reply to questions put to him this session stated that the contractors for this breakwater were released and their deposit of $800 returned to them on the 3rd of December, 1904. Subsequent to that the department received notice that a number of labourers on that work were unpaid and that certain men who had furnished material which had gone into its construction also remained unpaid. This work was constructed at Sandy Cove on Digby Neck which there is about one mile in width. There are properly speaking two coves, one on the bay of Fundy side and one on St. Mary's bay side, and the village of Sandy Cove is located——

Mr. PUGSLEY. To which item is the hon. gentleman speaking ?

Mr. JAMESON. I am speaking on the item before the committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not wish to interfere with the hon. gentleman discussing a question of this kind but it certainly does not arise on the vote now before the House. Let me say that this claim which the hon. gentleman is referring to has already been pressed upon the attention of the government just as strong as the hon. gentleman can press it. It has been pressed on the government by his predecessor and by the hon. member for Antigonish and the matter is now under consideration. There is nothing which my hon. friend can say to-night which can affect the determination of the question.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jameson) is perfectly in order in speaking as he does on this item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a claim against the government which if granted would be a matter of grace on the part of the department and which would require a special appropriation.

Mr. JAMESON. I will ask the Chairman if I am in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I was not following very closely the remarks of the hon. gentleman but on an item such as this I think it would be quite competent to refer to a vote which the hon. gentleman would desire to have in the estimates. I would not be prepared to rule that out of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work is not paid out of this general vote. There was a special appropriation for it and the claim referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jameson) is in no way pertinent to this item.

Mr. JAMESON. I will continue what I was saying when the minister interrupted me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is your ruling, Mr. Chairman, in view of my statement?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If it is a matter which is under the consideration of the government in an official way it might be as well for the hon. gentleman not to press it. As there are special circumstances in connection with it a long discussion on this item would not appear to be in order.

Mr. JAMESON. The minister stated in reply to a question of mine that these claims had been received by the government on the 20th June, 1905, and as they have been so long under consideration I think it is my duty to refresh the memory of the minister with regard to them. As I was saying when interrupted, this wharf was unfortunately located on the Bay of Fundy shore and not at the village of Sandy Cove proper. The construction of the work involved an expenditure larger than the contractors had estimated, and it appears they were unable to meet the cost of construction out of the money they received from the government. I shall not now speak in regard to the large claim of Mr. J. D. Kirk for $2,085.50 but I shall specially deal with the claims of a number of poor men, residents of that locality, for labour performed and material supplied. They supplied the labour and the material in good faith expecting to get paid for it, but their pay was not forthcoming and the government released the contractors and returned to them their deposit of $800. The government has taken over the work, and while I believe that the expenditure was not justified because of the location, as it should have been constructed on the St. Mary's Bay side of Digby Neck and at the village of Sandy Cove, where it would have been of considerable usefulness and would have assisted in the building up of that village, yet at the same time I do believe that the men who performed this labour and supplied the material should be paid. The government has taken over the work and has the advantage of the time and labour and material supplied by the men who have made the claims. If the work was justified, as it must have been in the opinion of the department before the expenditure was made, then these men have a very strong claim on the government for the amount still due them. I am not asking that anything be done for the contractors; I am not asking that anything be done for any one except the poor men who performed the labour and supplied the timber. I do think that their claim should be considered by the government and that payment to them should not be any longer deferred.

Mr. RHODES. In justice to the residents of a certain district of my county, I desire

to bring to the minister's attention the fact that a portion of an item of $5,000 which was in the estimates last year was, I believe, expended on the construction of a wharf at Joggin's Mines. I have been advised that, owing to the work having been stopped last season and fenders not having been placed on the sides of the wharf, the work thus far done is likely to go for naught. I feel it my duty to bring the matter to the attention of the minister in the interest of public property.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have it looked into.

Little Narrows wharf, $1,200.

Mr. RHODES. Is this a repair to an existing wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is for the construction of a small wharf.

Mr. RHODES. Is it to be built of creosoted timber?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have no detailed plan yet.

Mr. RHODES. I understand that the water there is largely populated by the teredo, the worm that destroys timber.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we find on the report of the engineer that it is necessary, we will have it creosoted.

Middle river—shear dams, $700.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a revote.

Mr. AMES. I know that it is a revote, but it never should have been voted in the first place. As I understand it, when voting for the harbours and rivers of Nova Scotia, the term rivers means navigable rivers, for the purpose of assisting shipping. There is a small stream in Cape Breton, a trout stream which I have fished in on more than one occasion, which contains so little water in summer time that one can wade across it without getting wet above his ankles; but sometimes, when the water is high, the farm land is washed into this brook, and the department has been persuaded somehow or other that it is a part of the duty of the federal authorities to build shear dams along the banks of this small river eleven miles inland. I can imagine no excuse that can be urged that can bring that expenditure properly under the vote we are being asked for. While I do not wish to divide the House to-night, I wish to go on record as protesting against that expenditure as being wholly and completely outside of our domain. If that principle were carried out generally, and every little river in any province where there was danger of farm land being washed away by the spring freshets, was to have cribwork built along its banks by the Dominion government, and the farmers whose land was protected were paid $2.50 a day for building it, the department would see no end to the demands that would be made upon it. In these days of economy, when we want to spend our money as carefully as possible, it seems to me that the minister should avoid expenditures of this character, which have no other than a political end.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a class of work which has been done more or less by all governments since confederation.

Mr. HUGHES. Can the minister cite any instance?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, yes. In the province of New Brunswick, on the upper waters of the St. John river, ever since confederation, a few hundred dollars have been expended each year for the purpose of blasting out rocks.

Mr. HUGHES. That is because it is an international river.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at that point. Then, in the province of British Columbia work has been done, at the joint expense of the federal and provincial governments, on the Fraser and other rivers for the protection of the banks.

Mr. HUGHES. The Fraser is a navigable river.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work has not been for the benefit of navigation, but for the protection of the property of the people living along the banks. In the same way twenty years ago work was done on the South Nation river, not to improve navigation, but for the purpose of enabling the water to flow more rapidly, and so preventing the lands being flooded. In the province of Nova Scotia and also in Quebec and Ontario, protection works of the same kind have been carried on. It has been done to a certain extent by both governments. Last session parliament made an appropriation to cut a channel across a portion of land near Portage la Prairie, the effect of which, it is asserted, will be to prevent the flooding of some 40,000 acres. Therefore, it is a question of degree. I admit very frankly that if this work were new, I would not at this moment and in the state of the revenues ask parliament for an appropriation; but the small amount now being asked is to complete the work which has already been begun.

Mr. AMES. There is only this to be said, that the rivers the minister has cited are all rivers in point of fact; and while what he describes may not be defensible, the crime is not so great as it is in this particular case. There is no reason why the land of the particular men on this little stream, several miles inland, should be protected any more than that of others,

but they had some strong pull. There are. I venture to say, in Nova Scotia, 500 streams as to which a similar excuse could be urged, and if we once commence spending moneys for this purpose, there will be no end to the demands and no possibility of refusing any.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. As the minister has enunciated the policy of the government on this matter, I would like to call his attention to the fact that there is a very large stream running through the country I represent, the Nottawasaga river, which is navigable for about thirty miles, and has been used for many years as a means of transportation to the north. This river overflows every spring and renders useless some 30,000 acres of most valuable land in that section. In the province of Ontario we have not been accustomed to receive many of those favours. People have to go down into their own pockets to pay for these works, and in this case those interested have not seen fit to carry on the work for many years, but last session the Ontario government gave something towards cutting that river wider and deepening it so as to protect this land.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is undoubtedly proper provincial work.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. In the province of Ontario these works are provincial works, but not in the other provinces. I would ask the minister to bear this in mind as possibly his department may be asked to assist in that work along that river. If so, I trust he will give it the same consideration that he does these small trout streams in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton.

Minasville wharf at Dalrymple Point, $9,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the construction of a breakwater, 300 feet long, 16 feet wide at the top, 4 feet deep at the shore and 19 feet at the outer end. Quite a number of vessels come there for lumber as well as fishing boats.

Mr. JAMESON. Was this under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, six tenders were received and the contract was let to Bigelow and Co., for $7,985. This will complete the work.

Port Hastings wharf, $11,600.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders were called for and a contract entered into with W. J. Landrey, of Antigonish. This will complete the work.

Portuguese Cove breakwater—to complete payments to contractors Reid & Archibald on final estimates inclusive of interest accrued at 5 per cent per annum on overdue balance of $1,120—revote of lapsed amount, $1,100.

Mr. AMES.

Mr. CROSBY. This is a very important work, and I would bring to the notice of the minister the necessity of having a construction at the end of the breakwater, a kind of tee. This is necessary to make it complete.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will consider this suggestion.

Mr. RHODES. Why is 5 per cent interest to be paid to the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a delayed payment.

Mr. RHODES. What amount is the interest?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $40.

South Lake Lakevale—opening channel from Lake St. George's bay, inclusive of protection work, $6,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I move to reduce that item by $4,500. The amount will be provided for in the supplementary estimates of the current year.

Mr. AMES. That is, $4,500 will be asked for that will be spent in the year 1908-9?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. AMES. What is it required for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the work of opening the channel.

Mr. AMES. Has the $4,500 already been spent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be spent before the end of the current year.

Mr. AMES. Is it all, or practically all, owing in wages at the present time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, practically.

Mr. AMES. Has it been owing since last September, October and November?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give the particulars. There was a mistake—I do not know whether the fault of the resident engineer or the printer—and there was delay in making provision for it, and we understood that by leaving the whole amount in the estimates of the coming year, it would delay payment, and so we intend to ask for $4,500 in the supplementaries of the current year.

Mr. AMES. Last year the amount asked was $5,625. But the Minister of Finance said:

That estimate was made some time ago. Progress has been made so that so large an amount is not required. I propose to reduce the item to $700 and move that the amount be reduced accordingly.

So, we were given to understand that $700 would be all that would be required, but in addition, $4,500 has been spent. Who made the mistake?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was reduced through an error. There is a good deal of correspondence, and the matter has taken a good deal of trouble to straighten out. It was a mistake to have the vote reduced last year.

Mr. AMES. It was a mistake. In this way, if I am rightly informed: the work was commenced and was continued until the appropriation was exhausted. Legally, no more money could be expended at that point. But the elections were close at hand, and Antigonish was a close county, and the member for the county felt that it would not be well to have the work stop suddenly in September or October. So the work was continued; the men were hired but not paid, and they continued to work until some time after the election. The form of irregularity may have been avoided by not paying out money, still, the amount of $4,500 wages is due to these men for the last four or five months. That is my information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite right.

Mr. AMES. Is that the principle followed in the department—that if a fund is exhausted, the department feels justified in keeping men at work trusting to a subsequent parliament to see that they are paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The moment an appropriation is exhausted, or even when it is about exhausted, instructions go from the chief engineer to the resident engineer to stop the work.

Mr. AMES. Why not in this case?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amount required for this work was placed in the printed estimates which were passed by the committee, and went to the chief engineer and he gave his instructions to the resident engineer, not being aware that on concurrence the amount was reduced. But that reduction was made in error. Ordinarily, when an appropriation is about exhausted, the chief engineer sends out word to the resident engineer and the work is stopped. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) will remember that in the very letter he quoted the instructions to the resident engineer were that the amounts voted must not be over expended.

Mr. AMES. But the hon. gentleman does not touch the real point. It is hardly credible that the season would have nearly slipped by before the engineer found that only $700 had been voted. That must have been discovered with the first pay -roll that came up exceeding the $700. Yet other pay-rolls came up week after week and month after month, and these were not repudiated. A search of the files of correspondence with the local men would show why the work was not stopped. We are justified in protesting against this as an absolute irregularity. When the appropriation was exhausted, the department instead of discharging the men and taking the risk of losing the county—

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member is entirely in error.

Mr. AMES. This opens up a method of doing business under stress of political pressure which shakes considerably the confidence of the people in the department. We have supposed, here in parliament, that when an appropriation for one of these works is exhausted, the work shall cease. It is a principle that has been fought for for hundreds of years that money that is not voted cannot be spent. When the appropriation was exhausted, the government should not have continued the work, even at the strenuous request of the hon. member for Antigonish to employ the men on that wharf. Is this the only case the minister knows of arising in the months of October or November?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry to see the hon. gentleman so suspicious; one so good should be disposed to be charitable. The hon. gentleman jumps at the conclusion that what was done was done at the instance of the local men.

Mr. AMES. Will the hon. minister say that there are no letters on file to that effect?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was brought to my notice, and, so far as I know, no communication of any kind took place with the local men. The correspondence arose between the chief engineer of the department and the resident engineer. As I have stated. the amount was voted, and, on the strength of that the timber was procured and the work commenced. But owing to a misunderstanding, the amount was reduced on concurrence. Now at that time the work had been commenced, the timber had been bought. The deputy minister brought the matter to my notice, and I made inquiry and found a report from the resident engineer stating that unless the work was carried to completion, what was done would be absolutely destroyed and the money wasted. Under these circumstances I authorized the engineer to allow the resident engineer to go on. I thought the proper thing to do was to finish up the work.

Mr. AMES. When the minister gave that authority, did he expect that the men would be paid as they did their work ? Were the men given to understand as they worked through September, October and November, that the appropriation was exhausted, and that they would not get their money until

parliament had met and voted another appropriation? Was it just to the men to keep them at work on the expectation that money was coming from Ottawa when no money had been voted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The engineer was told to inform the men they would have to wait for their pay.

Mr. AMES. Did the engineer inform the men while they were still at work during those three months, that they would have to wait till parliament voted more money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was instructed to do so, and I presume he did.

Mr. AMES. Would the minister lay on the table all the papers he has in connection with this transaction, within the next few days?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will do so.

Mr. HUGHES. Was the minister within his right in ordering this work to go on when only $700 had been voted? Was the minister within his right in ordering the expenditure of $7,000 more?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have explained that this work was done in order to prevent the loss of materials and the destruction of work already done. Something similar to that is done always when a contract is let. Parliament may vote $5,000 or $10,000 for carrying on a work, which may ultimately cost three times that. But the contract is entered into subject always to parliament appropriating the necessary amounts. The contractor goes on, but of course he has to trust to parliament making the necessary appropriation later.

Mr. HUGHES. Have these men been paid from any other fund, or any other source, or is the money due to these men personally?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know whether the men have been paid yet or not. I could find out. I will undertake to get that information.

Mr. PRICE. I would like to ask the minister a question. Supposing there had not been an election last year, would these men have been paid? Would they have been kept on the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Everything would have been done exactly as it has been done.

Mr. PRICE. This looks like an election job.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the election had nothing to do with it.

Mr. AMES. I understand the minister will give us all the papers in connection with this matter, with all the letters from the local members with reference to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be glad to do so.

Tangier harbour—wharf extension, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is in Halifax county, and is to extend the wall which was built in 1907-8. This will complete the work, which is being done by day's labour. We have only obtained the material.

Mr. CROSBY. When did you obtain the material?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The expenditure up to the 1st of January was only $328, evidently for material.

Wallace bridge—wharf, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the construction of a wharf at Wallace bridge. The wharf runs at right angles with the bridge, towards the harbour.

Mr. RHODES. With respect to the wharf at Wallace bridge, I put a question on the Order Paper the other day, and the minister stated in answer that the total cost was $1,324, and that a portion of it was completed. Is there another portion of this wharf to be completed, and is this vote to complete that other portion?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost was estimated at $2,500. We had an appropriation last year of $1,500, that leaves a balance of $1,000.

Mr. RHODES. In the reply the minister gave to me he said that a portion was completed, and that small vessels could use it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are not asking now any vote for an extension. This finishes the work.

Mr. RHODES. Then this vote does not agree with the answers the minister gave me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Evidently there was an application for a further extension which we have not decided to make.

Mr. RHODES. Has any portion of this $1,000 been expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No portion of this has been expended. This will complete the required work.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the minister quite certain that none of that money has been expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, none.

Yarmouth harbour—improvements, $60,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to continue the dredging work there.

Mr. JAMESON. Is it under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, to the Dominion Dredging Company.

Mr. JAMESON. What rate per yard?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Fifty cents per cubic yard.

Mr. JAMESON. To what depth?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To a depth suitable for those large steamers plying between Boston and Yarmouth.

Mr. JAMESON. Is it to straighten the harbour ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. JAMESON. Will this complete the proposed improvements ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, you can dredge a long time before you finish. As you keep dredging, the boats are getting larger.

Mr. J. D. REID. Have this Dominion Dredging Company their own dredges ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, they have quite a large fleet of dredges in different parts of Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is at the head of this company ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is Mr. Stewart.

Mr. J. D. REID. Of Ottawa?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. The son of the ex-member ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. May I ask the minister if this 50 cents per cubic yard means scow measurement ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, scow measurement.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is it the policy of the government to favour dredging by scow measurement all over the country ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know about it being the policy of the department, but that is the way it is being done.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to know why a different policy is being pursued by the Department of Railways and Canals and the Department of Public Works? When the Department of Railways and Canals let their dredging contracts it is always in situ and when the Department of Public Works let their contracts it is always scow measurement. When we get evidence before the Public Accounts Committee from officials of the Department of Railways and Canals they say that the only way that the government are safe in letting these contracts is to provide for measurement in situ. When we get the engineers of the Department of Public Works before that committee they say that scow measurement is the only safe way as far as keeping tally upon the work is concerned. I would like to know why there should be this difference in policy between these two departments?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the case of canal work there is no difficulty at all in taking measurements in situ by cross sections and soundings. By reason of the work being confined to narrow dimensions measurement in situ can very easily be made. In the case of harbour works it is more difficult to make measurements with- sufficient accuracy to make sure that you can determine the quantity to be dredged by measurements in situ. Of course, if you can rely upon the honesty and carefulness of your inspectors I would think that scow measurement would be more accurate. Everything depends on the integrity and carefulness of the inspectors. Canal dredging would be something like dredging for crib sites. In the case of dredging for crib sites at Quebec hon. gentlemen will remember that the tender was for measurement in situ, but in ordinary harbour work where it is not confined to narrow dimensions, I should think that scow measurement would be the more accurate provided the inspectors could be relied upon.

Mr. J. D. REID. As far as the Department of Railways and Canals are concerned I do not think the minister will pretend that their work is entirely canal work. I know of a case in my own county where there was no canal work about it at all; it was simply dredging, widening and deepening the river between Prescott and the next village. It was similar to harbour work and in that case it was measured in situ. As far as the inspectors are concerned, I think it was proved in the Public Accounts that, as a general rule, the inspectors who are appointed are not men of experience. We had a case last year before the Public Accounts Committee in which a shoemaker was appointed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think that was so. The late member for Simcoe had a strong idea of that kind but it was not shared in by many.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think the minister will agree that the inspector we had before the public accounts Committee last year was a man not qualified for the position. In that case there was an inspector appointed for two dredges working a mile apart.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The best qualification for an inspector is to be thoroughly honest.

Mr. LENNOX. There were two inspectors appointed, but one did the work and had a rake off from the other.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that only lasted a very short time. The man was dismissed.

Mr. LENNOX. No, the work was finished.

Mr. FISHER. The work was not finished, but he was refused employment next year.

Mr. LENNOX. I dare say.

Mr. J. D. REID. From what I have seen of scow measurement I do not think there is any doubt but that in every case the government are defrauded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hardly think that. We are extremely careful.

Mr. J. D. REID. No matter how honest the ministers and his officers may be it cannot be avoided. I have seen work going on in my county and I have no confidence whatever in scow measurement. If an in situ contract is let I believe the work will be carried out in an honest way but I have no confidence in so far as scow measurement is concerned. I believe the Department of Public Works are paying an enormous amount for work more than is being paid by any other department that lets contracts by the in situ method.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Take the western entrance to Toronto harbour; the measurement there is in situ. To do dredging work all over the country where it is not confined within narrow limits, it would require a very large and extensive staff of engineers. It would all have to be sounded with the very greatest care. Then, as to the different materials there would have to be a very careful examination beforehand. I am not thoroughly wedded to the scow measurement; it is a question for consideration.

Mr. J. D. REID. The best evidence I have had of this is what the contractors themselves tell me. Contractors who have been doing work for the government for years have told me that if they could get a contract from the Department of Public Works on the principle of scow measurement they could take it at almost any price and make money out of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who in the world ever told you that?

Mr. J. D. REID. A contractor working for the Public Works Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would you mind giving me his name?

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think it would be fair to the contractor, but if I gave his name he would never get a contract in the Public Works Department again.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps he is a gentleman who never did get a contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. He is working to-day for the Public Works Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And if he does that it shows the man is a scoundrel.

Mr. J. D. REID. It does not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does. It shows he conspires with the inspectors to defraud the government and I should be sorry either to take that man's word or to give him a contract under the government.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not agree with the minister, for the reason that the department lets the contract, scow measurement. If it is in situ there is not any possible chance of his getting any more than he would be entitled to, but with the scow measurement the inspector simply passes it along. We had evidence in the committee that there are from 20 yards to 40 yards difference in each scow; that a scow would hold 100 yards when there might be only 80 yards in it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the quantities must be certified to by the contractor's own man as well as by the inspector for the government. There is no way of defrauding the government unless the contractor is guilty of conspiracy jointly with the inspector.

Mr. J. D. REID. The contractor has nothing to do with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes he has.

Mr. J. D. REID. The government inspector is responsible for the certificate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman think the inspector would be dishonest unless the contractor offers him some inducement to be so?

Mr. J. D. REID. It was proved before the Public Accounts Committee last year that some of these inspectors were dishonest.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Without being induced by the contractor to be dishonest?

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then what possible object could the inspector have in being dishonest ?

Mr. J. D. REID. It was proved that one inspector was not attending to two different works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That man was dismissed.

Mr. J. D. REID. It was proved the contractors were getting more than they were entitled to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman say that an inspector would be dishonest without connivance with the contractor?

Mr. J. D. REID. The contractor would not have anything to do with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do you think a man would be deliberately dishonest without any one wanting him to be dishonest?

Mr. JAMESON. Who is the inspector and what is the amount of the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $5 per cubic yard for rock, and 50 cents and 35 cents for other material.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the name of the inspector?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The inspectors are Messrs. Johnston, Crosby and Kimball.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. Supply: Public Works, and as we will likely go through them very quickly we will take up Interior and Marine afterwards, and probably Mines later on in the day.

Mr. AMES. Will you take the Public Works for Prince Edward Island and Quebec as the first order ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think they will be the first.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 1.45 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 12, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ADDRESSES, ETC., RE INSURANCE BILL 1908.

Mr. MILLER moved:

That the clerk be requested to lay on the table of the House a printed copy of the addresses, representations and suggestions made during the session of 1907-8 to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, on behalf of various insurance companies, in connection with Bill (No. 42) of last session, respecting insurance.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to state that the said report has now been laid on the table.

Mr. MILLER moved that the said addresses, representations and suggestions be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

ADULTERATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe)moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 107) to amend the Adulteration Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The Bill first does away with the necessity of a deposit of money by the complainant in the case of goods being sold that are adulterated. The Adulteration Act provides that if anyone enters a complaint he must deposit with the officer sufficient money to cover the cost of purchasing a sample, and secondly, sufficient money to cover the cost of an analysis. I consider this a hardship on the public when parliament provides large sums of money for these officers and when, acording to the Auditor General's report, large sums are spent annually in purchasing samples for analysis.

The second clause is intended to simplify the prosecution. We have no prosecutions to speak of under this Act because the Act provides that the informant must deposit $25 with the officer as a guarantee of the costs of the prosecution; or, in other words, if anyone wishes to enforce this public Act he must first deposit $25 with the official. The Adulteration Act also provides that the complainant or informant shall receive a portion of the fine. The second clause of this Bill does away with this provision altogether and simply states that the officer shall prosecute in the same manner as under any other Act so that anyone may lay an information without making a deposit. Thus the law would be carried out and the offender fined but the informant would not receive a portion of the fine. Under this system there would be no inducement for anyone to become an informer beyond the desire to carry out the provisions of the Act. When this matter was under discussion in the House it was shown that whilst a great number of analyses had been made by the department, hardly any prosecutions had been made and if a firm or person were guilty of adulterating goods the only punishment suffered was the fact of their having sold adulterated goods was published in the pamphlets issued from time to time by the government. I think the time has come when the same course should be pursued in the enforcement of this Act as of any other Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DAYLIGHT SAVING ACT.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 108) intituled the Daylight Saving Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. LEWIS. I can best explain the provisions of this Act by, for two or three minutes, explaining the position of time in Great Britain and in Canada. On June 15, 1881, Mr. Sandford Fleming civil engineer, now Sir Sandford Fleming, made a report, which was really an essay, as to the time system then in use in Canada. We were then using the system which had been in vogue from time immemorial. On the 17th of June, 1882, Sir Sandford Fleming as chairman of the committee appointed for the purpose of looking into the question recommended a standard system of time for different parts of the country instead of the existing time system which changed with each degree of latitude, and in 1883 our present system was adopted in Canada. We have now in Canada four systems of time, namely, the eastern system, the central system, the mountain system, the Pacific system, not including the Atlantic system or the Yukon system, with regard to which there is special legislation in the Yukon territory. In the United Kingdom they have always been using mean time, namely Greenwich time or Dublin time. Some two or three years ago a gentleman named William Willets, who had been accustomed to early rising, began to realize that most of the people of England were lying in bed during the best hours of the day, that the best part of the sun-lit day was lost to the people and that the hours of recreation for workingmen were in twilight and dark when they might just as well be in the hours of daylight. Mr. Willets found that this condition of things affected adversely, more particularly the working men, the artizans, the agriculturalists, and the youth of the land. He agitated his scheme with the result that in March, 1908, the British parliament appointed a commission of nine members to investigate the subject and evidence was taken , the report of which may be found in the library. There was a majority report brought in by eight members of that commission and a minority report by one. The majority report contained this recommendation:

The Select Committee to whom the Daylight Saving Bill was referred, have agreed to the following special report:—

1. That the committee have met and considered the said Bill, and have examined numerous witnesses, records and papers and have directed the said Bill to be reported to the House with amendments.

2. And the committee find that the Bill proposes the adoption of a local time in advance of Greenwich mean time in the case of Great Britain, and in advance of Dublin mean time in the case of Ireland, during the summer months, viz.: from April to September in each year, with the object of promoting the earlier and more extended use and enjoyment of daylight during those months. And that such object is desirable and would benefit the community if it can be generally attained, and that the weight of the evidence submitted to the committee agrees with and supports this view, though there was divergence of opinion as to the best mode of accomplishing it.

The effect of the proposals of the Bill would be:—

(1) To move the usual hours of work and leisure nearer to sunrise.

(2) To promote the greater use of daylight for recreative purposes of all kinds.

(3) To benefit the physique, general health and welfare of all classes of the community.

(4) To reduce the industrial, commercial and domestic expenditure on artificial light.

A Bill founded on this report was introduced in the Imperial House of Commons and passed through its second reading last session. This year a similar Bill was introduced, read a second time, and submitted to a special committee for a report. The Bill which I propose submitting to the House is drafted on the same lines as the English Bill so far as the conditions in Canada will admit and is as follows:

An Act respecting the system of time now in use in Canada.

This Act shall be known as the Daylight Saving Bill.

Whereas, the adoption of a local time in Canada in advance of the standard time now in use there during the summer months for the object of promoting the earlier and more extended use and enjoyment of daylight during said period is desirable.

Therefore, His Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. From two o'clock in the morning of the last day of April in each year in Canada until two o'clock in the morning of the last day in October in each year in Canada the local time shall be one hour in advance of the standard time as now in use in Canada.

2. The time hereby established shall be known as local time in Canada, and whenever any period of time is mentioned in any Act of parliament, deed, or other legal instrument, the time mentioned or referred to shall, unless it is otherwise specifically stated, be held in the case of Canada to be local time as prescribed by this Act.

3. Greenwich mean time as used for the purposes of astronomy and navigation shall not be affected by this Act.

4. This Act shall apply to the Dominion of Canada, save and except the Yukon Territory, and may be cited as the Daylight Saving Act, and shall not come into force until one year from the date of passing of same.

I might state to the House that a number of localities in Canada have attempted to adopt some such system as is here outlined, but their efforts have not been successful as they could not legally alter the standard

time. The city of Nelson in British Columbia has been much agitated over the question for the last two or three months, and in Fort William and Port Arthur an unsuccessful attempt was made to deal with it. I would point out that after the first change is made there would be really no inconvenience to the people of Canada, and I feel they would soon become used to and highly pleased with the system which I propose. In Canada on April 30 the sun rises at 11 minutes past 5 o'clock and sets at 18 minutes past 7 o'clock; on October 31 the sun rises at 52 minutes past six o'clock and sets at 11 minutes past five o'clock. These are the dates set in the proposed Bill. I trust that Canada will not be backward in this movement, and I would ask the government to appoint a committee to investigate and to confer with the authorities in England, the United States, Australia and New Zealand, the latter countries having started legislation on these lines. I believe that if my idea is carried into legislation it will be conducive to the health and wealth of the labouring men, of the workingmen, and of the farmers of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CLASSIFICATION — HOUSE OF COMMONS STAFF.

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to state to the House that in the classification list of the staff of the House of Commons, laid by me on the table of the House yesterday, there was, through misapprehension, an error in the classification of one second-class clerk who was placed in the second division subdivision A, who should, under the Act, have been placed in the second division, subdivision B, and the classification is to be amended accordingly. And also that all classification references in the organization statement be amended to correspond throughout with the said classification list.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask again as to the reasons for delay in bringing down certain returns. We have been generous in passing estimates, but if these returns are not brought down, so far as I am concerned I shall not continue that generosity.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As to the returns from my department my deputy has informed me that there were quite a number of other motions ahead of those of my hon. friend, but I have instructed him to push these ahead at once and let the others stand.

Mr. DANIEL. What about the motion for papers which I referred to the other day?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will be brought down.

Mr. DANIEL. When?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very soon; in the course of a few days.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member for North Toronto asked for a return in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific terminal town sites. I am informed that that return was laid on the table about the 12th of February.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. member for North Toronto asked for a return in reference to the persons appointed to office in connection with the Transcontinental Railway Commission, with their addresses. If it were not for the addresses, we could get the return very quickly; but it is likely to take weeks to ferret out the addresses of these men, and in many instances we have not their addresses at all.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS TREATY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As inquiry has been made in the House several times in regard to the Waterways Treaty, I have to inform the House that a despatch has been received, and the treaty will be laid on the table on Monday.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will there be any announcement at an early date as to the acceptance by this government of the changes made in the treaty? I do not ask for any answer at this moment, but only whether or not there will be an announcement at an early date.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say that we were prepared to accept the treaty as it was. The changes made in it have reference to St. Mary's river, and we require some local information, which we are now trying to obtain before we make up our minds whether or not we can accept it.

SUPPLY—THE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

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

Mr. OWEN. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if he is prepared to answer the question which I asked yesterday with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. The reason I asked the question is that I have been told on good authority that that railway is costing this country in the neighbourhood of $100,000 a mile, including terminals and stations.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). The estimate per mile which I gave my hon. friend yesterday still stands. This estimate includes the roadbed, ties,

rails and fastenings, trackage of sidings and yards (326 miles), section-houses, stations, engine-houses, and cost of surveys, right of way and bridges, and also includes 10 per cent for engineering and contingencies. It does not include the terminals at Quebec and Winnipeg and large shops at Winnipeg, but includes $90,000 for ordinary divisional point at Moncton.

PUBLIC WORKS AT KINGSTON.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). Mr. Speaker, before you submit the motion for the House to go into Committee of Supply, I desire to make a few observations in regard to moneys expended and moneys proposed to be expended on certain buildings in the neighbourhood of Kingston. When we were considering the estimates some time ago, I asked several questions of the hon. Minister of Public Works, desiring to obtain full information as to the amount of money proposed to be expended. The minister told me that if I would submit a memorandum of what I wanted, he would bring down the information at a convenient time, and place it in 'Hansard.' For the past two and a-half or three weeks I have been endeavouring to get that information. It is scattered over the pages of 'Hansard' at different places, and I must say that I am not satisfied with the answers I have received nor with the manner in which they have been given. Following the promises of the minister made to me on Febuary 23, I asked certain questions, which were answered on March 1, at page 1792 of 'Unrevised Hansard.' Let us look at these questions and the answers. I asked for the estimated total cost of the 16 cottages constructed for the accommodation of the civil subordinate staff at Kingston Royal Military College, including fittings and furnishings. The answer which I received to that question was that the original estimated cost was $96,000. Now, I did not ask for the original estimated cost. I asked for the estimated total cost at the time I asked the question. On the 10th of March the hon. minister answered a somewhat similar set of questions, which I felt called upon to ask, as I had not received the information which I desired in the first place. The first question related to the present estimated cost—that is the way I put it. The answer was: $96,000, the same figure as was given in answer to the question I put on March 1. It would not have been necessary to submit this question on the 10th of March had I received the information which I asked for on the 23rd of February, and which I was entitled to receive. A second question which I asked on the 1st of March was:

> What portion of the work, in addition to the original contract, has been let by tender, to whom, and at what price?

Mr. GRAHAM.

I submit that that is a very plain question, and one that is entitled to a plain and distinct answer. The answer which I received to that question was this:

Alterations to main drain and lowering basement and inside drain, M. Sullivan..	$1,777 00
Change to pressed brick... ..	1,700 00
Electric wiring and fixtures, Halliday Electric Company.	3,550 00
Outside connections, Halliday Electric Company..	145 00
Heating, Mr. Sullivan..	2,750 00

Now, I want to call the minister's attention to page 1562 of 'Unrevised Hansard', when we were discussing the estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may call the hon. gentleman's attention to the rule on that subject:

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

If this matter has been referred to in committee, it is irregular to discuss it at this time.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am not aware that this matter has been referred to in committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood that the hon. member was quoting from 'Hansard' a debate in committee.

Mr. EDWARDS. I was going to quote from 'Hansard' an observation made by the Minister of Public Works which is very pertinent to the point I am discussing.

Mr. SPEAKER. Until the committee has reported it would be irregular to discuss it.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have no desire to transgress the rules of the House in any particular.

Mr. SPEAKER. This may be discussed in a committee but not at this stage.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. the Minister of Public Works has said that tenders were received for the electric wiring and fixtures.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman had better wait until the House is in committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose that is an answer to a question and which is on the record?

Mr. SPEAKER. He cannot refer to anything done in committee.

Mr. FOSTER. That was not done in committee. It was an answer given before the House went into committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The discussion might be justified on another ground, that this relates to an expenditure of the previous year.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand there is an item in the estimates now on that point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The fact that there is an item for a continuance of the expenditure would not be justification for preventing the discussion of the expenditure during a previous year and which is not before the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am quite prepared to hear argument on that point.

Mr. EDWARDS. I want to show that I have endeavoured to obtain information from the Minister of Public Works to which I was entitled but have not been able to get.

Mr. SPEAKER. So long as the hon. gentleman does not refer to what has taken place in committee, he may proceed.

Mr. EDWARDS. In answer to a question which I put, we were told that tenders were called for in the case of the items I specified, namely, the lowering of the basement, the electric lighting and fittings, and so on. I am under the impression that tenders were not called for any of these except the electric wiring and fixtures. My reason is this. In answer to a question which I put to the minister, on the 10th of March, he said that tenders were received from three parties for the electric wiring and fixtures; but as regards the other work, the only person who seems to have been considered was Mr. Sullivan, the original contractor. Another question which I submitted, and to which I did not get a proper answer, was with regard to the work which was let without tender. I was informed that only $1,230 of the work had been let without tender. A little later, on the 10th of March, in answer to a question of precisely the same import, I was informed by the minister that the amount of work let without tender was $3,034. I submit that this was not fair treatment. I submit that when I asked a question in relation to this large expenditure at Kingston, I was entitled to the fullest details, and the Minister of Public Works promised he would give me the fullest details if I submitted a memo of what I wanted. I took him at his word but regret to say he has not kept his word. It was strongly impressed on my mind that in answering questions on the estimates, the hon. gentleman is more actuated by expediency than by regard for the facts or the rights of this House. I had certain reasons for alluding to this matter. These buildings are in my own constituency where the people of my riding can see them every day, and it is only natural that they should ask questions and that I should try to get the fullest information. I find that the amount appropriated for these cottages is $112,000, and that the estimate of the government's architect—a man referred to by the minister as an employee of thirty years' experience and undoubted ability—for the total work is $96,000. I think therefore I may very properly ask why the minister should have asked for an appropriation of $112,000 when his chief architect said the work could have been done for $96,000, and what becomes of the other $16,000. Taking the amount expended on these buildings up to the present, I find that the sum of $90,695 has been expended, so that there is something over $5,000 to be expended before the government reach their architect's estimate of the cost, and that leaves some $23,000 to be expended before they reach the amount they have asked for. Why have they asked for something over $20,000 more for these buildings than their own architect estimates they would cost and which even then is an enormous amount. In referring to the cost of these buildings, I made comparison with certain buildings at Queen's University, and the Minister of Public Works took exception to my comparison, an exception in which I think he was not justified.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would ask whether or not it is proper, Mr. Speaker, to discuss a debate which took place in Committee of Supply? It is very inconvenient, on a motion to go into supply to discuss harbours and rivers, that we should be called on to deal with a debate which took place on public buildings. The officials in my department are not present and I have not the information always with me. If the hon. gentleman will indicate what information has not been furnished to him, I shall be only too glad to get it for him.

Mr. SPROULE. May I submit this point? If the House is deprived of information to which it is rightly entitled for an intelligent consideration of the votes it is asked to give, surely that ought to be a sufficient reason to submit before supplies are granted. If there is any one rule well understood, it is that before granting supplies grievances must be redressed, and this is a grievance the opposition have to contend with.

Mr. SPEAKER. My idea in calling the attention of the hon. member to the point is very evident: We are about to go into Supply, and, as the matter under discussion is before the Committee of Supply, I thought it would be better to know how the House intends to proceed. For, if this practice is followed, every item may be called up whenever the House is to go into Committee of Supply and the discussion

that has been had in Supply repeated. The rule laid down is that members 'may not refer specifically to any vote which has been passed, or is about to be discussed in committee.' In the estimates, this is one of the items still before the Committee of Supply. I think the older parliamentarians in the House will agree with me that it is a matter that the House might well determine in order that we may know what to do in the future.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) only to incidentally mention the vote as evidence of his inability to get the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, he was referring to what took place in Supply, and to what he had said and what I had said.

Mr. FOSTER. I think at the time particularly referred to, my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) was referring directly to a discussion which had taken place between himself and the Minister of Public Works in Committee of Supply on this item. In that respect, I should be inclined to agree with the ruling of the chair that such a practice would be both inconvenient and against the rules. But in the main matter which is being discussed by my hon. friend, he has taken his material from answers to questions given by the Minister of Public Works not in Committee of Supply. Any information he has received in that way, I think he has a perfect right to refer to, and to read from the records if he sees fit.

Mr. HUGHES. Or lack of information.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, or lack of information; he has a right to make his plea to the House that he has not been given the information to which he is entitled.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman refers, not to the proceedings in the Committee of Supply but merely to answers of questions by the Minister of Public Works in the House, I think the discussion is in order. The hon. member will have an opportunity, when the House goes into Committee of Supply, of taking the matter up. I thought I would take the sense of the House on the subject, because the same question might come up again.

Mr. EDWARDS. I will endeavour to confine my remarks within the lines of questions that I put and answers that I have received when the House was not in Committee of Supply. I understand that I shall be in order if I do that. I regret that I am unable to accept the assurance of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) given me a few minutes ago, that he would give me any information I desire, if I would put my wish in the form of a question. I have had experience of the hon. minister along that line which I do not care to have repeated. Now, I have certain reasons for thinking that the expenditure on these cottages is entirely too great. One of the reasons which led me to that conclusion is this: The contractor, at the same time that he was building these cottages, built four residences in the city of Kingston, seven-roomed houses, with pressed brick fronts, a verandah and balcony, fitted up in the most modern way imaginable; and these four residences, he says himself, cost him $11,000. Here are four residences erected at an average cost of $2,750, but these cottages are costing, according to the money voted, $7,000 each. This, compared with the cost of large buildings in Kingston in connection with Queen's University, buildings divided up into class-rooms and with solid partition walls, justifies me in concluding that money was being wasted in the building of these cottages.

Another matter on which I desired information, and on which I submitted questions, was the Royal Military College stables. The total cost of these was $8,563.69. But the contract price was $6,990, an excess over contract price of about $1,583. I called attention to the fact, and repeat the statement now, that these stables were lying idle for four years and are lying idle at the present time—they have never been made use of since they were erected. It has been stated that the reason for that was that there is no accommodation for the men who were to look after them. Money was voted to erect certain buildings for this purpose. I put a question on the Order Paper in regard to that, and was told that the barracks accommodation for the stables was for 25 or 30 men. Now, I call attention to the fact that the stables were to accommodate 22 horses. Thus, the barrack accommodation for the men to look after the horses allows for 25 or 30 men, and these men, apparently, are to look after 22 horses. This seems to me something that the country should be informed about. In answer to a question which I asked in reference to the barrack accommodation, I was informed that the contract, amounting to $9,490, covered practically every thing—excavation, mason work, brick work, carpentry, plastering, galvanized iron work, plumbing, painting and glazing. Yet the department is asking for $15,000 for this work. I think it is quite pertinent to ask what they are going to do with the other $5,510.

Another matter to which I wish to refer, and in regard to which I submitted questions to the Minister of Public Works, is the vote of $15,000 for veterinary hospital at Kingston. The answers to the questions with regard to this expenditure are, to say the least, very peculiar. On February 23, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) justified the expenditure of $15,000. On March 8, in answer to a question I put, he said that

the whole item of $15,000 was an error. He lays the blame on the printer. It does seem to me very peculiar, to say the least, that, according to his own words, after consulting last year with the Minister of Militia, with reference to the veterinary hospital, he should, when the item comes up, justify the expenditure, and a week later feel called upon to explain that it was all a mistake, that the item should not have been in the estimates, and he proposes, with the concurrence of the House, to have it struck out.

Now, I have referred to these matters, not in any spirit of captious criticism, but because I think that I have the right, and the people of my constituency have the right to know what is being done with the public money. I think I was entirely within my right in asking the questions I did, and I do not think I have received the answers I should have received from the Minister of Public Works, and the answers which I had a right to expect after he had given me his assurance that if I would let the item go through and give him a memorandum of what I wanted, he would give me the fullest information. I say that I have reason to doubt his assurance to-day, I have reason to doubt that if I again submitted a series of questions he would give me the information I desired. I repeat that I express that doubt with extreme regret. A great deal has been said with regard to retrenchment; and I would call attention to the figures I have given here, showing the enormous cost of these cottages, and to the fact that over $20,000 has been appropriated more than the whole thing has cost up to date, and yet, according to the answers given me, everything has been covered except perhaps some painting and papering. I would call the attention of the House particularly to the large vote which has been granted by this House for these buildings; and I think that when in future we are considering in Supply the estimates that are brought down to the House by the various departments to construct public works, we should examine them more carefully than we have done in the past. I may say here that if I had possessed at the time the information I have received in this hap-hazard way, I would have urged more strenuously than I did that this money should not have been voted. I repeat again that I have no desire to transgress the rules of the House, and I trust that you, Mr. Speaker, and the House will be lenient towards me, and attribute any failure in that regard on my part to the fact that I am as yet new to the ways of this parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In view of what the hon. gentleman has said of his inexperience in the ways of this parliament, perhaps I should not complain of the somewhat unusual manner in which he has brought this subject up at the present time. The hon. gentleman ought to be aware, and I am sure when he gets some experience he will be aware, that it is the usual practice, when a member intends to discuss a matter of public interest, to notify the minister concerned, and who would be likely to give information upon the subject, of his intention to bring the matter before the House.

Mr. EDWARDS. Right here I want to state to the House that I did send the hon. gentleman a letter of notification, this very day, that I was going to bring this matter up. Although in a previous discussion he had declared that so far as he was concerned he had said all that could be said on the matter, nevertheless I sent him a notification.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman did send me to-day a letter stating that at some convenient time he would bring the matter up

Mr. EDWARDS. I rise to a point of order. I did not say what the hon. gentleman alleges I said; I said I would bring it up at the first convenient opportunity, and this is the first convenient opportunity.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I certainly did not assume for a moment that the hon. gentleman intended to bring the matter up to-day. I would certainly assume that if the hon. gentleman intended to discuss the necessity for these buildings at Kingston, he would have given the same intimation to the Minister of Militia, who is the minister best informed upon militia matters, so that he also might have been in his place to reply to the hon. gentleman. However, as the hon. gentleman has not chosen to do that, I will deal with the matter for a few moments. Now let me say that when I stated in Committee of Supply that if the hon. gentleman would furnish me with a memorandum of what he wanted I would be glad to give him all the information he desired, I indicated that the memorandum should go to the deputy minister, who would prepare the requisite information, but I am not aware whether the hon. gentleman gave any memorandum to the deputy minister or not. Certainly I have no recollection of his giving the memorandum to me which he intimated that he would do. I did give instructions, I remember, to the deputy minister to produce the tenders which were put in for these cottages, as I understood the hon. gentleman to desire them. I do not know whether he has received them or not, but I presume he has, because I gave the necessary directions. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that any information which he or any other member of this House desires from my department, if it is proper that the information should be furnished, will be pro-

duced at all times, whether the request comes from an hon. member sitting on this side of the House or on the other side. If I may be pardoned for making this observation, I may say that it ill becomes any member of this House, in the absence of any ground whatever, such as would appear to be the case with respect to the hon. gentleman, to insinuate with regard either to myself or any other member of the government, that information is being refused or withheld. Nothing has occurred since the hon. gentleman has been a member of this House to warrant him in suggesting any insinuation of that character.

Now the hon. gentleman asked questions with regard to these buildings upon two different occasions. I find upon page 2390 that the hon. gentleman asked some questions. He asked:

What is the present estimated total cost of the 16 cottages constructed for the civil subordinate staff at Kingston Royal Military College, including fittings, furnishings, &c.

That was the second question the hon. gentleman had asked. He had asked previously, page 1792, what was the original estimated cost, and the chief architect had given the original estimated cost at $96,000. But he had also been told, as the hon. gentleman will see if he chooses to read with any degree of care the answer which was given—

Mr. EDWARDS. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has misquoted me, he has stated things that I did not say. I did not ask what was the original estimated cost, as the hon. gentleman says I did.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not a point of order. If there is a question of privilege, the hon. member can only give his explanation with the permission of the gentleman occupying the floor, otherwise he will have to wait until the speaker has concluded his remarks.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There can be no doubt whatever as to the meaning of the question, and the answer thereto. The question was:

What is the estimated total cost of the 16 cottages constructed for the accommodation of the civil subordinate staff at Kingston Royal Military College, including fittings, furnishings, &c.

The answer was that the original estimated cost was $96,000. Then the next question was:

What portion of the work, in addition to the original contract, has been let by tender, to whom and at what price?

Showing that the hon. gentleman was asking for two things, first, as to the original tender for the buildings, and secondly, as to the additional work which was required. The second question shows that the hon. gentleman was perfectly aware that there had been an original contract for the buildings, and that there had been additional work which would increase the price beyond the $96,000. The answer to the second question was as follows:

2. Alterations to main drain and lowering basement and inside drain, M. Sullivan.. ..$1,777 00
Change to pressed brick.. .. .. 1,700 00
Electric wiring and fixtures, Halliday Electric Company. 3,550 00
Outside connections, Halliday Electric Company.. .. .. .. 145 00
Heating, Mr. Sullivan.. .. .. 2,750 00

Then the hon. gentleman asked:

3. Has any of the work been let without tender? If so, what, to whom and the amount in each case?

To which the reply was:

3. Hot water boilers purchased from Cluff Bros. for $1,230, regular market price.

Any one who understands the meaning of the English language would understand that the original estimate was for the buildings alone, $96,000, and this was additional work which had to be performed. The hon. gentleman apparently was not satisfied with that answer and he put another question in somewhat similar form which appears at page 2390. He repeated the question as to the cost. Evidently the officials of my department, seeing the same question and having given the answer as to the original contract and additional work, repeated that the estimate was $96,000. It may be that the officials of my department should have repeated that that was the original estimated cost, but they took it for granted that my hon. friend was asking the same question because he followed it with other questions as to the hot water boilers, fittings, furnaces and other work for which tenders were not asked. There is another question as to the amount of any work, fittings, furnishings contracted for since the awarding of the original contract to Mr. Sullivan for which tenders were not asked. He also asked:

6. Will the sum of $57,000 voted this session complete the cottages, ready for use, or will a further sum be required?

To this the answer was:

(a) Yes; (b) No.

It may be that my hon. friend intended that that should not apply to the cost as estimated by the architect in the first instance, because you could understand that as this item was discussed in the Committee of Supply, without going into what took place there, there would be the

fullest opportunity to go into details and it would naturally be assumed that these details were gone into when the officers of my department were here in attendance on me as Minister of Public Works, consequently the estimate was repeated, being the original estimate of the chief architect. But then, in order that the hon. gentleman should have full information, detailed information is given in answer to his questions as to the boilers, printing and advertising, travelling expenses, architects' commission, photographs, and even a small charge by the Shedden Forwarding Company for cartage.

Mr. EDWARDS. How do you reconcile the facts that on page 1792 in answer to a question as to the total amount of work let without tender, the answer is given, $1,230, and on page 2391, in answer to a similar question, you say $3,034.20?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What are these items for?

Mr. EDWARDS. These are boilers, printing and advertising, travelling expenses, architect's commission, photographs, and cartage.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend see that when speaking of work being awarded without tender, the travelling expenses would not be included. How would you let a contract for travelling expenses? Does not my hon. friend see, if he will pardon me, how silly is the suggestion he makes?

Mr. EDWARDS. Why did you answer in the second place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend suppose that I would include the architect's commission when speaking of the work let after calling for public tenders? And then the photographs, $10? Does not my hon. friend understand that these photographs would be taken at the instance of the department? My hon. friend even complains of the payment to the Shedden Forwarding Company for cartage. Of course there were no tenders for these items.

Mr. EDWARDS. Then why were they not left out the second time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is certainly cavilling in the matter, and I am quite unable to follow him.

Mr. EDWARDS. That is not my fault.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The two answers are identical that so far as concerned the fittings for these buildings the boilers were purchased from Cluff Brothers without tender.

Notwithstanding the unusual and unexpected remarks of the hon. gentleman, even now if there is any further information which he wishes, all he has to do is to make a memorandum which I shall send to the deputy minister and any additional information will be sent to him. The department has nothing whatever to conceal so far as this building or any other public work is concerned. The hon. gentleman has said that these buildings cost more than they should have cost, and compares them with certain cottages which he said have been erected in Kingston. The answer I make is that when the plans and specifications for these buildings were prepared we did the proper and usual thing for us to do, we called for public tenders, and gave the advertisement as wide publicity as it was reasonable to give it. We received four tenders, including one by Mr. Sullivan, of Kingston, an experienced contractor. The highest tender was from an Ottawa firm, Doran & Devlin, also experienced contractors. Their tender was considerably higher than the lowest tender.

Mr. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order, In case our good friend is going into such a lengthy discussion of this matter, the hon. member for Frontenac should be at liberty to state his side of the case, and not be limited to these questions.

Mr. SPEAKER. That confirms the stand I took, and I think the House will agree that a matter of this kind should have been discussed in committee, because we are clearly drifting away from the rules.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am merely replying to the hon. gentleman who——

Mr. LENNOX. I presume if the hon. gentleman is allowed to pursue this argument we will be allowed to discuss it. We want to discuss it if it is opened in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER. The only justification for alluding to it now is that two questions were put to the minister by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) and replied to. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who spoke on the point, thought that with that view of it the question might now be discussed under other phases and certainly any discussion of that kind should take place in Committee of the Whole. While the question is on an item which I find in the estimates, it is clearly in violation of the rules to discuss it now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The motion having been made that the House go into Committee of Supply, I am now replying to the observations of the hon. gentleman and I trust I have not departed at all from the line of argument presented by him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The general rule applies of course that in the interest

of the despatch of public business, the House should hear any explanation a minister of the Crown may have to make.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I frankly admit that buildings of a cheaper character might have been designed, but it was a fact that there was an area of some 330 feet by 30 feet, which had to be excavated from the solid rock. Of course, the buildings might have been erected without providing for fire proof brick partitions.——

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I ask if the minister is in order in discussing this question beyond showing that his answers were correct. He is now leading the House into a general discussion and making a defence of his policy.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, I feel we are only wasting time and I will cease my observations at once so as to close the matter.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. OWEN. I want to say a word or two, Mr. Chairman, before you proceed in committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no business yet before the committee.

Mr. OWEN. But I want to speak on a matter before you bring up any business.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That would not be in order.

Mr. OWEN. Then I move the committee rise, and I would ask the minister if he intends to follow the same policy this session as he announced last session when he stated that it was the policy of the government to erect public buildings in towns where they were most needed irrespective of the politics of the member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman having moved that the committee rise, his remarks must be relevant to that motion.

Mr. OWEN. I move that the committee rise for the purpose of saying a few words to the Minister of Public Works. If I am out of order I will not proceed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will have opportunity to speak on another occasion.

Graham's pond, Prince Edward Island, $1,000.

Mr. FRASER. Is this work to be done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, by day's labour.

Harbours, rivers and bridges, generally—improvements, $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the usual vote, it is the same as last year.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Mr. FRASER. Is it the intention to bring down supplementary estimates for this same purpose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of any such intention.

Mr. FRASER. Last year $85,000 was voted in the main estimates for public wharfs and public structures in Prince Edward Island, and $90,000 was voted in the supplementary estimates. This year the total vote is only $100,000 and some of the works for which there were appropriations last year are eliminated altogether this year. What is the explanation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The postponing of works provided for at the last sesion of parliament is in accordance with the policy of retrenchment which is being pursued. It must not be forgotten that the government has two dredges at work in the harbours of Prince Edward Island, and the colleagues of my hon. friend (Mr. Fraser) from the island have already seen me in regard to very important dredging operations to be carried on there during the coming season. I have strong hope that in this way we may be able to meet the reasonable expectations of the people of Prince Edward Island. I have had to postpone the work on some of the wharfs because I was obliged to curtail my estimates very considerably.

Mr. FRASER. Last year there was a sum of $8,000 for the construction of a breakwater at Long Point and that is eliminated this year. Is it the intention to go ahead with that work this year or next year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not the intention to proceed with the breakwater this year; I am unable to say what will be done next year.

Mr. EDWARDS. How much would that breakwater cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Between $30,000 and $40,000.

Mr. EDWARDS. That is just about the sum you over-expended on the Kingston buildings.

Naufrage pond—protected entrance to channel, $14,500.

Mr. FRASER. I wish to call attention to either a contradiction or a mistake made by the Minister of Public Works in this matter. Some days ago, when the hon. member for North Toronto asked the Minister of Public Works if he was proceeding on any principle in dropping certain works and going on with certain other works, and asked him to give a concrete case in which any public works for which tenders were called had been dropped, he gave this very case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend pardon me? I admit that that was a mis-

take. The name was given to me by one of my officials.

Mr. FRASER. I do not wish to object to the appropriation, but 'Hansard' has gone down to that part of the country, and people have told me that they had the minister's word that the work was not going on. I am glad to see that that is a mistake.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The case of Naufrage pond was confounded with the Long Point work, which I decided to drop. I intend to proceed with the Naufrage pond work.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to ask the minister if tenders have been called, and, if so, the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work is under contract to F. S. Macdonald, of Souris, P.E.I., and the contract price is $12,995.

Mr. FRASER. Were any other tenders received?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Three were received in response to public advertisment, and this gentleman's was the lowest tender.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to have the name and the amount of each tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I haven't them here. The hon. gentleman can be furnished with them if he makes a motion.

Mr. FOSTER. Surely the minister is not going to ask a member to give a notice of motion in the House for tenders for a work for which a vote is being taken?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I merely wished the hon. member to call my attention to it or to ask a question in the House in case I should forget; but I think I can say that I shall have them this evening.

Mr. FOSTER. Let the item stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. The primary thing for a minister to have, when he is asked for the name of the successful tenderer, is the names of the other tenderers, and the amounts of their tenders. That information is absolutely germane, and it raised my hair to hear this young member asked to wait for a formal motion to be carried by the House for a return for this information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am quite sure that the hon. member can take care of himself without the assistance of the hon. member for North Toronto. If the hon. member wishes this item to stand, I am willing that it should stand.

Mr. FRASER. I would ask that it stand until we get the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very well; perhaps we can get it in half an hour or twenty minutes.

Item allowed to stand.

Sturgeon pier — enlarging outer end and raising stem of pier, $4,500.

Mr. FRASER. I would ask the Minister of Public Works if this is sometimes called the Panmure wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know. This is on the southern side of Cardigan bay, about six miles south of Georgetown.

Mr. FRASER. That is where Panmure Island is. Although the wharf was built two years ago, the right of way to it has not yet been opened to the public. I would like the minister to have that done as soon as possible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have it looked into and attended to at once.

Tignish—extension of harbour channel piers inwardly, $25,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister had better give us some information as to the present condition of the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract for this work has just been let. It has been pressed on the attention of the department for a good many years. Tignish is a very important point, particularly as a harbour of refuge for fishermen. I may say that there have been protection works built at Tignish, but they are not adequate to the protection of the harbour, and the present works include the extension of the northern and southern breakwater, 650 feet and 620 feet respectively, and the construction of a breastwork to extend 400 feet from either end of the breakwaters. Tenders were called by public advertisement in the ordinary way, and four tenders were received, ranging from $23,950 to $30,750, and the lowest tender was accepted.

Mr. BLAIN. Do public tenders mean public advertisement in the newspapers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. How many newspapers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the number here, but at least a dozen.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the policy down there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to give a sufficiently wide advertisement to assure a large number of contractors getting the notice.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the advertisement inserted in any papers that are not friendly to the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am inclined to think so. I can name one at any rate.

Mr. BLAIN. What one is that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not care to name it.

Vernon river bridge, Port Vernon—landing pier on west side of river, $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete. It is under contract. Probable total cost $8,000.

Mr. FRASER. Is it the intention to buy the right of way ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The right of way is to cost us only $1.

To purchase creosoted timber for works in the maritime provinces generally, $20,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the system followed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The resident engineers in the lower provinces, in making provision for repairs to wharfs, where the teredo is likely to prove harmful to ordinary timber, estimate for creosoted timber. That is obtained in the south. We have no creosoting works in Eastern Canada. The wood is southern pine, and it is treated at Norfolk, Virginia. There are only two concerns engaged in the work.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of a contract do you make ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not ask for public tenders but obtain prices and take the lowest provided the timber passes a certain test. We require that it shall pass the test of our inspector.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you test it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of the details, but there is a regular mode of testing the quantity of creosote which is forced into the timber.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why not have the timber creosoted in Canada ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would require an expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars to establish a plant.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand there are two methods—one by forcing the creosote into the wood by pressure and the other by boiling the wood in creosote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The boiling is of no use. The oil must be forced in by pressure. The sap has to be drawn out by putting the timber in a vacum, and then the oil of creosote takes the place of the sap.

Mr. FOSTER. What extra cost does this creosoting entail ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It trebles the cost, but more than trebles the life of the timber.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the timber bought by the department direct ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, through agents. The agents are Mr. Kirk of Nova Scotia and Mr. Bell of St. John.

Mr. BLAIN.

Mr. CROCKET. What price was paid last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think about $65 per 1000 feet. It depends on the length of the sticks. Long sticks would be worth more.

Mr. CROCKET. How much was bought last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to the 1st of February, we bought $9,711 worth.

Naufrage pond, Prince Edward Island—protecting entrance channel, $14,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have the information which my hon. friend from Kings county (Mr. Fraser) desired. The parties tendering were: F. S. Macdonald, Souris, Prince Edward Island, $12,995; R. N. Cox, Morell, Prince Edward Island, $13,800; Kimbell, Coffin, Calien McCarthy, H. D. McEwen, $14,925. The contract was given to F S. Macdonald at $12,995.

Public Works—Chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—Quebec—Anse à Beaufils—extension of western pier and breakwater, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of this, $1,000 is a revote, and the present vote is the amount required to complete the work.

Anse à la Barbe breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is required to complete payment on the breakwater that has been constructed. This is under contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is Anse à la Barbe?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Bonaventure.

Mr. FOSTER. We had asked for a return relating to that county.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is being prepared as rapidly as possible.

Mr. Foster. It is hardly in order to take up the items to be included in that return until the return has been brought down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a lengthy return, covering thirteen years.

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to discuss these matters when the return is brought down, and, in the absence of the return, we cannot possibly discuss these matters intelligently.

Mr. FOSTER. Let the items relating to Bonaventure stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a great deal of work about the return, and it cannot be ready for two weeks. I do not think the return would in any way affect the passing of these items. Could not we have it understood that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) should have an opportunity, on some other item, of freely discussing these Bonaventure matters?

Mr. LENNOX. I think what the minister has said, if I understood him rightly, will be satisfactory—that is, it is understood that I can bring the matter up again.

Mr. AMES. Will this vote complete the contract on this breakwater?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Anse à l'Ilot landing pier, $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote, to complete the work.

Mr. AMES. It is done by day's work, is it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Not in reference particularly to this item, but generally, could the minister tell us how he proceeds when he undertakes a construction like this by day's work? What is the process?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The process is to instruct the resident engineer to proceed with the work by day's labour. He is instructed to confer with the member for the county supporting the government as to the names of competent foremen, to begin with, to take charge of the work, and also to purchase material at the lowest price.

Mr. FOSTER. From whom?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is to use his judgment.

Mr. FOSTER. Whom does he consult as to that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has no instructions on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the practice?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to say. I suppose that in this also he would consult the member supporting the government.

Mr. FOSTER. What price does he pay for labour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The ordinary price paid in the neighbourhood.

Mr. FOSTER. And as to material?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He buys that at fair market prices.

Mr. FOSTER. Who buys it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The resident engineer.

Mr. FOSTER. From whom does he buy?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From dealers.

Mr. FOSTER. Who keeps the pay-roll?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The resident engineer.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the resident engineer whose time is not entirely devoted to one of these little works, keep the weekly pay-roll?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no, the foreman must do that. The foreman certifies to the resident engineer, and the resident engineer certifies to the chief engineer.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does the engineer receive instructions to buy at the lowest prices?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Always?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Always.

Mr. EDWARDS. Very often they do not do it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very sorry to hear that.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, as I brought this matter up, I may be permitted a remark. We have got a lot of information in a very short space of time. The system is a lovely system in theory—and it can be even more lovely in practice. Shorn of all verbiage, what does this mean? It means that the work, from beginning to end, is in the hands of the representative of the county supporting the government and is used for his party benefit, to go no further. When the work is decided upon, the resident engineer is told to go on and do the work by day labour. He applies first—and last and always—to the member who represents the county. He needs foremen to supervise the labouring men; the member for the county appoints them. He needs material for the work; the member for the county tells him where to go to get it. He needs to know the prices to pay for them; he consults the member of the county as to the prices.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOSTER. The pay-rolls are kept by the nominee of the member for the county, that is by the member for the county himself.

Mr. CROSBY. Or the defeated government candidate.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, or the unsuccessful candidate in the interests of the government. It all inures to the party benefit, either to the member supporting the government or to the defeated candidate who wishes, next time, to be elected to support the government. These facts are sufficient condemnation of the system. The minister's power is absolutely nil, so far as any real effectiveness is concerned. No independent supervision is given over the matter, with the exception of what the resident engineer may give and he is not independent. The first thing he is told to do is to consult the member representing the county, if he is in favour of the government. Now under that system any one can understand what is going on in the public works of this country in the expenditure of millions of dollars, a very considerable portion of

which is done by day's work. It seems to me that this is a very bad system, both for the government and for the political life of the country.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The remarks of the hon. member for North Toronto would certainly apply where the pier is a large work involving a large amount of money. But I lay it down as a general principle that when the amount to be expended is less than $5,000, it is better not to call for tenders. For instance, in the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé several small works have been going on for the last ten or fifteen years. Now take a small pier which is being built, to cost less than $5,000; would it be wise on the part of the government to call for tenders over all portions of Canada, or the whole district of Quebec, for instance, for the construction of that work? We would have to expend considerable money in advertisements, we know that newspapers are not paid by prayers, and we would have to spend a large amount of money in notices, advertisements and so on. Now take the county of Gaspé where this particular work is being done. The resident engineer of course is supposed to be an honest man, he belongs to a profession which naturally makes of him an honest man. He has to supervise the work for which a certain sum of money has been voted by parliament. Well, what interest would the resident engineer have in spending that money in an unwise manner? Would he take the advice of any one, and pay for timber a higher price than the market value? All accounts have to come back to the Public Works Department, where they are carefully checked by Mr. Kingston, I believe, an expert, who has been there many years. I know as a matter of fact, having had some experience with works of this kind in that district, that accounts have been checked and payment has been refused when the price appeared to be above the market price. So we can take it for granted that the market price is the one paid by the Department of Public Works. As regards paying the men—well, I am always speaking for the district of Gaspé. I have received letter after letter from my electors complaining that they had not been paid what they were entitled to. There is in every contract a clause inserted by the Department of Labour called the fair wage clause, which governs the payment of wages, so that in each district only the market price is paid for labour. This is known and adopted in the particular district. So there is no possibility, unless the resident engineer is a thief, of the department being swindled by people who are employed on those works. The acounts for the timber, the accounts for the stone, the accounts for labour, are all checked by Mr. Kingston, the chief accountant of the Public Works Department, and I do not see how the department can be swindled at all. My hon. friend says it is all a piece of partisanship, that only friends of the government are employed. Well, let me say this to my hon. friend: The county of Gaspé has elected me by acclamation many times, or by large majorities, since 1896, and it would be folly on my part to say to the resident engineer: You will employ only so and so. He must not make any difference, he must employ his men irrespective of politics.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us argue this question out in a common sense way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How was it about fifteen years ago?

Mr. FOSTER. That doesn't amount to anything it all. We are trying now to see whether this is a good way to spend the people's money. What does the present system amount to? In the first place, the member representing the county, if he supports the government, obtains the work, and what is the next thing he does? There is a work to be carried on by the day's labour system as it has been portrayed by the minister. He goes down to his constiuency and he says, I have got a work for the constituency. He wants foremen, and he says to his party friends, I am going to put you in as foreman, and I am going to get this other man employed in some other capacity. And so he selects the workers, all party men. He says to this foreman. We have to have so many cords of stone. He goes around amongst those who have supported him and whom he expects to support him again, and he says: All you who have stone, here is a chance to bring it in. From the moment you start to the moment you finish is it not a complete electioneering arrangement? The men who sell the stone are the recipients of what my hon. friend denominates the bounty of the government—he remembers that phrase. They are told that the bounty of the government is being shared by virtue of the good will of the member whom they have elected, and whom they will be asked to elect again. From first to end, the work is confined to the party, is used to buttress up the members or the defeated candidate, and in all these things added expense is incurred. Here is an example. Word goes out even when a contract is taken on. The contractor is informed that he must buy his lumber or stone within the constituency in which the work is situated. Instruction goes out from somebody. If it does not, what is the meaning of this letter?

Ottawa, February 10, 1908.

E. D. Lafleur, Esq.,
Chief Engineer,
Department of Public Works,
City.

Dear sir,—With reference to our timber required for St. Alphonse work, Chicoutimi county, we find that to comply with the request of the member, Mr. Girard, to purchase all our timber in his constituency, we would have to take round timber from 12 inches up, as it is impossible to get 14 inch. We are very anxious to purchase everything in the constituency, and we trust that we will be allowed to take the round timber from 12 inches up to comply with the wishes of the member.

There may be no printed instructions sent to these men, but it works out; the member has it understood with the minister and knows exactly what his rights are and will insist on them and in the province of Quebec or in any other province he insists on his right and so the freedom of contract, the freedom of purchase, the freedom of wage, the freedom of the work from the beginning to the end is restricted by the party interests and the party advantages and the party privilege. That is not a way in which the country should do its business. I know that the Minister of Public Works believes that to be the case. But I never knew a proposition to be mentioned in this House in the way of criticism, affecting the minister's department, that he had not a defence for it. Why he even not very long ago——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I want no better defence than the course pursued by the hon. gentleman when he had a chance.

Mr. FOSTER. —set up the defence that if there was a candidate running in the interest of the government it was a proper thing that he should interest himself in peddling post office sites just previous to the time of election. The minister knows in his heart that that is not a correct system. His answer will be: You did the same thing. He has that in the back of his head now; I see it coming out, even before it receives audible expression.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And from one so perfect as my hon. friend it must have been correct.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another nice little phase of my hon. friend. When he is in a bad corner and his conscience troubles him a little—what he has left of it, and I hope he has a lot—he wants to say something about the virtues or perfection of the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no harm in that.

Mr. FOSTER. But the nice little way in which he does it, as if he was to say: Oh, good Lord, you know I am sinful and weak and will reserve a large lot of favour for me; but you know that the hon. member for North Toronto is all straight, do not give him an inch of liberty. My hon. friend knows that this is a bad business system. Will he not acknowledge that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is perhaps a little bit of human nature in my soul, and when I try to measure up as to whether my conduct is absolutely right or reasonably right, I look to what other people have done who are at least as good as I am and who sometimes are thought by their friends and even by themselves to be a little better.

Mr. FOSTER. That is another nice little thing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How does that strike my hon. friend?

Mr. FOSTER. You mean the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As a new Minister of Public Works it certainly is not at all out of place in determining the course to be pursued by my department to look back and see what has been the course pursued for many years, even ever since confederation, and it certainly would not be out of place for me to ask the course pursued when my hon. friend had charge of the public affairs of this country to a very large degree, while occupying the very responsible position of Minister of Finance, and, apart altogether from that portfolio, when he filled a large place in the public affairs of this country. I did not and do not think it out of place for me to refer to the fact that during all the time he was in power and was a very important factor in the government of the country, the very same course was pursued that we are pursuing to-day. We ought to be reasonable about these things. I am satisfied that one of the things which has hurt my hon. friend as much as anything else in the opinion of the people of this country is that he pretends, if he will pardon me for saying it in a public way, that if he had the power he would pursue a different course politically from what he did when he was in power. When my hon. friend was in power his government and the Minister of Public Works in his government allowed the very thing to be done which is being done to-day. What is more reasonable than that the resident engineer, who has the carrying on of these small works in regard to which tenders are not called, which are not large enough to require calling for tenders, should be told to confer with the member for the county who is supposed to be certainly as intelligent as anybody else in the county, and whose interest it is to avoid any possibility of scandal and to see that the public work is done in the most economical manner possible?

Mr. FOSTER. Roche & Carney, for instance, in Halifax?

Mr. PUGSLEY. And whose interest it is to see that the most capable foreman is chosen and that the material going into the public works is bought at the lowest possible price. I think it is not unreasonable that the member supporting the government should be consulted. My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor), who is opposing the government, complained bitterly yesterday that I did not consult him and would not appoint a foreman whom he recommended. That hon. gentleman takes even a stronger view as to what should be done as to consulting representatives than we do on this side.

Mr. SPROULE. If you consult the member in one county it would be a good rule to apply in another county.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall explain the difference. The member supporting the government is interested in seeing that government work is carried on in a thoroughly honest and proper manner. Without any disrespect to hon. gentlemen opposite, I am not able to say that they have any such interest as that. I have seen my hon. friends' faces beam with joy when they discovered that there had been any apparent maladministration of public affairs on the part of even the smallest official in the employ of the government. Therefore, I think it is only right, if we are to confer with anybody, that our resident engineer should confer with those whose desire it is, in the public interest, to see that the works are carried on in a proper and economical way.

Mr. LALOR. In case the member representing the county is opposed to the government to whom does the resident engineer go?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then the resident engineer is instructed—we may as well be perfectly frank about it—to confer as a rule with the gentleman who had run as a candidate in support of the government. That has always been the practice, and that is the practice to-day; there is no use being hypocritical about these things; that is the way in which they are done.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you have not abolished the patronage system in your department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not so far as consulting for the selection of a foreman. We have the safeguard that even after the foreman is suggested by the member, the engineer is instructed not to employ him unless in his judgment he is a man who thoroughly understands the work and can be relied upon to perform his duties. As to the labouring men, they are, as a rule, employed by the foreman who is given a free hand. It is difficult often to get labouring men, and I happen to know that labourers on both sides of politics are chosen. As to the pay-sheets, the foreman is obliged to swear to their correctness, and when this sworn return is certified to by the resident engineer it comes to the chief engineer. The instructions to the resident engineer are of a very peremptory character to purchase materials only at the market rates, and as to whether he confers with friends of the government I have no knowledge. His duty is to see that the prices of material are fair and reasonable. The chief engineer has a pretty accurate knowledge of what are fair and reasonable prices for materials in all sections of the country, and he has to certify to the correctness of the bills, which then have to go to the chief accountant of the department, who must also be satisfied they are correct, and then to the Auditor General whose duty it is to review them. I do not think the hon. gentleman has presented any strong argument against the existing practice.

Mr. AMES. When the vote was taken last year it was promised the work would be completed, but only half the appropriation was spent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As my hon. friend knows —and I hope he may not be annoyed at my referring to it because it might suggest a hint that he and his friends were responsible for it—we did not get the Supply Bill through until the middle of July, and the summer was more than half gone when we were able to commence the work.

Mr. AMES. Is it not a fact that in the case of pretty nearly every public work in Gaspé and Bonaventure the actual expenditure did not commence until about one month before the elections?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think that can be true because we tried to get the work commenced as quickly as we could after parliament prorogued.

Mr. AMES. Will the minister have prepared a statement in respect to the expenditure in Gaspé and Bonaventure on harbours and rivers, showing at what date the several appropriations which were voted last parliament for these two counties commenced to be expended? I mean the commencement of the expenditure, not in Ottawa, but on the works themselves.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be glad to get that.

Mr. AMES. I refer to the work done by day labour and not by contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All right.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The Minister of Public Works does not appear to have grasped the force of the remarks I made to the House last night. Perhaps it was because it was so late at night and that we were all so tired with the arduous labours of the day that we were not in a position to grasp an idea so clearly as we could this afternoon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Or to express it so clearly.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. That may be. In order that there may be no misunderstanding on the subject I shall now endeavour to make clear what I stated to the committee last night, and in passing I would like to refer to a remark made now by the Minister of Public Works to the effect that he has no confidence in the honesty of gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not surely go so far as that. I must have lost my head completely if I said that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the second time to-day you lost your head.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps I said 'political' honesty.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Let us take it that way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think I even went as far as that.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. At all events I would direct the attention of the minister to the fact that while in investigations before committees of this House there have been brought out no facts reflecting on the political honesty of the Conservative members, there have been brought out very material facts reflecting upon the honesty, political and otherwise—

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Let these hon. gentlemen opposite possess their souls in patience—reflecting upon the honesty, political and otherwise, of the gentlemen outside of this House to whom the Minister of Public Works has chosen to go for that advice which he might better have sought from the chosen representatives of the people. It was no member of the Conservative party who was concerned—only to mention one of the most glaring transactions brought to light—in the five cents a yard additional on the St. John dredging contract. The point I sought to make last night was that when the minister seeks for advice throughout this country as to the men to be employed, as to the persons from whom supplies should be purchased, as to all the details of the administration of his department, there can be no objection of course to his going to any official source because then he goes to the man who is receiving pay for rendering the service which the minister requires of him. It is not surprising to me that in connection with the constituency of New Westminster the Minister of Public Works does not ask my advice as to whom he shall employ, although perhaps if he did it might save him trouble on some occasions. But it is surprising to me to hear him lay down the principle that in the constituency of New Westminster he should choose as the source of the inspiration of his official acts not the duly elected member for the constituency, not the late member who should possess the confidence of the government in every respect, but a man whose distinction is that he was rejected by the people by the largest majority they have ever given in an election. Here I give a concrete case of how this system works out, and one can speak more to the point in citing a concrete case than in dealing with generalities. The Minister of Public Works tells us he will continue this system in the face of the most solemn report of his own commissioners that the evil of the public life of this country has its origin in the patronage list. Notwithstanding the warning he has received from high official sources the Minister of Public Works has to-day declared it is his intention to perpetuate that evil and in each electoral district of this country enable some chosen instrument of his party to tithe all the contractors and to tithe all the employees in the service of the government; to make them contribute to a party political fund by the power he gives his instruments of having the final word as to who shall get this work, as to who shall be favoured with purchases by the government, and as to who shall be promoted to positions. I declare that system to be an abominable one. In our part of the world—and other members can speak for their own districts—it has led to the most grave abuses. It has led to the contractors under the government and to the employees of the government being called upon for contributions of all kinds for purely party political work, and which contributions they are forced to make good at the expense of the people of Canada. That is the point I sought to make in the protest I registered here last night. That is the point which is bound to be discussed this session in view of the public announcement of the minister, and of other matters which have come to the knowledge of members of this House.

Cap. St. Ignace wharf, $16,500.

Mr. NANTEL. Is that a new work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. NANTEL. Last year $5,000 was voted for that work, but was not expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, nothing was expended last year.

Mr. NANTEL. What is the estimated cost of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $16,500.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What is the amount of the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $14,913.

Mr. NANTEL. Who has the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Clouthier and Goudron.

Mr. FOSTER. What county is this in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Montmagny.

Chicoutimi harbour improvements, $30,000.

Mr. AMES. Is that work by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The construction of the retaining wall is by contract, and there is dredging work as well.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $92,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What will the minister have there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A good deep water wharf, with a frontage of about 500 feet and a basin for vessels to turn in. But if the work is to be satisfactorily completed, it will mean straightening the channel for some distance down the river, which will take some years.

Mr. FOSTER. What depth of water will you get in the harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Fifteen feet at the outer face of the wharf.

Mr. AMES. Who has the contract for building the wharf extension?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Thadée Desbiens.

Mr. AMES. What is the amount of the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $52,500.

Mr. AMES. When was the contract awarded?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the 27th of January, 1908.

Mr. AMES. Since the contract was awarded have any changes been made which lessen the quantity of the work to be done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the 29th of June there was a change in location which added $2,955 to the contract, making the total contract $55,455.

Mr. AMES. Is it not a fact that the change made the wharf a hundred feet shorter?

Mr. NANTEL.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of that. Does my hon. friend state that? If so, I will have it looked into.

Mr. AMES. I am so informed. Where is the dredging being done—in the immediate vicinity of the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In front of the wharf, in the basin of the Chicoutimi harbour.

Mr. AMES. What depth of water does the minister wish to secure in front of the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Fifteen feet.

Mr. AMES. Is he aware that the dredge is working to a depth of 25 feet ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have heard that stated, but I have not been able to verify it.

Mr. AMES. Can the minister state what the dredge is doing with the soil that is being dug up opposite the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is taken down to a part of the river where the water is deeper.

Mr. AMES. That is in the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. AMES. And the contractor is under contract to do that with all the soil he digs out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To deposit it wherever the resident engineer may direct. That is the usual specification.

Mr. AMES. If the resident engineer should direct it to be deposited at a point which would save the contractor an enormous sum of money, would the department feel interested in the matter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would depend entirely on circumstances. The department would not permit it to be deposited where it would interfere with navigation; but if it could be deposited in another place with equal advantage to the department without interfering with navigation, and the resident engineer allowed that to be done, I do not suppose the department would object.

Mr. AMES. If after a contract has been let, under the condition that the soil shall be deposited at a distant point, the contractor finds a place near by where it can be deposited more conveniently, and the resident engineer allows him to deposit it there, is any allowance made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The dredged material has to be deposited at such place as the engineer in charge may direct.

Mr. AMES. Then the engineer in charge has it in his power to make it possible for the dredging contractor to make either very little or a great deal of money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the engineer insisted upon the contract taking the spoil an un-

reasonable distance, the contractor could protest to the chief engineer. In dredging contracts, the specifications are all alike in this respect, that the contractors must deposit the spoil at a specified place or at such other place as the resident engineer may direct; and therefore if there is a place nearer at hand, where it could be deposited without interfering with navigation, I should think the contractor would have that in mind, and would ask the resident engineer to allow him to deposit it there. But ordinarily that question does not arise.

Mr. AMES. I shall give the minister the information which has come to me and which will at least bear investigation as to its absolute veracity. There is at Chicoutimi a pier built at right angles with the south shore. It runs north and south. It was decided to very much enlarge the area, and in order to do so another pier is being built from the end at right angles, thus making a sort of L upside down. It is expected that at the far side of the L there will be a further construction, making three sides, the shore being the fourth, and that will be filled in and so make a solid wall. The contract was given to one Thaddée Desbiens. Tenders were called for. A number of responsible parties tendered, all of whom asked a pretty high figure. But Mr. Desbiens, a hotel-keeper at Chicoutimi, put in his tender at a very low figure, $52,500, and when his tender was accepted it was said by the local people that at that price he could make no money. But at the same time there was a contract made by the government with the dredging construction company whereby the dredge 'Algonquin' was set at work in that neighborhood. Four or five miles down the river there is a shallow channel and the government have been dredging out the channel in order to get a total 15 feet in depth. Opposite the pier there is already a depth of 15 feet, but the dredge 'Algonquin', which had the contract for dredging, is located immediately opposite the wharf, and it dug to the depth of 25 feet. And all the spoil which the 'Algonquin' dredged out was quietly taken, with the permission of the resident engineer, and dumped behind the pier which Desbiens was building. That made it unnecessary for him to bring down any dump and made it possible for the dredging contractor to get all his spoil placed within a very few yards of the place where he was dredging. Both the dredging contractor and the wharf builder benefited, and had it not been for the complacency of the resident engineer, the wharf could not have been built at the price. The result is a lot of unnecessary dredging. The dredge should have been located where a channel is wanted. But located where it is, it has served a double purpose, that of enabling the contractor to make some money and enabling the dredging company to increase their large profits.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The wharf is built by Mr. Desbiens at a very much lower price than the work is fairly worth.

Mr. AMES. The others cannot see how it was possible for him to make money at the price but now we see how it was possible. The local resident engineer was the arbiter of the whole matter. He said to the dredge-owner: Work opposite the wharf and deposit all your spoil behind Desbien's revetment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contractor is doing a good thing for himself and for the country as well.

Mr. FOSTER. But how about the other one who is digging down to 25 feet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am afraid my hon. friend relies too much upon rumours. He does not know himself that the contractor has gone to a depth of 25 feet. He does not know that he has gone actually below 15 feet. It is the duty of the resident engineer to keep very careful track of the dredging and he ought not to pay for a single yard of dredging below the specified depth. Until my hon. friend is able to state that the dredging has gone to a depth of 25 feet, I would not feel bound to accept that statement. There is a tide there of 15 feet, and you might have to dredge 25 feet or 30 feet to get 15 feet below low water. I have no information on the point and am surprised to hear the statement or rather the suggestion of my hon. friend. If I had any evidence, I would feel it my duty to make careful inquiry.

Mr. AMES. There is certain circumstantial evidence which supports the contention of my informant. The depth of water opposite the wharf has been recognized by all concerned as 32 feet and that was ample for any vessel expected there. But that dredge has been hard at work digging where there are 22 feet already and bringing up lots of mud, which would lead one to conclude that they were doing extra dredging for the purpose of accommodating the wharf contractor.

Clarke City, Seven Islands—wharf improvement, $4,600.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to pay the balance due on the contract to the Messrs. Clark. The contractors are the North Shore Power Railway and Navigation Company. A contract was entered into with them on the 4th of January, 1907 for this wharf at $29,990. This company, of which the Messrs. Clark own the controlling interest, has expended a very much larger amount on this work, but all the department agreed to pay was $29,990. The actual

expenditure made would run up to nearly $75,000. The Messrs. Clark have inaugurated works of very large proportions at Clarke city and expended considerably more than a million dollars. They employ a great many hands, and the government felt that, under ordinary circumstances, they would have been justified, in the public interest, in paying the whole cost of this work. But it was undertaken in the first place by the company, and a compromise was made that the government should pay only $29,990, and that is all we asked the committee to vote. This amount $4,600 is to pay the balance due them under the contract.

Mr. AMES. Has some dredging been done at Clark city close to the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not at the moment aware, but I think some dredging was done there.

Mr. AMES. This is one of the pieces of work that, I think, reflects less credit on the department than almost any other along that north shore. The minister did not tell us that, after the wharf was built and the mud was taken away from beside it, the greater portion of the wharf turned turtle, and a great deal of money had to be spent in taking down the old material and building up again. The wharf was built on a very soft, oozy mud flat. You could stick a pole down five or six inches anywhere.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was not the wharf that turned over the company's wharf, built before the government took hold of the matter?

Mr. AMES. It was originally the company's wharf, but it was taken over by the government and the government have had to make the damage good. The trouble seems to have been due to the foolishness of taking out this soft mud beside the wharf. The government took over a private enterprise, and the private enterprise was so handled that it became practically useless and cost many thousands of dollars to put it in shape again. And all this for one private company.

Mr. FOSTER. How much money has the government put into the whole thing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to 30th November last the government had paid altogether $102,562.29.

Mr. BLONDIN. Can the minister tell me the name of the inspector of the work from June 15 to September 15, 1907?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a Mr. Charles Sweeny at one time—I do not know whether at the time the hon. member refers to or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. BLONDIN. I see it stated in the Auditor General's Report that Mr. L. P. Girard was the inspector. I understand that Mr. Girard was paid $2.50 per day. I would ask the minister if he knows that Mr. Girard was a law student at the time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a Mr. Girard who was on the engineering staff of the resident engineer, Mr. Michaud. He was at one time at Chicoutimi. He was engaged on this work in the summer for one or two summers.

Mr. AMES. A son of the member?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it a fact that a young law student was put on as inspector of an important work like this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that he is an engineering student.

Mr. AMES. He is practising law in Chicoutimi now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That must be another man, because Mr. Girard is on the engineering staff of the department under Mr. Michaud at the present time. He was at Chicoutimi at one time on Mr. Tache's staff.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is important that we should know the facts in this matter, in view of the statement made by the hon. member (Mr. Blondin) that this man who was appointed inspector was a law student. If the minister cannot state the facts definitely now, he can learn them and give them to us later—say when we meet at eight o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, Mr. Tache, the resident engineer, would have to be communicated with. I will get the information as soon as possible. It should not be necessary to let the item stand. The amount is small and we should close up this matter.

Mr. J. D. REID. The passing of this item is not important; we have a month or two to deal with it. The fact of putting on a man as inspector who was not qualified may account for the loss. Of course, the present minister was not in charge, and may not be personally liable to censure. But someone in his department is. If we pass the item now, we shall never get the information. As far as I am concerned, I would like the item to stand, so that we may learn whether the statement made to the committee is correct or not. If the minister can show that this man was a competent inspector, of course, the item will pass.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When I explain the case to the hon. member (Mr. J. D. Reid)

I am confident he will not press his request. The wharf which, it is alleged, fell down, was not built by the government, but by the company. Since the government rebuilt it, it has stood perfectly.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is not the point. What we want to know is whether it is the policy of the government to have incompetent men as inspectors of important works. The minister must know that this is not the only case in which unqualified men have been appointed as inspectors of important public works. If the minister had been here a few years ago and had stood with me at the corner of this building and seen the new tower of the western block fall, he would realize more clearly the importance of having good inspectors. I understand that the inspector who had the supervision of the work on this tower had never seen stonework or brickwork in progress before. It cost the country many thousands of dollars to make good that mistake. We find that on dredging works the government have men who are not competent. They put on men who are mere labourers at $1.50 or $2.50 a day, and the running of the whole thing is left to the contractor. If, in order to give a law student a holiday with pay the government have caused serious loss to the country, this committee should know it.

Mr. AMES. There is a little more in this than appears on the surface, and enough to make it necessary to discuss it for a few minutes at any rate. Here was a work of considerable difficulty, because the first wharf constructed there had collapsed, and it was found necessary to rebuild, removing the old wharf. The wharf was built on a very peculiar bottom, and consequently the construction required engineering management of considerable skill. Now what was done? A young man, who is the son, I understand, of the federal member, and who is a law student, was sent up there for his summer holidays. He got $2.50 a day while he stayed there, and all his expenses, as well as $116 for his board and travelling expenses. He spent a very pleasant vacation in the neighbourhood, and came back again, having had his whole summer at the expense of the government. He resumed the study of law, and has I believe just been admitted to the bar.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the facts are as the hon. gentleman alleges, I will get the information about it as soon as I reasonably can.

Mr. FOSTER. Let the item stand in the meantime.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

PRINCE ALBERT AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company—Mr. Neely.

Mr. LENNOX. Last session preliminary steps were taken by the government to build a railway to Hudson bay and surveyors have been put in the field at considerable expense to the country. The map exhibited in the Railway Committee shows this line cutting through what is supposed to be the government line, which apparently runs to Fort Churchill while this line apparently is projected to reach Fort Nelson. It is stated that Mr. Armstrong, government engineer, has reported in effect that a suitable harbour cannot be obtained at Fort Churchill, and that while Fort Nelson harbour was none too good it can be made suitable by a considerable expenditure. We have had a flood of oratory if not of reason within the last few days about the desirability of free trade in railways, but we have also had the matured wisdom of several members of the government in earlier days impelling them to point out the inadvisability of multiplying railways in such a way that they may become an increased charge on the people. Every sane statesman recognizes that if you construct two lines of railway where there is only business for one, the charge in the end must fall on the people. There may be infinite possibilities for railway development in the direction of Hudson bay, but at present it is in the experimental stage, and if the country is to build a railway to Hudson bay there is no reason why we should encourage a competing line. We extended the Transcontinental Railway to Moncton and we were told by the government that we were forced into that position by the stupidity of the Tories in building the Intercolonial on its present location. The Minister of Railways has now a chance to prevent anything of that kind occurring in the future; he has the ball at his foot and I hope he will do the kicking on this occasion and see that these people do not get this charter if it is going to injuriously affect the government road. I see there is another charter sought for a railway to Hudson bay in addition to this one, and as the object of the government in building a line is to find a short route for our western grain to Liverpool, and not for the purpose of developing local traffic, it makes no difference whether these lines parallel each other or not, for so long as their destination is a port on the Hudson

bay they must be in competition. The minister did not refer to this matter in the Railway Committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is hard to get a word in there.

Mr. LENNOX. That is true, but I trust the hon. gentleman will now say there is a good deal of reason why we should hesitate to incorporate railway companies into that country at present. If the minister thinks it is all right I will not make a very big kick, but I hope it will not result in our having to buy out these charters as has been our experience in the past.

Mr. GRAHAM. The giving of a large number of charters over any particular territory does not mean that there will be a large number of railways in that territory. The difficulty in Canada is, and I suppose it is not peculiar to us, that the number of railways constructed is small in proportion to the number of charters granted. As to the building of more than one railway through any particular territory, my hon. friend's observations may in some cases be correct, but generally speaking it is against the well established usage of endeavouring to get competition in railway lines. If two stores exist where there would be only a good living for one, the argument of the hon. gentleman is that the people would pay more for their goods because the two stores would have to be maintained, and while he is right in theory he is wrong in practice, because competition would compel them to sell their goods lower so as to allow one of them at all events to live, and in the end it would be the survival of the fittest. Mr. Armstrong is an engineer sent out by the government to survey the route from Pas Mission to Fort Churchill, and if I remember correctly, his report is not that Fort Churchill would not provide a suitable harbour but that he has been given information which leads him to believe that Nelson might provide a better harbour. There is a greater difference of opinion on that point than I had thought existed until I read this report. It is only to-day I had a conversation with a man well known in Canada who made an exploration through that part of the country some years ago on behalf of the then Ontario government, and he is confident that Nelson is the better harbour of the two.

Mr. LENNOX. That coincides with Armstrong.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, but it is fair to say that Mr. Armstrong says his report is only based on information he had received. I may say frankly that it is my intention to have Mr. Armstrong survey the route to Nelson as well as to Churchill so that we may have information obtained from an actual survey, and I have an item in the estimates to pay for that. I think it would be wise to take what he has reported even if it is only hearsay information. The route to be taken by these roads is not the route of the government line. The government line starts at The Pas, and runs to Churchill or Nelson as the case may be. If it runs to Churchill, the distance is 497 miles. This road starts in the vicinity of Prince Albert, runs south to a certain point further east than our line, and then to Churchill. I am not sure that it would be wise to prevent these charters being granted, because I am a bit skeptical as to the number of railways that will be built to Hudson bay. My own opinion is that the country will be glad, and I shall be satisfied, if one railway is constructed at an early day. But I am not prepared to say that we ought not to grant a charter or two for a line to run from Prince Albert in the direction I have indicated, even if we should build a line of our own to Hudson bay. I may say to the committee that there was strong pressure brought to bear on the government to start our line from Prince Albert; a deputation waited upon the Minister of Railways and urged that view. I pointed out that they already had a charter for a line from Prince Albert, that that line was surveyed or would be surveyed, and that our idea was to give the most direct connection from the railways now in existence to Hudson bay. Conditions vary so much in different parts of the country that it is impossible to lay down a hard and fast rule as to railway charters. Under some conditions it is wise to give as many charters as are wanted in order to get a railway built, because there is the danger of refusing a charter to the people most apt to build it. There are circumstances when it would be unwise to grant new charters, as they might possibly injure a business enterprise about to be launched. We have to deal with the different projects on their merits. Personally I see no objection to giving charters for a dozen lines to Hudson bay.

Mr. LENNOX. It is true that if you have two grocery stores on opposite corners, the prices of goods may be reduced by competition; but our railway board is not working in that way. We have established it at considerable expense, which is likely to increase as the years go by, and the theory on which it is based is this, that it shall see that the tariffs of the railways are so adjusted that they shall have a reasonable return on capital, working expenses, and so on, and that consistently with that object the rates shall be reduced to the people as much as possible. So that the minister's argument in that respect does not apply to this case. It is exactly the opposite, if our railway board does its duty, as I expect it will. If you put two roads where there is only a legitimate

amount of traffic for one, the railway board, when it comes to adjust the rates, will have to allow such rates as will pay ordinary working expenses and a reasonable return on the capital invested. If one railway can serve the needs of that country for the time being, and the government, as I assume, are going to build a railway, and you have another railway built to serve the same purpose, whether it is exactly parallel or not, you will diminish the profits of both roads, and each will have to charge the traffic a larger amount than it would otherwise do. The minister mentioned that the government were urged to start their road from Prince Albert. That is a very effective answer to the argument which we have often heard in the Railway Committee and sometimes in this House, that we do not interfere with freedom of action by granting a charter. The minister says that by reason of the fact that there was already a charter granted for a line from Prince Albert, he decided that the government would not begin their railway from that point.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not quite say that. I stated as a fact that there was a charter for a road from Prince Albert, and that it was the object of the government to get the closest connection from the existing railways to the Hudson bay.

Mr. LENNOX. As I undersood, the minister was influenced by that fact, as a wise minister would be, because he would not want to build a railway over the same line for which there was already a charter. Where, as the minister himself suggests, one railway would probably serve the purpose completely for the present, we are not acting in the interest of the people or with good judgment if we grant this charter while we are contemplating building a road ourselves.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. I have a letter in my hand from a gentleman of the name of Mr. Green. It is dated Fort Churchill, and I received it to-day. He gives some information in regard to this matter which I think it might not be out of place to state to the House. He has been there all summer. I saw him in Prince Albert before he left, and he told me that when he reached Fort Churchill he would send me a letter. I would point out to the House that Prince Albert bears very much the same relation to Hudson bay that Winnipeg does to Fort William. There was a time when people thought that one railway from Winnipeg to Fort William would be quite sufficient, but we shall very soon have three, and one of them will be double tracked. We need have no fear whatever in granting charters for railways to Hudson bay. Hudson bay must ultimately be the outlet for the northern parts of both Saskatchewan and Alberta, and no doubt before many years we shall see a railway running from Edmonton to Athabasca lake and thence to Depot harbour on Chesterfield inlet; another from Prince Albert to Fort Churchill, and probably another running east of Lake Winnipeg to York Factory. The probability is that York Factory is the best harbour, but Fort Churchill from what I have heard can be made an exceedingly good harbour, and it is considerably nearer to Europe. We will need all these harbours. Of course the traffic will require to go through Hudson straits after leaving Fort Churchill. It is considerably nearer to Europe than Port Nelson. It is not fair to the northern part of Saskatchewan and Alberta to ask them to send their trade away round to Nelson, nearly 150 miles out of the way from Prince Albert. There are settlers seventy-five miles north of Prince Albert and you ask them to send their produce to Prince Albert, then across the Northern Saskatchewan and then afterwards the southern Saskatchewan, and then go way down out of their way in a circle and come back to the crossing of those rivers at La Pau. From all I can hear there are no great difficulties to be encountered between the north part of Prince Albert and Fort Churchill. My correspondent tells me that there are great mistakes being made in locating railways in that country. In some places the moss between Split lake and Port Nelson is so exceedingly thick that it acts as a cover for the frost, just like straw in an ice-house, and prevents the ground from thawing out in the summer. But when a railway shall be constructed and this moss disturbed and gathered up the heat of the sun will penetrate into the ground and very often the bottom will be very apt to go out of the railway. More than that, my correspondent tells me that from Split lake to Port Nelson a great deal of the ground is simply muskeg. It would appear, therefore, to be almost impossible to continue the road the government have had surveyed from La Pau by way of Split lake to Fort Churchill, and it will be necessary to go to Port Nelson some other way. I see no reason why we should not have three or four railways, and even at my age I hope to live to see the day when there will be a double tracked railway running from Prince Albert to Fort Churchill. The government need have no fear to grant a charter. If we get plenty of charters, no doubt some of the companies chartered will undertake to build.

There is another thing. A few days ago the Minister of Railways, in answer to a question I put him, told us that the Nelson river might in time become navigable. If that be the case, why should not the two Saskatchewan rivers also become navig-

able? We all know that the difficulty in these rivers is that they're full of shifting sand. The sand bars form so rapidly that it is difficult to continue navigation. There is an item of $21,000 to clear the boulders out of the northern Saskatchewan this year which means that it is expected to make it navigable. No doubt if we do not have navigation on these rivers, we will have two canals, one from Edmonton to Prince Albert, and the other following the course of the south Saskatchewan, and then we may expect that Prince Albert will grow to be a great deal larger than Winnipeg. The grain will be transhipped from these canals to the railway from Prince Albert to Fort Churchill. I desire also to draw attention to the fact that there is no doubt that Hudson bay is open for as long a period in the year, or nearly as long as Lake Superior. We must not forget that Lake Superior is frozen up for a great part of the year. And, from what I have read in history, and from what I know of Hudson bay, I am led to believe that the season of navigation there is as long as that on Lake Superior. I made reference before to the situation of Winnipeg in relation to Lake Superior being similar to that of Prince Albert in relation to Hudson bay. In 1811, we find, Lord Selkirk came into Hudson bay with the old 'Edward and Anne,' an old worn out ship, and with another ship that was no better, and brought in his settlers, landing them at York Factory. At that time, there were no lighthouses, no wireless telegraphy—none of the advantages and aids to navigation that can easily be provided now. If we had lighthouses, signal stations and wireless telegraphy, I have no doubt that it would be quite possible to navigate Hudson bay for several months longer every year than at the present time. We know that the ice drifts south from Fury and Hecla straits and Fox channel, and if it comes in that direction, it must be driven to the south of Hudson strait. That being so, there must be open water near the northern shore of Hudson strait, even at a season when that strait is now supposed to be blocked with ice. With modern facilities, there can be no reasonable doubt, Hudson bay will be open to navigation for as many days of the year as Lake Superior is. I do not think that we should hesitate to grant all the charters that are required.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. Before that order is passed, I would like to get an expression from the minister on a very important point. It is stated by the government that the matter of assisting the railways to Hudson bay is under consideration and that money will be voted for the purpose of bonusing or building the road. I would like to have a statement from the Minister of Railways on this point. If these charters are granted and the government should undertake to build a railway itself or assist a railway such as the Grand Trunk Pacific, will it undertake to compensate the holders of these charters for any expenditure they may have made or claim to have made while they were holding their charters. The moment the government steps in and proposes to bonus one of the companies holding a charter, the others will make a claim for compensation. It would be well for the minister to announce that there will be no compensation whatever in such a case. He will recollect many occasions when claims, in similar circumstances, were made for compensation by the holders of charters who never did anything with them. If we are going to give free trade in charters, which virtually is the policy of the railway committee, there should be a declaration by the government that any expenditure made by the holders of these charters, unless they proceed to build the road, will not be considered in fixing any compensation when the matter of bonuses comes up or the matter of building a railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are glad to grant these companies a privilege, and undertaking no obligation towards them whatever I could understand the situation when it would be fair that some compensation should be given a company holding a charter if this were the situation. Suppose a company had surveyed a certain route and the government stepped in and proposed to build on that route, it would be but right to compensate the company for the money it had spent in laying out that line. But except in such a case, the government has no intention whatever of giving any compensation.

Mr. BLAIN. I think that the government and parliament will have to be more careful in future in granting railway charters. It is only fair that great corporations, engaged in railway construction, should be treated generously by the government, but where promoters secure charters for other purposes than constructing the road, the government should be more careful. It is only fair that the government should state whether any of these gentlemen who are the provisional directors and who are not well known in Canada as railway constructors are bona fide railway men. Either the minister or the promoter of the Bill should be in a position to state this. They should be able to state whether there is any hope of the road being constructed under these directors or whether this charter is being obtained for the purpose of selling it to some other company.

Mr. NEELY. I have absolutely no personal interest in this Bill. I take charge of it because I believe the charter asked for is one that ought to be granted by this House. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) wants to know if the men whose names appear as provisional directors are, bona fide, seeking this charter for the purpose of building the road or seek it merely for speculative purposes. So far as I know, their intention is to build the road—not all of it right away, but a part of it. A part of this road is urgently needed at this time. From the city of Prince Albert north, east and west some sixty or seventy miles, there is a tract of country a considerable part of which is good farming land, and some of which is very fine timber country. Settlers are loath to go into that district because there is no railway accommodation. Therefore, the first sixty or seventy miles of this road would be in the nature of a colonization road. As the committee are aware, the local government of Saskatchewan is assisting branch lines and colonization roads to a very considerable extent, and the promoters of this company have every reason to believe that, as soon as they are prepared to go on with the work, they will be able to secure aid from the provincial government. So, I think I can assure my hon. friend that the charter is being asked for in good faith, for the purpose of building the railway. While I am on my feet, I may say that it rather surprised me to hear the remarks of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). Surely he is not aware of the condition of affairs in western Canada, or he would not state that one road to Hudson bay should and would meet the needs of western Canada.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister says that one railway will be enough at present.

Mr. NEELY. One railway may be enough by way of experiment—and we know that the value of the road to Hudson bay is somewhat experimental. But the people of western Canada believe that it is a feasible route and that, at no very distant day, a large part of the produce of western Canadian farms will be shipped by way of Hudson bay. Should that prove to be the case, the hon. gentleman, of course, will not ask us to believe that one railroad will be sufficient to carry the produce of our western Canadian prairies to the markets of the world. So far as the route of this road is concerned, it does not interfere, as I understand the matter, with the railway projected by the government. I was pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) in relation to granting this and similar charters to Hudson bay, and I hope that, in the interests of the people who wish to settle in the country north of Prince Albert, and in the interest of all western Canada, this charter will be granted.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I am sorry to have to disagree with my hon. friend from South Simcoe because I do not think the people of Canada care how many railroads run parallel to each other, provided they are built at the expense of the corporations who receive these charters. I do not see where any danger arises in this case. If this road were to be built right away, these people, of course, would never obtain any subsidies from the government. Except in the case of railways, which, to reach from point to point must go through some narrow pass which will not accommodate more than one road, I do not see why the government should exercise great care in giving charters as my hon. friend wants them to do. Where there is room for many roads, parliament may well charter these roads, to be built at the expense of those who receive the charter. Judging from the way the government have treated the province of Ontario in not subsidizing the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, we may believe that the government will leave these other people to build the roads at their own expense.

Mr. LENNOX. I want to make it plain that I do not oppose railways, but I want the people to have them on reasonable terms, that is, I want the government to do what is right. The government should either occupy this field or else give it up to others to occupy. If they are going to occupy that field, they should see that they serve it properly. We should not have the same thing happening that we had in reference to the Intercolonial, and after these roads are built be asked to buy the roads out. Would it not be better for the government to adopt a definite policy now and say: We will occupy that territory and serve it; or else get out of the field and let an ordinary company in.

Mr. GRAHAM. What policy would my hon. friend adopt, that the government should take hold, or get out and give it to a company?

Mr. LENNOX. When I occupy the place the hon. gentleman occupies, I will have a policy, and when that time comes I won't be afraid to tell the people what my policy is. When I occupy a position of that kind I will say: 'Gentlemen, we are going in there and we are going to occupy that field, but we will occupy it on terms profitable to the people that we represent as the government of Canada, and profitable to the people whom we are to serve in that region. We will have our feeders running into our trunk lines, and it will be a profitable enterprise.' But on the other hand, what the government are doing is this, they are going to build their railway, they are going to let others build feeders from Prince Albert and Port Nelson; we will have the lean

part of it, and the others will have the rich part, and we will pay for both.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Ottawa and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Devlin.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate La Compagnie du chemin de fer international de Rimouski.—Mr. Ross.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. J. D. Taylor.

Bill (No. 59)to incorporate the Victoria and Barkley Sound Railway Company.—Mr. Ralph Smith.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Burrard, Westminster Boundary Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Ralph Smith.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before we resume consideration of item 143 I would like to mention a matter for the information of my hon. friend the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). I am inclined to think that both he and I, when we spoke this afternoon, were acting upon a wrong interpretation which we had taken from the answer which I had given to the House, I was misled, and I think he was misled also, by the amount which was in the estimates when that matter was under consideration before the committee a few days ago. The amount printed in the estimates was $57,000; the amount which had been asked for by the chief architect was $37,000. My hon. friend knows that the figure 5 and the figure 3 very often look alike upon the carbon copy of typewritten paper. The amount should be $37,000 instead of $57,000. So the answer which was given by me on the 10th instant, and which appears upon page 2391 of 'Hansard,' was that the estimated cost of $96,000 covered the cost of the building, heating, fittings of all kinds and all those expenses which are set forth upon the same page. As a matter of fact, the information of the chief architect is that the total cost will be something under that, and may not exceed $94,000. I am very glad to be able to give that information to the committee. My hon. friend can look up the figures, and if he takes the memorandum which I gave and substitute $37,000 for $57,000, he will see how the error has occurred. I have no doubt he was misled by these figures, as I was myself. When we come finally to pass the item I will have the correction made. I regret that the error occurred, and I am very sorry if it was the means of causing any misunderstanding between my hon. friend and myself.

Mr. BARKER. What was the number of the item?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is in Ontario Public Bildings, item 132, Kingston Royal Military College, additional accommodation. $55,000 was voted last year, and $37,000 will entirely complete the building, and provide for heating, electric wiring, furnishing and fittings of all kinds.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am glad to hear the explanation given by the minister. I was seeking to ascertain where that money went. It seems to me the minister's explanation justifies the stand I took in endeavouring to find out. We discussed the item on the basis of $57,000 and on a total of $112,000, and dividing the $112,000 by 16 cottages we found that the total cost for each cottage was 7,000.

Of course if the item had been going through at $37,000 it would not have been necessary for me to ask so many questions.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What puzzled me was seeing the item at $57,000, and I had the memorandum of the chief architect that the total cost was $96,000. I am very glad I have been able to set the item right.

Mr. EDWARDS. I presume this item will be reduced as well as the other item for veterinary hospital, $15,000.

Clarke city, Seven Islands, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have telegraphed to Mr. Taché, the resident engineer, asking for information with regard to this young man, Mr. Girard, and may have it tonight. I find that Mr. Lamoureux was the engineer in charge, and it would be his duty to be constantly in attendance on the work. It has been the practice for a number of years for the resident engineers to take on young men, many of them students who are putting themselves through college and who wish to earn money for that purpose during the summer months by acting as rodmen or chainmen. I would be glad to have the item passed and would undertake to supply the information as soon as I receive it.

Mr. AMES. It would hardly seem that this young man would come under that class as he received the equivalent of $4 a day, $2.50 a day salary and his board and travelling expenses.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not fair to count the expenses in his wages.

Mr. BLAIN. What amount has been expended at this point?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A little over $102,000 altogether.

Mr. BLAIN. And what is the population of this place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know the population, but an exceedingly large industry has been established there, one of the largest manufacturing industries in Canada. The North Shore Power, Railway and Navigation Company have expended upwards of $2,000,000 and make daily freight shipments of 1,000 tons of pulp. The Quebec Steam Whaling Company have their headquarters there, with an investment of $200,000, and there are various other industries, so that altogether the investment of capital at Clarke City would be in the vicinity of $3,000,000. Several hundred hands are employed in these various industries.

Mr. BARKER. I would appeal to the minister that it is not fair to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who are endeavouring to criticise these items fairly and intelligently for him to ask to have items passed on his promise to bring down information asked for with reference to them. It is impossible for us to keep a check on the manner in which the minister carries out these promises so that we will know just what is being done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am quite sure the hon. member would not object if he understood that the information asked for in this case is with reference to the employment of a rodman or a chainman two years ago. The certificates of the engineer show that the work has been thoroughly well done. No good purpose can be served by delaying the passage of this item, as there will be ample opportunity at another time to criticise the employment of this young man.

Mr. BARKER. It is a frequent occurrence in this House for a minister to ask that an item be passed on the promise of giving at a future date information which he should have in his possession at the time. It is unbusinesslike and should not be allowed. If the minister says that the question has nothing to with the item let him say so, but if it has, then the item should not be passed until we get the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Surely I cannot be expected to have with me the names of all the young men who were employed on that work some years ago?

Mr. J. D. REID. There is no difficulty about finding out the name of this young man because his name, L. P. Girard, appears in the Auditor General's Report as having been paid for 92 days at $2.50 a day. The only other items in the Auditor General's Report in connection with this are for payments to Joseph Lamoureux, assistant engineer, and a payment to the North Shore Power Company for 500 feet of copper wire with 21 rings attaching pine plugs. This young man must have been inspecting that copper wire.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was for making the survey.

Mr. J. D. REID. You paid this young man Girard for every day in the week including Sunday. Was he inspecting anything on Sunday? The very fact that this item appears in such a form in the Auditor General's Report convinces me there is something wrong. It would appear that this young man was sent down there on his summer holidays to do nothing but sit around and draw his pay. It is said he is the son of one of the members of this House, and the minister can very soon get the information asked for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has to be got from Chicoutimi.

Mr. J. D. REID. Let the item stand then. The information will never be tendered to the House unless it is asked for again.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is so important you would not forget to ask.

Mr. J. D. REID. You paid this young man for Sundays as well as week days?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This young man was not paid out of this vote at all but out of the general vote for harbours and rivers and bridges, so that it is entirely possible he was engaged on the survey of the harbour at Clarke City. The practice in the past has been to pay inspectors for Sundays. Last session I said I would give directions that they should not be paid for Sundays and I did so and the practice now is not to pay for Sundays.

Mr. AMES. Mr. Lamoureux was the assistant engineer on the wharf and his name appears in this same item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was in charge of the survey too.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it not the practice in the Public Works Department for the inspector to make out the pay-lists and send them to the department? That practice is followed in the Department of Railways and Canals, and if so, did Mr. Lamoureux put Mr. Girard on the list?

Mr. BARKER. The minister says he has telegraphed for the information and that he will get it in the course of the evening and when he gets it the item can be discussed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Suppose we do not get a telegram to-night, will not the item be passed?

Mr. BARKER. We can consider that when the occasion arises.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will let the item stand for a little while.

Doucet's Landing—pile wharf, $1,000.

Mr. BOYCE. I should like to know what is the necessity for this wharf. It appears that there was a vote for it of $5,000 in 1906-7, which was revoted in 1907-8. The main necessity for this vote seems to have been the exigencies of a by-election, and the consequent expenditure upon a wharf from which the public in the county of Nicolet get absolutely no benefit whatever. There is there already, I believe, a wharf owned by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which, as the minister doubtless knows, is used by one small ferry, that is all; and yet when there comes a by-election and it is necessary in order to carry that election to practically buy the votes of the electorate, the Minister of Public Works does not hesitate to appropriate a further sum to carry on a work for which there appears to be absolutely no use. Let me remind the minister of the discussion which we had in this House only a few days ago, and of his pathetic expression of opinion as to the need of retrenchment in expenditure, and let me again emphasize what I then said, that the time had come, if he desired to appear before the people of Canada in an official capacity as being honest in his administration, when he should retrench where retrenchment was most desirable, and should not, in pursuance of a policy of pretended retrenchment, lavish public moneys foolishly and uselessly where they would not serve the public good. It is somewhat difficult to understand how the minister can persist in forcing through appropriations of this kind for works for which there appears to be absolutely no necessity, except the exigencies of the party to which he belongs, while he leaves the public service without the necessary buildings which the public service requires. I see by the Auditor General's Report of 1908, at page V—206, that $400 was paid for a right of way, that is, the approach to this wharf. Now, the minister will find in his department records of some correspondence that I had with him during the past two or three years with regard to payment for a right of way for a wharf he built at Echo bay in the district of West Algoma, and the minister there states that under no circumstances does the government pay for a right of way to a wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has the hon. gentleman that letter to which he refers?

Mr. BOYCE. I have not got the letter by me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman would surprise me very greatly if he could produce a letter like that.

Mr. BOYCE. That need not surprise the hon. gentleman. There are more surprising things than that which have been and will be brought to his attention. But what I want to emphasize is that, in my judgment and from the information I have, this wharf is not required in the public interest; that there is no shipping to use it; that the wharf there already is used only by a small ferry and answers all the purposes of the public, and that this expenditure is probably only for the purpose of assisting in the carrying of a by-election for this government.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I happen to know about this wharf, because for some months I was the member for the county of Nicolet, and it was during my tenure of that position that this wharf was initiated. My hon. friend is under a misapprehension as to that wharf not being needed for the traffic of the county of Nicolet, the tourist traffic and the lumber traffic. It is quite true, there is already one wharf at Doucet's landing or Ste. Angele in the county of Nicolet; but that wharf is the property of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which is the proprietor of the line running from Athabaska, the terminus of which is at Doucet's landing. The trouble is that that wharf is in a very poor condition, and is not fit for the ferry service between Three Rivers and the south shore. About four years ago the Delaware and Hudson Railway Company became the owner of the Quebec and South Shore Railway. The terminus of that railway at that time was Pierreville in the county of Yamaska; but when the Delaware and Hudson Railway Company became the proprietors of that road, they started to extend the railway, and at the present time it is constructed as far as Ste. Philoméne, in the county of Lotbinière. I might say that this is one of the most interesting districts in the province of Quebec; it is very rich and there is quite a trade in prospect for it with the construction of that new railway. The ferry service between Three Rivers and Doucet's landing could hardly use the Grand Trunk wharf, because it was in very poor condition, and the government were obliged every year to do some dredging at its extremity, and the Grand Trunk Company would contribute nothing towards the dredging or towards repairing the wharf. The government will not force the Grand Trunk Railway to make any repairs, but since the Delaware and Hudson have bought the Quebec and Southern Railway, they have started quite a business with the lumbering district in the St. Maurice region. Doucet's landing is exactly opposite Three Rivers. This serves not only Doucet's landing but Gentilly and Becancourt, a very large parish between Doucet landing and Gentilly. There is quite a large firm from Berlin, United States, which intends building a large pulp mill at that place and

the timber is to come from the St .Maurice river where this company has acquired very extensive limits. That wharf will serve for the lumber trade which comes over the St. Maurice river and which will be sent to the United States by the Delaware and Hudson.

Mr. BOYCE. When did the necessity arise for this?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The St. Maurice company has been in business quite a number of years but there was then no Delaware and Hudson. The old wharf is the property of the Grand Trunk Railway and any repairs done there would be for the benefit of the company. The government are pledged every year to do some dredging at the extremity of the wharf, while the present wharf although much shorter than the old one which is not our property, is in deeper water.

Mr. AMES. Will this appropriation finish that work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Will the Postmaster General tell us that we shall not have that wharf up again, once every four years?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not suppose you shall hear of it again.

Mr. BOYCE. How much has been spent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The original contract was $4,911.75 and the total expenditure $7,500. My hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) has made the statement that I wrote him that under no circumstances would my department pay for the right of way to a public wharf. In view of the fact that this is a vote for the right of way to this wharf and that I have asked for votes to pay for the rights of way to other wharfs, I would ask my hon. friend to produce the letted to which he refers. If he has any letter from me bearing on the subject of wharfs at West Algoma, I think he will find, if he will read over again, that it contains no such statement as the one he attributes to me.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman must not put words into my mouth which I did not say. No matter how exalted his position, he has no greater rights in this House than any other member, and I very strongly resent the attitude of the minister in endeavouring to thrust down my throat statements as having been made by me in this House which I did not make. I stated that I had communicated with his department and had received a communication from his department to the effect I mentioned. That is a communication upon which I think I can without difficulty lay my hands. I am quite willing to refer the hon. minister to that correspondence, but do not want him to endeavour to trap me into an apparent deviation from the actual line of truth by putting into my mouth the statement that I had correspondence with him and that he had written me such a letter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. 'Hansard' will show tomorrow whether the hon. gentleman made the statement or not. I certainly understood him to say that he had received a communication from me. I think he used the expression 'the minister,' but possibly not, and that the minister said that under no circumstances would the department pay for the right of way to a wharf. If he did not say that, that puts a different phase on the matter altogether. I wish to say that the department does, in cases where it is necessary, make a practice of paying for the right of way to public wharfs. It is necessary to do that in order to enable the public to have that enjoyment of a public wharf which parliament intended they should have.

Mr. BOYCE. Is that the principle, that the right of way shall be paid for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly, where it is necessary for the public enjoyment.

Mr. BOYCE. Where a wharf is built, the approach, as a right of way, shall be paid by the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. minister will find that his words are at variance with the correspondence from his department.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In the riding I represent there is a wharf at Grand Bay, and the entrance, which is not owned by the department, is the cause of considerable trouble. I would like to know whether the minister intends taking any action to secure the right of way?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have had considerable trouble with regard to that property, and are taking the necessary steps to expropriate with the view of vesting it in the Crown.

Douglastown pier—addition, $2,000.

Mr. AMES. What is the estimate of the total cost when finally completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to the 31st of March last, $22,528.52 was spent and we are requiring $2,000 more. I think that will complete the work.

Mr. AMES. I do not think so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it will do all we purpose doing at the present.

Mr. AMES. Then you will have something that is of no value.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is said this will enable steamers to stop safely at the wharf.

Mr. AMES. It will not enable anybody to get ashore.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is an isolated pier, of course.

Mr. AMES. Perhaps the minister will allow me to refresh his memory a little about this work. Douglastown is a very small point near Gaspé. There is practically no shipping there, though occasionally a steamer discharges a solitary passenger. The government has built a pier nearly one-third of a mile from the shore that is gradually, year by year with the expenditure of a few thousand dollars, creeping its way across the bay to the shore. It is already built some distance partly under water and partly above water. I suppose it is hoped that in the course of time, scores of years hence, perhaps, the land will be reached and the people will be able to go ashore without having to reship in a small boat. If the minister will let us know how much it is going to cost to actually complete this operation, perhaps the money could be voted, and we would not have this hardy annual coming up every session.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) is at bay, if I may so speak, about this matter——

Mr. AMES. Does the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) mean 'at sea?'

Mr. LEMIEUX. No at bay, because this is at the entrance to the Bay of Gaspé, one of the most exposed points of the whole coast of Gaspé. When the hon. gentleman says that Douglastown is a small settlement, he is at sea because it is one of the mose respectable settlements on the coast of Gaspé in point of numbers.

Mr. AMES. Six hundred people all told.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, that is quite a respectable settlement. Douglastown was settled more than a century ago by the United Empire loyalists, being one of the few places in Gaspé settled by the loyalists. The people there are fishermen. This is one of the points which are most exposed, and my hon. friend has heard of the terrible disaster which took place there some years ago. The fishermen at Douglastown and Point Peter, the next settlement, fish on what are called the Orphan's banks off New Brunswick. They leave on Monday morning and come back on Friday evening the principal season being the fall of the year. The only protection they have in their harbour is this block; it is not a wharf, but a breakwater. It has rendered valuable service to the fishermen at that point. The hon. gentleman is also unjust —unwittingly, I hope— when he says that Douglastown will always be a small place. He has travelled in that country and he knows that the railway is under construction. By the end of next summer the line—the Atlantic, Quebec, and Western Railway Company's line—will have reached Douglastown and the Bay of Gaspé. The terminus will not be far from Douglastown, and that place will become a very important settlement. There is already quite a trade at that point.

Mr. AMES. What I want to know from the Minister of Public Works is how long it is going to take and what it is going to cost to have this Douglastown pier connected with the mainland, as, I suppose, is expected to be done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My department has no intention, and I have no intention, of connecting that pier with the shore. For reasons which the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has given, the pier is of very great service without being so connected. It is a breakwater and affords shelter for fishermen and others which entirely justifies its construction. Not having any present intention of connecting it with the shore, I have not prepared an estimate of the cost of doing so. It will be time enough to prepare such an estimate when we contemplate doing the work.

Mr. AMES. Is it not a fact that at present it is a danger to navigation with a considerable portion of it under water?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not. Every breakwater must have a portion of it under water.

Father point—wharf repairs, $1,000.

Mr. AMES. I am sorry that, in this case, I cannot agree with the minister in his cutting down of his estimates. It is understood that some money was to be spent at Father Point, but, evidently, this is abandoned, and only $1,000 asked for to make small repairs. I am one of those who believe that Father Point should be developed so that ocean steamers passing up the gulf could stop there and discharge mails. There is not a deep water wharf between Gaspé and Quebec, and I do not know any place where steamers could actually stop close by the shore except at Father Point. I hope this will be taken into consideration, and that, when the finances of the country permit it, the work will be proceeded with.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is true that the best point for landing passengers from ocean steamers would be Father Point, but for some reason, probably political, forty or fifty years ago, Rimouski was selected as the landing place. There is a splendid wharf there nearly a mile long. In order

to divert the landing place from Rimouski to Father Point, a large expenditure will be necessary, because you would have to extend the Intercolonial Railway at a cost of something like $200,000 to afford the facilities which we now have at Rimouski.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member (Mr. Ames) is aware that we have dropped an amount from the estimates and are only asking for $1,000 for Father Point. The Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) I think, has in mind only a part of the cost of the works. The cost is estimated at a minimum of $250,000, and it may run to $750,000 before the work is finished. I regretted that I was obliged to drop the amount, but we had to do it in pursuance with our policy of retrenchment.

Garthby—wharf on Lake Aylmer, $500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to construct a roof over the head block of the landing pier.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister give us some information about this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A landing pier has been built at Garthby, on Lake Aylmer, the total expenditure, including the amount now asked for, being $5,178.30. This is to put on a roof for the shelter of the people who come to take the steamer.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any revenue from that wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure whether it has been transferred to the Marine Department or not.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the policy of the government with respect to transferring these wharfs? Are they transferred as soon as completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not always. The policy is, generally speaking, to make transfers to the Marine Department, but in quite a number of cases, ever since the government has been building wharfs, there has been an objection to transferring the wharfs to the Marine Department, for that would mean that tolls would be collected from the farmers and others, who would find it burdensome. Owing to the hardship involved and the pressure brought to bear, it has been urged on the department to delay making the transfer. That is true of all governments, ever since confederation. I know some cases where wharfs were built twenty years ago and have never been transferred to the Marine Department. I may say that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and myself have been conferring upon the subject, and endeavouring to arrive at some rule for the use of these wharfs at which small business is done. We think it would be well to take power to make an arrangement with the steamboat companies which come to the wharfs that they should pay a small wharfage sufficient to keep the wharfs in repair, so that the department will be saved the necessity of exacting tolls from farmers and others in respect to top wharfage. The House may be asked to consider a Bill which will give power to the Department of Marine to enter into arrangements of that character. But it is only after the wharfs are transferred that wharfage can be collected.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the population?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Between 300 and 400.

Mr. AMES. Can the minister tell us whether there is any steamer on this lake doing business?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. AMES. For how much of the year does the steam ferry service run?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know there is a ferry running between Stratford and Garthby, I presume during the ordinary season.

Mr. AMES. It is built principally for summer residents, is it not?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Lake Aylmer is frequented by a large number of tourists.

Mr. BLAIN. Before this work was commenced, did the minister send his engineer to report upon the necessity of the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was undertaken before I became minister. But there was a report from the engineer on the 15th of January, 1907.

Gaspé—deep water wharf, $10,000.

Mr. AMES. How much does the minister intend to expend at the terminus of the new railroad at Gaspé?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give, with any degree of accuracy, an estimate of the cost. We propose to make a careful examination, and then see how much it will be necessary to build at first in order to give the needed accommodation to the railway. Just how much would be expended, evidently would depend upon the extent of shipping and the extent of accommodation which will be required.

Mr. LEMIEUX. A few days ago I met the engineer of the railroad company. He had prepared a plan and submitted it to the Department of Public Works, for a wharf which was going to be the terminus of the railway. According to that plan his estimate of the cost would be something like $75,000 to $80,000. I told the engineer that the railway company need not expect that the government would spend so large an amount of money for the terminus of the railway. I understand he has since had an interview with the engineer of the Public Works Department,

and they have so far modified the plan as to reduce the cost of the proposed wharf by something like $35,000. The wharf will be at the terminus of the railway company. Ths rails will be laid within 15 or 16 months. The railway has reached more than half way now, and next summer will reach Pabos. In 18 or 19 months the whole line should be in operation, and I can assure my hon. friend that they are building a splendid line. They intend to have steamers plying between England and Canada at Gaspé. As my hon. friend knows, the harbour of Gaspé is one of the finest in the Dominion. I have the authority of Commander Wakeham to say that the harbour is open for navigation for at least nine months of the year, some say ten months, and in some years during the whole year. When this railway is built and proper facilities are given to that steamship company, Gaspé will afford the shortest route between Canada and Europe.

Mr. AMES. There is no question as to the importance of having proper terminal facilities when the railroad reaches Gaspé. But I would like to know what is the government's policy now in connection with the terminus of a railroad line. We have just had it enunciated that at Doucet's landing it was necessary to build a new wharf to be occupied by a railway company. Now we are starting with a new proposition. Is the government going to build a wharf that this railroad will occupy.

Mr LEMIEUX. Not exclusively.

Mr. AMES. Are they going to make an arrangement between the railroad and the government whereby they will divide the cost?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That would be a proper thing.

Mr. AMES. I would like to ascertain the policy of the government. Here we have, so to speak, a new proposition, with no entangling alliances and no vested rights. A railroad is coming down to the sea-board, and how is the cost of the terminal facilities to be borne? Is the government to pay for that, or will they make an arrangement with the railway company to pay for it mutually? If the wharf is built with public money, will anybody beside the railroad have use of it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no hard and fast rule with regard to building wharfs for the use of railways. Of course, this wharf being built by the government, owned and controlled by the government, will be open to the use of the public equally with the railroad company. The same facilities will be given to whoever wishes to use the wharf. Speaking generally, a great deal depends upon circumstances. In the case of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway, we are doing the dredging work for their new harbours at Tiffin and Victoria, while the railway companies are building the wharfs and other terminal facilities. We do the dredging, yet we feel that these companies, having now been in operation a good many years, are well able to build the wharfs themselves. In the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific at Fort William, which we regard as a part of the great transportation system of the country, we are doing the dredging and we are also building certain revetement walls which will be used as a part of the system of wharfage and for an essential part of the terminal facilities. There we will control in the interests of the public the wharfs and will have the right to say what tolls will be charged, and to give equal privileges to all vessels which desire to use those facilities. We think in the public interest we should do this. In the city of St. John, up to quite recently, the government has only done the dredging. The city of St. John and the Canadian Pacific Railway, but principally the city of St. John, has provided the wharfage facilities. The government is now building a wharf there which will be used in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. In many smaller towns we are building wharfs which are used in connection with railroads, but which are built at the government expense. At the city of Quebec we are building a new wharf upon the St. Lawrence and the St. Charles rivers in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but the government is building that wharf at its own expense and will, subject possibly to an arrangement with the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, control the wharf tolls and the access of vessels to it in the public interest, so that there is no hard and fast rule, as I have said. In the case of Levis we have just bought a property with the approval of parliament for the purpose of constructing on the Carriere-Lane property a deep water wharf which will probably be used by all the railways centreing at Levis, the Delaware and Hudson, the Grand Trunk, the Intercolonial Railway and no doubt in a short time the Grand Trunk Pacific. We must be guided largely by circumstances, and I do not think it would be possible to lay down a hard and fast rule which would apply to all cases.

Mr. AMES. As we are always trying to do something in a better way than it has been done before, would not this be a good opportunity to test the best way in which there could be co-operation between the government and the railway company in the building of a wharf?

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I have a lettter from the Board of Trade of New Liskeard asking me if anything has been done with regard to the building of a wharf in that town. It seems that the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway have agreed to build a track from the main line down to the bay as soon as this wharf is built.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no amount in the estimates for a wharf at New Liskeard and therefore I am not able to give my hon. friend any assurance that a wharf will be built during the present year; but I would suggest to my hon. friend whether, in view of the fact that we are retrenching in connection with the building of wharfs as well as other public works, the Ontario government, as owners of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, which is hauling in enormous quantities of freight, vast numbers of passengers, and is receiving enormous revenues as royalties from the development of that country, should not build these wharfs needed there for the purpose of giving terminal facilities, in connection with their railroad. Instead of coming to this government and asking us to give these terminal facilities, let them do what this government is doing in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. It is building terminal facilities, building wharfs, dredging harbours and giving all the accommodation which is needed fo the Intercolonial Railway at the various harbours and various lakes touched by the Intercolonial Railway system. I recognize that in that northern country, upon Lake Temiskaming, the Montreal river and the Gowganda country, where thousands of people are going, the people should address themselves at this time to the Ontario government and get them to provide terminal facilities in connection with this railroad which is doing such an immense business as a result of the marvellous development taking place in that country.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. Am I to understand that great sums of money should be spent by the federal government in places where comparatively little business is done, and that in Ontario when places require wharfs if they are doing a large business, the minister would like the people to put up their own money instead of federal money. I do not think it is fair or right.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The province of Ontario is benefiting enormously in a financial way by this development.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. Does not the Quebec government benefit from the development there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At all events there is nothing in the estimates for it.

Quebec harbours and rivers, and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $48,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the general vote.

Mr. PRICE. Will the minister give us some information about this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make repairs to the various wharfs in the province of Quebec and improvements to rivers and harbours in respect of which there is no specific vote.

Mr. PRICE. How about bridges?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That expression is used generally all over the country but it applies more particularly, in fact entirely, to the repairs of bridges that would be called interprovincial bridges. There are several bridges across the Ottawa north of here. My deputy informs me that there is one bridge in Ontario, in Haldimand county, which was built by the government many years ago which we keep in repair.

Mr. AMES. Does the minister affirm that the government have built no bridges in Quebec?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. AMES. Would he ask his engineer to examine the bridge between St. Francois de Salle and Terrebonne? The government spent $20,000 in building concrete piers in a rapid running river upon which a bridge has been built.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would that not be a case where the municipality utilized the wharf as a foundation? The government did not build the bridge.

Mr. AMES. The government built all the piers.

Lake St. Francis (Beauce)—wharfs, $5,000.

Mr. PRICE. Is my information correct that there is no navigation on Lake St. Francis except for pleasure boats?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am informed that there is traffic in taking farm produce to market, but the principal passenger travel is in summer tourists.

Mr. PRICE. Considering the small amount of navigation on this lake it seems to me that an expenditure of $8,000 for a wharf is a little too stiff.

Mr. BELAND. It is for two wharfs, one at the upper end and one at the lower end of the lake. Lake St. Francis is twenty-one miles long and is situated in the counties of Beauce, Megantic and Wolfe. There are three boats plying on the lake.

Mr. PRICE. What kind?

Mr. BELAND. One steamer and two gasolene.

Mr. PRICE. Large or small?

Mr. BELAND. The steamer is large enough to carry the produce of the farmers

in the spring. The upper end of the lake is seven miles from a railway station, while the lower end is only one mile distant from the railway, and as the roads from the upper end to the lower end are impassable in the spring it is necessary to have crafts on the lake to carry the dairy products to where they can be transferred to the railway. There is an extensive lumber trade on Lake St. Francis. These wharfs have been petitioned for by every farmer in the vicinity.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON. The lumber trade on that lake is so extensive that one steamer and two gasolenes can accommodate it.

Mr. BELAND. At present the steamers have to anchor in the lake as there is no wharf, and of course that is highly inconvenient. There is no strong current on the lake and the logs are towed by these small boats.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON. Well, just previous to the last election in my district, my opponent in the Liberal interest promised that a wharf would be built at Liskeard, which is a town of 3,000 inhabitants. There is a dredge doing considerable work there and that work is absolutely useless until a wharf is constructed. Also, previous to the election my opponent promised that a wharf would be built at the small town of Cache Bay where there is quite an extensive lumbering industry, but there is no appropriation in the estimates for it this year. The Minister of Public Works has laid down the principle tonight that in other provinces small places where little business is done are to have wharfs, but when I make an appeal on behalf of certain places in the province of Ontario he advises me to ask the Ontario government for help. That is neither right nor fair. I am young in this game, as some one called it to-day, but if that is the political game I don't think much of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I laid down the principle which has influenced the Grand Trunk Railway and other railway companies to give terminal facilities in connection with their railway without appealing to the government for every little wharf. Here is the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway touching the Montreal river and Lake Temiskaming at different points, and expecting to reach Lake Gowganda, and I do not see why the Ontario government or these commissioners ought not to build wharfs to accommodate their traffic as other railways do.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Why didn't the Grand Trunk do that at Lévis?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Grand Trunk has done it at various places, and the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company have wharfs up and down the St. Lawrence. The hon. gentleman goes on the principle that notwithstanding all that the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway is earning it should do absolutely nothing for the accommodation of the people to make connection between its railway and the water, but that it should come to this government, at a time when our revenues are not buoyant, and ask us to assist that railway which is amply able to give to the people the requisite accommodation. However, although I would be glad to have an appropriation in the estimates for a wharf at New Liskeard this year I am obliged to defer it for the present.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON. The minister knows that the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway is about the only road in Canada that has not been heavily subsidized by the Dominion government. Not only has the federal government not contributed one cent to this road, but the minister now goes further and says that the railways should build, with the moneys of the province of Ontario, wharfs, which in other provinces are built by this government for railways that have been heavily subsidized. It is unfair and unjust to discriminate against Ontario in this way.

Lake St. John—dredging, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a government dredge there and this is to pay the expense.

Mr. AMES. This is to keep the dredge in operation during the summer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Lake St. John—piers, repairs, &c., $4,000.

Mr. AMES. Are all the office charges of the engineer at Chicoutimi charged against this vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Any services performed by the engineers or inspectors in connection with these different wharfs would be payable out of this vote.

Mr. AMES. That is not my point. My point is whether the office staff expenses and all the charges of the local engineer at Chicoutimi are not charged to the Lake St. John wharfs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I think not. They would be paid out of the vote for the outside engineering staff.

Mr. AMES. As a matter of book-keeping it is very confusing. If the hon. gentleman will consult the Auditor General's Report he will find that these are charged to the Lake St. John wharfs, although Lake St. John is fifty or sixty miles from where the engineer lives.

Magadalen Islands, break-waters and piers, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for a number of improvements.

Mr. AMES. Last year the minister told us that the $12,000 which was then voted would absolutely complete the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer, who was present last year, told me that that amount would complete the work which was then under construction or contemplated, but I am not quite sure whether further expenditure would not be required on new work. As there are a number of piers on the Magdalen islands there is work required there every year.

Mr. AMES. What work is expected this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the works begun at Point Bass, Grindstone and Amherst piers, Basin Point—quite a number have to be constructed with a view to affording shelter and better harbour accommodation.

Mistook wharf, lake St. John—repairs, $1,000.

Mr. AMES. I would like the minister to see if this information is not correct in respect to this work. Mistook is a little place on Lake St. John, a mile and a half from the main road. There is not a house in the locality, and the money spent last year, I am informed, was spent in building a road from the wharf to the main road, about a mile and a half through the woods. The question arises whether we have to build for the people of Saguenay county not only their wharfs, but their roads to connect the wharfs with the main arteries of commerce.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This wharf was built in 1903-4. I do not know what representations were made or the exact location of the wharf; but I may say that it has been very badly damaged by the northwest storms which swept over Lake St. John during the unusually high spring floods of 1908. Whatever criticism there may have been for erecting the wharf in the first place, it being there and being damaged, it would hardly be right to allow it to be destroyed completely, and we are asking for this small sum for the purpose of repairing it.

Mr. AMES. Will the minister give us his assurance that this money will be spent on the wharf, and will not be used in improving the roads?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, certainly.

Rimouski wharf—sheathing west side, $8,000.

Mr. AMES. There is a great deal of public work going on at Rimouski which I think is open to criticism. There is an extremely large bill every year for dredging in the neighbourhood of this wharf. I am quite familiar with the place, and it seems to me that the government are dredging to no purpose, but are simply wasting the money of the country at that point. The dredging channel is through soft, shifting sand, and the dredges are working on a line running north and south, while the current sweeps east and west, and the current of the river sweeps across the bay in the same direction, so that the sand is going back again, almost as fast as it is dug out. I think money should be spent in dredging at Rimouski, but not in the way most of it is being spent.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As Postmaster General, I am somewhat familiar with the condition of the Rimouski wharf. When the question of the repairs to the wharf at Father Point came up, I stated that forty or fifty years ago, when the landing pier for Atlantic passengers was selected, it was decided that it should be at Father Point and not at Rimouski. However, the government of the day selected Rimouski, and the wharf there is about a mile long. The river at Rimouski. as my hon. friend says, empties not very far from that wharf, and consequently drives the sand along the wharf. When two years ago we purchased a new tender for the service, the tender was for three or four months unable to reach Rimouski wharf, and that is how I happen to know about the dredging. Since that time some good work has been done by the dredges of the Department of Public Works, and the channel has been widened and deepened. I do not know how the government can stop dredging every two or three years at that wharf for the very reason given by my hon. friend a moment ago. The wharf was built too close to the river Rimouski and there is shifting sand at that point. Not only will dredging have to be continued near that long wharf, but there must be some dredging done in the river itself, because there are at the entrance to the river some very considerable lumbering establishments. I think that the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Price) is largely interested in that district. The Prices have been interested there for years, and some dredging is needed for the lumber trade at the entrance to the river. Since ten or fifteen years that trade has developed considerably. It is the main trade of the district, and I do not see how the government can avoid spending some money on dredging at that point. But I admit it is very difficult on account of the sand which accumulates and is carried away by the river.

Mr. AMES. Undoubtedly you continue the dredging which is being done by the General Construction Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is dredging for the accommodation of the mail steamers.

Last year we had our own dredge there and we purpose continuing the dredging this year. The present vote is for the purpose of building and driving a row of piles around the wharf so as to enable dredging to be done close up to the wharf for the accommodation of the mail steamers.

Rivière Bonaventure training pier, $9,000.

Mr. AMES. This is an extremely absurd expenditure. There are many other ways in which we could invest that money better than by building a wharf at the Bonaventure river which cannot be reached by any steamer. There is not water enough at the far end, it is only used by four or five fishing boats, and the cost is entirely out of proportion to any benefit derived from it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why is it called a training pier?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because it gives direction to the current so as to preserve navigation.

Mr. AMES. It cannot be reached by any steamer. The farmers do not use it for taking out material and the railway runs right through the town. We have already spent $24,000, and are now going to spend $9,000 more on this useless wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to pay for the completion of the work. I must confess that I am not sufficiently familiar with the locality to give very accurate information as to the necessity for the work. I find however, that the rivière Bonaventure was represented to the department as one of the largest streams in the Baie des Chaleurs district and that the harbour at the mouth is the most important lumbering point in Bonaventure county. The channel which leads to the inner harbour was being constantly filled in with sand and the building of this training pier will give a certain direction to the current which will scour out the channel and prevent the necessity of expensive dredging from year to year.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. If there is no shipping what is the use of it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is very considerable shipping done.

Mr. AMES. If the minister investigates, he will find that it is a very much less important than a good many other items he struck out of his estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was under contract and I have to pay for it.

River Richelieu improvements, $60,000.

Mr. AMES. We shall want very full details in connection with that expenditure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The matter was brought to my notice shortly after I became minister and I found it had been under consideration a considerable time before that. It appears that in the season of floods the Richelieu river overflows its banks with the result that about 30,000 acres of what would otherwise be most valuable farming land is annually flooded. The hon. gentleman can see that land situated as this is in a well settled district would be of very considerable value if it could be saved from this great damage occurring yearly. The object sought to be obtained by the improvements to the river is to give such vent to it during the season of flooding that this overflow will be prevented. Upon the recommendation of the engineers of the department the government have asked parliament for the authority to enter upon this work. As a result we have had the plans prepared, and we are engaged in doing what may be called dredging work—removing boulders and rocks from the bed of the river at the point where the obstruction exists. We propose following that up with the construction of a movable dam in the river, and we believe that the effect will be to somewhat improve the navigation of the river for some distance above the obstruction, and also to somewhat improve the navigation of the Chambly canal, and be of enormous benefit to the people living on either side of the Richelieu river. The cost is estimated at $185,000. We are asking this year for $60,000. We did a good deal of work last year. We first ask for tenders, but when these came in we thought they were too high. After careful consideration and consultation between the resident engineer, Mr. Michaud, who is a very competent man, a man of experience and of excellent judgment, and the chief engineer of the department, it was decided that we could get the work done cheaper by providing a dredge and doing the work with our own plant. I am happy to say that we have saved a considerable amount of money, because we get the work done more cheaply than if we had accepted the owest tender. I believe that the contracors felt that there was considerable risk in connection with the piers of the bridge, and they did not tender at the price that we can do the work for. The whole counry is interested in this work, and the people there believe that the results we hope or will be obtained, and their opinion is ortified by the opinion of engineering exerts.

Mr. JOS. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, as this vote interests particularly my county, I desire to say a few words on this important subject. I am somewhat surprised to see that we have yet to discuss this item to-night, an item which is not new to this House. During the years 1907 and 1908, this parliament voted different sums of money to improve the situation of the farmers of

that district. Last year the honourable Minister of Public Works has given very plain statements on this subject. However, as there are in the House this year many new members who might take an interest in this question, I will take the liberty to add a few explanations to those already given by the hon. minister.

For a great many years, that is to say, since the construction of the Chambly canal, the farmers of the counties of St. John, Missisquoi, Iberville, have complained to the federal government about the grievous situation in which they were put by a construction of this canal. The lands in the vicinity are very low and their irrigation is naturally very difficult. A very small obstruction will sometimes prevent the flowing of the waters and will cause very disastrous floods. The natural difficulties of the irrigation of these lands have also been increased by the construction of the Chambly canal which had the effect of narrowing the width of the river by 200 to 300 feet. Since the deepening of this canal other obstructions have been added to those already existing: First, the construction of the two bridges, one by the Central Vermont and the other by the Canadian Pacific railway, two companies incorporated by this parliament. Secondly built on each side of the river, with the authorization of the federal parliament; important fisheries were established, and this has necessitated the construction of new weirs which prevented the flowing of the water, so that we have opposite St. John a most complete dam.

For a very long time, as I have said, the farmers of the district have sent petitions signed by every inhabitant of the vicinity. Numerous deputations were sent to Ottawa year after year at large sacrifices. These representations were all unsuccessful up to 1900, when the federal government gave instructions to competent engineers to make a survey of the flooded lands and an estimate of the damages. These engineers were also asked to find the cause of the floods, and to indicate the means of stopping them.

Upon their report the government placed an item of $5,000 in the estimates to begin the works. But this sum being evidently too small, no money was expended. In 1907 another vote was granted, the government admitting thus, and for the second time, their responsibility in the matter. The vote at that time was $10,000. When the government was about to spend that money came another objection. We had to submit the question to the International Commission on Waterways, because the proposed works might affect the waters of Lake Champlain. The commission decided on the 24th of October, 1907, that this work could go on without any prejudice to the rights of the United States on Lake Champlain.

Following this decision the government placed in the estimates of last year for the preliminary work to be done, an item of $30,000, out of which $18,000 have been spent up to the present. This year, besides the amount voted last year, the additional sum of $30,000 is asked to continue the deepening of the River Richelieu opposite St. John, on a length of 4,000 feet, a width of 700 feet and an average depth of 5 feet. As this dredging will hinder the navigation because it will open a wider passage for the waters, it will be necessary to build a movable dam that will be opened and closed whenever needed. For instance, in the spring, during the month of April, the dam might be opened so as to allow a rapid effusion of the water, but it will be closed gradually after that so as to have always in the river, for the needs of the navigation, during the low water season, more water than we have presently in that season.

These works will not only stop the floods, but will save the government the expenditure of $75,000 or $100,000, a sum which the dredging of the River Richelieu between St. John and Rouse's Point to supply the needs of the navigation would have come to. Besides that, these works will save to the government considerable expenditure which we would be obliged to make for the dredging of the Chambly canal, which is not deep enough for the needs of navigation because you will have then in the canal an additional foot and a half of water during the low waters. I take those figures from the calculations made by the engineers themselves.

The lands flooded are of considerable extent. These engineers estimate that there are 25,000 acres completely lost for agriculture. These lands are of first quality; they are alluvial soil of the best kind and of the most fertile that there are in the country. I think I am not mistaken when saying that the farmers of that district are losing annually and since a very long time more than $125,000 by reason of the obstacles created by the different railway companies and other causes of which I have spoken a few minutes ago. The government three or four years ago, set itself to perform an act of justice which, I hope, it will have no difficulty in completing.

Mr. AMES. (Translation.) I will ask the honourable member, who has so well explained the situation, if it is not to his knowledge that a plan has been submitted to the government for the construction of a dam at the mouth of Lake Champlain, in order to use the lake as a reservoir instead of the present plan.

Mr. DEMERS. (Translation.) I have never heard of it.

Mr. AMES. (Translation.) I had a talk the other day with an engineer who seemed to understand the question thoroughly; he told me that in his opinion this was the best solution. I desire simply to ask the Minister of Public Works to take the suggestion into consideration.

I may state for the benefit of the minister that in conversation recently with an eminent engineer who is familiar with all the circumstances, he suggested that it would be possible to erect a dam near Lake Champlain so that the lake could be used as a reservoir, somewhat after the principle of the Assouan dam in Egypt, and the water could be permitted to go out more regularly throughout the season.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would approach the construction of a dam at Lake Champlain with great hesitation, because of the great value of the property which would be flooded upon the shores of the lake by the erection of a dam. The damages would be simply enormous; and it would have to be an international dam also.

Mr. AMES. I did not mean a dam that would be high enough to flood the waters, but a dam that would prevent the lake from reaching the extreme low level in the summer, making of it a reservoir.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All along the shores of Lake Champlain the water is high in the spring, but it recedes in summer, and people cultivate the land upon the shores of the lake. But the moment you hold the water back to a high level, you flood all the land in the dry season when it is capable of being put under cultivation. We had a little experience of that in Lake Nipissing. We thought we could hold the water back at high level, and we found enormous claims coming in, even there; and we have been obliged to alter the plan and give vent to the water so as not to retain it at the high level.

Mr. AMES. In this case the root of the evil is a little further back than appears on the surface. In the early days when the Adirondacks and the Green Mountains were wooded, and before all the timber was off, the water came down gradually into the lake and went out gradually. Now that the timber has been cut off the result is heavy spring freshets that raise the lake and cause a large efflux of water.

Mr. DEMERS. If we were to construct a dam near Rouses Point, what would happen to the navigation between St. John and Rouses Point?

Mr. AMES. The idea this engineer expressed was that if a dam was constructed near Rouse's Point the movement of the water flowing out could be regulated during the summer so that the extreme low level would not be reached.

Some resolutions reported.

INSURANCE ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. FIELDING moved the second reading of Bill (No. 97) respecting insurance. He said: It was intimated when I introduced the Bill that we should send it quickly to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. I think the general disposition of the House is so to send it, with the understanding that no hon. member is committed to it in any respect, but that every one will have full opportunity for discussing it in committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 15, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

WESTERN CANADIAN LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 37) to incorporate the Western Canadian Life Assurance Company—Mr. Knowles.

On section 6—policy-holders and directors.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is this in accordance with the Insurance Act ?

Mr. FIELDING. A clause in this Bill provides that if in any respect its provisions are found to be at variance with those of the Insurance Act as finally passed, the general Act will prevail.

On section 11—Notice of annual meeting.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be well for us to fix a certain date before which the annual meeting should take place, so that the company could send in its returns to the government at the proper time. We have such a provision in all Railway Bills, and it seems to me we ought to have a similar one in Insurance Bills.

Mr. FIELDING. The returns must be made at certain dates, and the presumption is that the company will hold the annual meeting early enough to enable that to be done.

On section 15—Distribution of profits.

Mr. SPROULE. This Bill is a little more definite in regard to what is meant by pro-

fits than another Bill which is before the House. They are here stated to be net profits. I think that in all Bills of this kind, it should be made clear that the policyholder shall be entitled to share in all the profits of the company instead of a portion of the profits; because the insurance companies resort to so many devices to put away their money, which is really earned from the policy-holders, that the participating policy-holder does not share in the profits in the proportion that he should. That is clearly the case in the Canada Life Bill, and I take it that it will be the same in this case. If this company, like the Canada Life, were to set apart a certain portion of the earnings every year as a reserve to strengthen the company, that money would really come from the policy-holders, and would be a portion of the profits in which they would have no share at all. It seems to me that there should be a clear and definite statement of what is meant by the distribution of profits as between the policy-holders and the stock holders.

Mr. FIELDING. The provisions of this Bill follow precisely the same lines as those of other Bills of similar character, and I would suggest to my hon. friend whether, if he wishes to press his view, he might more properly do so in connection with the general Bill, so that if there be an amendment made, it will apply to all.

Mr. SPROULE. If I were sure that there would be a general Act passed this session, and that it would contain a clause providing for this, I would have no objection; but it is because of the knowledge I have of the operations of insurance companies and of the difficulties that have arisen in the past on account of the ambiguity of the clauses relating to profits as between policyholders and stock holders, that I mention the matter. When we were dealing with the Canada Life Bill, the solicitor of the company said that it was a very far-reaching Bill. If the law as declared by Sir Robert Finlay with regard to the Canada Life prevails, and were not corrected by parliament, it would affect every life insurance company in the country doing business on the participating policy plan, and the participating policy-holder would properly demand and would be entitled to receive a much larger share of the profits than he has received heretofore. If we allow the provision before us, which has led to this difficulty, it seems to me that we shall be perpetuating something which has been declared to be very defective and not understandable, and I think we should take the earliest opportunity to make it so understandable and clear as to make it impossible for either the public or the companies or their agents to misunderstand it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I think it would be entirely contrary to the spirit of the British North America Act, and the jurisdiction of this parliament over civil contracts to have any further clauses of this kind included in insurance company charters. I think that a plain provision that the directors would have the power to make such a division of the profits with the participating policyholders as they might from time to time deem necessary, is all the power we should give them. But in this clause we undertake to limit the division of profits to the profits arising from the moneys of the participating policy-holders, and then we further limit the amount the participating policy-holders shall receive. The insurance agent, in canvassing, can make all kinds of representations to the party he wants to insure. He can represent to him that he is to receive a far greater amount than he possibly can receive under this legislation. The party canvassed takes out a policy believing in these representations. He does not find any provision in the policy or contract itself defining what portion of the profit he is to receive but he believes that it is in the company's charter. Then the innocent insurer who has taken out a policy expecting to get a profit of 90 per cent of the whole profits of the company finds, after he has paid in premiums the requisite number of years, that all he is entitled to is only 90 per cent of the profits on his own money. This is all the return he gets for paying in a heavier premium than the ordinary insurance. It strikes me that in every insurance policy, the proportionate amount of profit to accrue to the policyholder should be clearly stated. As far as this Bill is concerned, we have no more right to limit the amount of profit the policy holder is to receive on the participating policy plan than we would have the right in a marriage contract to limit the amount which the wife is entitled to receive out of the profits of a marriage contract in her husband's property, and declare that she shall not receive more than say 10 per cent. For that reason I would ask that the Bill be held over and be referred back to the Minister of Justice for his opinion as to the legality of that clause. In my opinion there is good ground for considering it an infringement of civil rights since it limits the right to contract.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). This clause has been in our insurance charters many years, and no question has ever been raised as to the constitutional power of parliament to enact it. Whatever opinion there may be regarding the wisdom of so distributing the profits, no question has been raised as to the constitutional authority of parliament on the matter. Unless the hon. gentleman has reason to think it is advisable, we ought not to treat this Bill differently from Bills of a similar character.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The reason is that this question is a matter of litigation now with companies.

Mr. FIELDING. Not affecting this company.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Why should we put in this Bill a clause which may, inside of six months, be declared ultra vires?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not aware that in any litigation, the constitutional power of parliament to pass a clause of this kind is raised. There may be litigation as to the meaning of a similar clause in another charter, but I am not aware of any question being raised touching the constitutional authority of parliament to enact such a clause.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. This involves a constitutional question. A company enters into a contract with an individual by which he is to participate in the profits. If that be a civil contract, it will be defined according to the civil law of the provinces. Have we the right to limit the scope of the contract and prevent an insurance company from giving more or less than a certain percentage of profits if their contracts should be to the contrary. On several occasions Bills have been before this parliament touching on civil rights. There was one in which the Methodist Missionary Society was concerned. An attempt was made to insert a clause providing that conveyances granting land to that society should contain certain clauses or conditions. This House objected to inserting any clause which would interfere with the rights of the parties to make a civil contract as that was a matter entirely within provincial jurisdiction. I think that we should hesitate before inserting the clause in question. The matter will shortly be decided by the civil courts, and in the meantime I think we should not pass legislation that may be contrary to that finding. I can see no reason why an insurance company should not have the right to distribute its profits to participating holicy-holders in accordance with the contract between them and the company. Leave it to the company to agree to give 10, 20 or 95 per cent of the profits or whatever they like but have that stipulated in the contract. As it is, there is now nothing in the contract, and a man, who has taken out a policy on the faith of representations made to him by an insurance agent, finds there is an Act of parliament limiting his rights and giving him less than he was told he would receive.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not in charge of the Bill and not particularly concerned in its advancement. If my hon. friend's view be correct, it would be better to discuss it when considering the general Bill, so that whatever we may do will apply, not to one company alone, but to all.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would be quite willing to acquiesce in the suggestion of the hon member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) if I could see any reasonable ground for believing his anxiety well founded. It would be rather presumptuous on my part to give an opinion off-hand on a debatable point regarding constitutional law, but I can see no reason for hesitation in this matter. When we have the power to create an insurance company, surely we have the power to place whatever restrictions we may deem advisable on its operation. True, the provincial legislatures have jurisdiction in matters of civil contracts, but that must be taken within limits, such as in the case before us where we are asked to create a company and define what powers we shall give it. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has called attention to the fact that this is the first occasion when objection has been raised to legislation of this kind; and before being asked to hold the Bill over, we ought to have some stronger reasons given for contending that it is ultra vires. Surely the anxiety of one individual is not sufficient reason for holding over the Bill. With all due regard for the valuable opinion of my hon friend, with which he so kindly favours us on frequent occasions, there is no documentary evidence and no seriously considered opinion submitted which would be a justification for our delay in passing the Bill.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I may say that a corporation has no right to divide its profits with its policy-holders or the public unless there is a special clause in its charter allowing it to do so. That is the law in England and every other country. This clause is placed in the charters of insurance companies to enable them to divide their profits and the charters of insurance companies give them the right to secure business not only in Canada, but in foreign countries. Have we the right to impose a limit in insurance contracts restricting the division of profits? Why should not the division of profits be a matter of simple contract between the company and the party insured. If you give a company the power to divide its profits with the policy-holders, why not let the percentage of profits be a matter of contract and written on the policy. Instead of doing this you frame this general clause, which is so worded that it enables an insurance company to avoid putting a clause in their contracts stating the amount of division. Thus a man may be induced to insure with the idea that he is going to receive a much larger percentage, and then, after he has paid in his premiums for many years, he finds, on looking at his policy, that there is no clause telling him what he is going to get,

and he has to refer to an Act of Parliament passed some twenty years before to find out that his profits are limited to a very small percentage. But if this question is going to receive consideration, if the Minister of Finance states that there will be a clause in the Insurance Bill which will deal generally with all companies, I am quite ready to waive my objection.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a clause in the Insurance Bill dealing with the method of distributing profits and raising this very question, so that my hon. friend will have an opportunity of dealing with the whole matter on that clause.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

GREAT WEST PERMANENT LOAN COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the Great West Permanent Loan Co.—Mr. Alexander Haggart.

On section 9—Securities for investments.

Mr. SPROULE. It is provided here that the company 'shall not invest in nor loan money upon the security of the stock of any other loan company except as hereinafter authorized.' That would indicate that they are authorized to invest in the stock of any other company not a loan company. Is not that too wide a power?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). This clause is the same as in the Acts of other similar companies, and is the same as in the general Loan Company's Act.

Mr. SPROULE. On section 16, subsection c,

(c) Delegate any of their powers to committees consisting of such member or members of their body as they think fit, and any committee so formed shall, in the exercise of the powers so delegated, conform to any regulations that may be imposed on it by the directors.

There was a company started some years ago that adopted this plan of committees, and it seemed to me a very bad one; it proved very disastrous to those who had bought stock in the company. The plan I refer to is that of having a committee in each village or locality. The present section seems to give the company the right to delegate any of their powers to committees. The committees might be given certain limited powers, but the company should not have the right to give any committee the power to incur an obligation, borrow money or anything like that. In the York Loan Company that had such a disastrous history lately, that was one of the features; they had committees all over the country. I think these committees should only do certain routine work, become inspectors, report on property, look after collections, and such things as that. These things could well be done by a committee. But when you go beyond that you are giving them too large powers.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the clause is a usual one, and the superintendent informs me that no case has been brought to his notice of any abuse arising from it. Of course, it is a somewhat broad power to give the company to allow them to delegate their powers to a committee. I take it that the chief purpose of these committees is to encourage local business and create an interest in the company. I would not call them canvassers, although they do seek business for the company. It is to be presumed that the central authority would only delegate to them such powers as may be safely exercised. I am not aware of any real abuse having arisen under the clause. As respects the York Loan Company, I did not understand my hon. friend to say that the troubles arose from the operation of these committees.

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say that having watched the operation of some of these companies I always regarded this as a bad feature. Here is what they usually do: An agent goes to a village, he wants to rope in certain parties and form a committee for the purpose of doing business in that locality. He makes one chairman, he makes another an inspector, he makes a third a secretary. Each one has a duty to perform, and they are paid in proportion to the amount of work done in that locality. These are all paid officials, though the remuneration they receive is small; but the higher the amount of work done and the larger the loans, the more they are paid. They are all interested parties, interested in getting business for the company, they are concerned in the amount of business they can get for the company. I have thought how easy it would be for the inspector to join with the agent, and with the secretary, and with the chairman, and recommend loans where the security was not perhaps very good, larger loans than they ought to recommend, and do it because they would get a larger commission for it. Individually I do not think they are under any bonds to make them liable for anything they might do improperly, although the general law would cover it. They represent to the public: If you will put your money into this company it will pay you back within a few months, or within a few years a certain return—and it is a return which no company could give legitimately. I know that to be a fact, because I have examined two or three of them, and I know the returns which they promise to give are such that no respectable company in the world could give if they were carrying on a legiti-

mate and honest business. This is done through these committees and the result is that after awhile the companies go down. I remember one that flourished some twenty years ago in our locality and I do not know whether there are two members of that board there to-day who were appointed about twenty years ago. What is the result? People paid in their money, and when they endeavoured afterwards to get a return for it, with the profits that they had reason to expect, according to the representations made to them, they found that they had been egregiously sold, they did not get back one-fourth of the money expected. I remember one man who, I think, paid in $62 or $64, and according to the representations made to him, he ought to have taken out, after a certain term of years, $250, but he took out about $2 less than he paid in. That is in my judgment, a fraudulent and improper transaction, but it is carried on through the exercise of the powers delegated to this special committee. One after another of the contributors, finding that was the case, dropped out of it, and practically lost all the money they had put into it.

Bill reported.

NIAGARA-WELLAND POWER COMPANY.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 33) respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company—Mr. Guthrie.

On section 2,

Mr. SPROULE. Has not this power company started its business?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Has it been carrying on operations for any length of time or making any effort to complete its work?

Mr. GUTHRIE. It was shown before the Private Bills Committee that it has spent between $60,000 and $70,000, but there are now some negotiations with the Ontario government arising out of the policy of the Ontario government with regard to the Niagara power. In the meantime this company does not want its charter rights to lapse.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADA LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 56) respecting the Canada Life Assurance Company—Mr. A. H. Clarke.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I understand that some members desire to look further into this Bill, and I would therefore like to have the consideration of it postponed until a further day. I therefore move that the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. PERLEY. I would like to say two or three words with regard to this matter. As I stated in committee, I am not a shareholder in any way in the Canada Life Assurance Company, but I am a policy-holder and as such I am perfectly satisfied with section No. 2, which is a contentious section, as I consider that it provides what was originally intended and what has actually been done for the last thirty years. But, as a member of parliament a serious question arises as to the retroactive character of this Bill. I spoke about this phase of it the other day in the committee, and I asked Mr. Leighton McCarthy, who had the Bill in charge, regarding our power to pass such legislation and as to the wisdom of our doing it. He answered me giving his reasons for it, which did not seem to be very satisfactory as he was naturally interested in the Bill as the lawyer for the Canada Life and there was no lawyer on the other side to represent the policy-holders. I have looked a little farther into the legal part of this question and I may say that I have found many lawyers opposed to our passing such legislation. Amongst others, I might refer to the argument of two celebrated and well known lawyers in this country who are members of this House, from the ridings of South Essex and North York. Both of these hon. gentlemen spoke the other day regarding the Cobalt Lake matter and presented arguments in that case which seemed to me to be decidedly against the wisdom of this House passing retroactive legislation of this kind. There are a great many policy-holders interested in this question who live not only in Canada but in almost every country in the world, and as I am not a lawyer and am unable to discuss this matter from a legal point of view it seems to me that before we pass this Bill we ought to have a definite statement from the Minister of Justice as to the wisdom of our passing legislation of this kind affecting as it does the possible civil rights of a great many people in a great many countries. I think he should assume the responsibility of advising this House regarding this matter as he is the keeper of the legal conscience of this House. Therefore, I wrote a letter to the hon. Minister of Justice, telling him that I would ask today that he give his opinion regarding the wisdom of passing this legislation, before we should go further with it. I sent the letter to him by mail and I am sorry to learn that he is indisposed. At the same time, I think the promoter of this Bill will agree with me that we should not go any further until we get an official opinion from the Minister of Justice as to whether it is wise and proper for us to pass such legislation. I therefore would be glad to second the motion of my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie).

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. The Bill before the committee has been very carefully considered by the Committee on Banking and Commerce, which is the proper committee for the consideration of matters of this sort. The questions which my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) has just spoken of were also discussed in that committee, and it seems to me that with respect to private Bills, where the parties are heard before a committee, the decision of the committee ought to be accepted by the House. However, it is quite open to the members of the House, I concede, to discuss it further, and if hon. gentlemen really and truly desire to have it stand over for the purpose of further investigation I certainly am not going to insist upon going on against their wishes. I am naturally desirous that it should be disposed of as quickly as possible. This is an entirely different thing from the Cobalt lake matter which we had here the other day. If it were not I would not be here in charge of this Bill. I may say that I have given it a great deal of careful consideration because I am as much interested as any person in this House in seeing that the rights of the people are not affected by retroactive legislation. It is not a case of retroactive legislation at all, in my judgment. In the Cobalt lake case the matter was going to the courts and the court was the only tribunal that could dispose of it. In this case the words used in the Act did not carry out what the real intention of the parties was and this Bill is not to change any law or take away any rights; it is merely to give full effect to what the intention of parliament was at the date of the passing of the Act which is being amended. The courts have no jurisdiction in such a case as this. The judges have said that this is not a question for the courts, but that it is a question for parliament, and that parliament must correct the mistake. In this case parliament must act in a judicial as well as in a legislative capacity. It is for the members of this parliament to deal with the question as judges and say whether or not the case which is set up by the Life Insurance Company has been made out.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I am not surprised that no policy-holders were present at the discussion of this Bill before the Banking and Commerce Committee, because I do not think the advertisement published announcing that this legislation would come before parliament was sufficient to fix knowledge upon the various policy-holders. As hon. members know, there are some 35,000 policy holders interested in this legislation, but not one of these was present before the committee to oppose it. I would urge the advisability of leaving the Bill over not for a week or a day but until next session, in order that the policy holders may have an opportunity to examine its contents and be present at the discussions in the committee. The notice of intention to introduce this legislation as published was as follows:

> Notice is hereby given that application will be made to the parliament of the Dominion of Canada at the next session thereof for an Act to amend the Acts relating to The Canada Life Assurance Company by changing the date of the annual meeting and making necessary changes as to notices of meetings consequent thereon and providing for any further changes in the date of such meeting.

Merely formal matters are inserted first in order apparently to conceal the real intent of the Bill. Then there is a small clause:

> —defining the provisions as to division of profits.

And then a small clause:

> —extending the powers of the company as to holding real estate in Ontario, and for other purposes.

I submit that this is not sufficient notice to the policy holders that they are to be deprived of their salient, vital rights in connection with this Bill. The Bill deals with upwards of $2,000,000 and deprives 35,000 policy-holders of their rights, according to the opinion of one of the best counsel in England. I think the Bill should not be considered this session, but that the company should publish a fair and reasonable advertisement setting out the intention of the Bill so that the policy-holders may discuss it and fully understand it.

I cannot agree with the hon. member for Essex (Mr. A. H. Clarke) that this differs in its nature from the legislation relating to the Cobalt Lake Mining Company. True, the positions of the two are not exactly the same or at all similar, but this is in its nature retroactive legislation; it is taking away rights that are said, on good advice, to belong to certain policy-holders and transferring these rights to another class interested in the company, the shareholders. It is dealing with most important rights. I was much surprised on looking at the Bill to find that its sponsor was the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. A. H. Clarke), the very gentleman who moved for the papers in reference to the Cobalt Lake legislation, and who made very caustic references to the action of the Ontario legislature in passing it. Who is proposing this Bill? It emanates not from the policy-holders, but from the shareholders, the beneficiaries. The policy-holders, numbering, 35,000, have had no opportunity to organize and oppose it, and no policy-holder should be expected to come here at his own expense for that purpose.

Progress reported.

ROYAL CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 51) respecting the Royal Casualty and Surety Company of Canada.—Mr. H. H. McLean.

On section 1,

Mr. LENNOX. I have a letter from a constituent in reference to the name of one company. He speaks of a Bill proposed by the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company to drop the word 'Victoria' and make it the Royal Life Insurance Company.

Mr. FIELDING. This is not the Bill to which my hon. friend refers. The question of title comes up here, however.

Mr. LENNOX. I presume that in the committee the question of title was probably discussed, but my correspondent, who is interested in the Royal Insurance Company, thinks this is not fair. I am not sure whether that is a life company.

Mr. FIELDING. Fire and Life.

Mr. LENNOX. This is a life and death company too; it is an accident company, and, of course, it involves the element of life insurance in that respect. I submit to the minister that it is worth while considering whether any company should be allowed to use a name that will conflict with the name of an existing company. I know that the minister thinks such a practice should not be encouraged. I find on the Order Paper a Bill to incorporate the Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Company, and I submit that we are having too much royalty in this matter.

Mr. FIELDING. I rather sympathize with the views of my hon. friend. This matter was considered before the committee and we had great difficulty in coming to a conclusion as to where the line should be drawn. Some of these names would naturally suggest themselves to anybody, and it has been held that no one company should have a monopoly of such a name. Take, for example, a Bill which we had before us respecting the Great West Loan Company. We have a Great West Life company, and it was suggested that there might be a certain confusing of names. On the other side it is said that the Great West is an expression which we use in describing our great western prairies, and that it would not be proper to let any one set of men take that name to themselves and use it as a monopoly; but if one company is doing one class of business and another company another, we would have to trust to the other words of their title to mark the distinction. Another view expressed at a previous meeting of the committee is that associations organized abroad, either in foreign countries or in Great Britain, and having particular names, should not be permitted to have a monopoly so that other companies could not use similar names in Canada. The last case of the kind which occurred a year ago was with reference to the word 'Travellers.' That is the name of a well-known American company doing business in Canada for many years. Application was made for a charter for a company to be called 'The Travellers of Canada.' Objection was at once taken that there was likely to be confusion, but the committee held that the word 'Travellers' could not be the property of any set of people; it was a common word which any one could use, and the mere fact that some company abroad had taken it should not debar the parliament of Canada from granting a similar name to a Canadian company. There is great difficulty in determining just where the line should be drawn. Wherever it is likely to create confusion in the public mind, I think we should not grant a similarity of names, but in the discussion before the committee the general view was that we should not permit any company to monopolize a name, especially one which might be common property. Royal is a name of that character; it is a name that is applied to a number of institutions. If we said that the first set of men who seized upon a common word of that kind should have a monopoly of it as applied to business organizations, I think we should be going too far. I am not very clear in my own mind as to whether this name is an invasion of the rule which the committee laid down or not; but taking it all in all, the committee held that the objections raised in this case were not well founded.

Mr. LENNOX. I quite appreciate that the minister has a pretty difficult task in this matter; but I am inclined to think that in this case we are doing what is probably unwise. There is, I think, a sharp distinction to be drawn between a foreign company and a British company; but I am not at all sure that there is any sharp distinction to be drawn between a Canadian company and a British company. We might refuse a charter to a foreign company which seeks to obtain a monopoly of a certain name; but when a British company, with our concurrence has been doing business with British people in Canada, I think we might very well deal with it upon the same basis as we would with our own people. That is the first point. There is another point. In the first case we view the matter from the company's standpoint; but it is even more important to view it from the standpoint of the people. The minister touched that note by saying that we want to deal with these matters so that the people will not be confused or misled, and as far as we can avoid repetition of names we should do so. The

'Royal' is the name of a very desirable insurance company, and people might be led into doing business with a company using that name under a misapprehension of the facts. There is a pretty long way between that name and such a name as the Great West. The Great West is a great inheritance of us all.

Mr. FIELDING. So is Royal.

Mr. LENNOX. Not in the same way. We do not propose to give a monopoly of the Great West to one set of people, not even to the Big Four; but when it comes to the question of a word that does not carry with it any property, it is somewhat different. I hope that whatever the minister may do in this particular instance, he has not made up his mind that in no instance will he restrain the use of the word Royal in connection with a life insurance company, and this is certainly in a sense a life insurance company.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I understand that some of the large English companies doing an insurance business in Canada get over the Act by having a Canadian company authorized, and underwriting its stock and its policies. I think the Liverpool, London & Globe, and one or two others, have charters of that description. The insurance agents who do business for the Royal Fire Insurance Company also do a casualty business.

Mr. FIELDING. No. The English company does not do an accident business.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The agents of the Royal do a casualty business for other companies; and the Royal of England is such a well known company that people taking casualty insurance from those agents assume that the Royal Canadian Company is a child of the English company and are therefore misled. If the promoter of this Bill will give this House the assurance that this company is a child of the Royal Insurance Company, I think we might pass it; but if he does not give us that assurance, I think we should not pass it.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member who has charge of the Bill does not appear to be in his place. Not only have I no assurance of the kind, but such information as I have leads me to believe that this is an independent company.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Then I would ask that progress be reported on this Bill until that assurance is given to us.

Mr. FIELDING. That matter was thoroughly considered in the committee. I do not say that is conclusive, but I doubt whether we can make much improvement in the Bill. This question is in line with other questions which have been discussed again and again. The committee thought there was a distinction between the Royal Casualty Company and the Royal Fire Insurance Company, and that there could be no confusion. However, I have no desire to press the Bill in the absence of the promoter, and if any considerable number of members wish to consider it further, I have no objection to it standing over.

Progress reported.

CANADA NATIONAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the Imperial Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. A. Haggart.

Mr. FIELDING. Objection has been taken to the name and it is proposed to substitute Canada National, but this can only be done by the Speaker in the Chair.

Bill reported and read the third time.

Mr. A. HAGGART moved that the Bill be passed and the title changed to Canada National Fire Insurance Company.

Motion agreed to.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Canada Life Assurance Company.—Mr. A. H. Clarke.

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Royal Casualty and Surety Company of Canada.—Mr. H. H. McLean.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Company.—Mr. Ames.

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company —Mr. Neely.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the British Columbia Life Assurance Company—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company. —Mr. Neely.

Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the Great West Permanent Loan Company.—Mr. A. Haggart.

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

PATENT OF THOMAS L. SMITH.

Bill (No. 71) respecting a Patent of Thomas L. Smith.—Mr. Bickerdike—considered in committee and reported.

On motion for third reading:

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Has this Bill come under the notice of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) and has it had his assent?

Bill read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Fort Erie and Buffalo Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Prudential Trust Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Company.—Mr. Boyer.

Bill (No. 95) to incorporate the Royal Guardians..—Mr. Lachance.

Bill (No. 96) respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the London and Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the National Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 104) respecting the Thessalon and Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Smyth.

PATENTS OF AMMONAL EXPLOSIVES (1908), LIMITED.

On motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 93) respecting Patents of Ammonal Explosives (1908), Limited.—Mr. A. C. Macdonell.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). This I take to be with reference to patents for the making of ammonia powders. Some explosives for military purposes are now being manufactured by ammonia process instead of nitrates. This government may be manufacturing such explosives, and it may be that here is doubt about the wisdom of recognizing any such patent as this. The promoter of the Bill is not present to explain the matter, so I would ask that the Bill be allowed to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

QUESTIONS.

CANADA EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. What was the price originally paid by the government for the Canada Eastern Railway?
2. Since the acquisition of the line between Fredericton and Chatham, what has been spent each year for betterment, and what does the government expect to spend under this head during 1909-1910?
3. What is the approximate value of the rolling stock that has been added to that previously in service on this branch?
4. What has been each year, since its acquisition by the government, the approximate expenditure for running expenses and the approximate revenue in connection with this branch?

Mr. FOSTER.

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

1. 1905

June 30, Department of Railways and Canals, amount paid at Ottawa	$800,000 00
1908	
February 29, Department of Railways and Canals, amount of cheques issued at Ottawa, W. B. Snowball, R. A. Snowball, W. C. Winslow	19,000 00
	$819,000 00

2. Amounts expended each year on Capital Account since the acquisition of the line between Fredericton and Chatham, from October 1, 1904 to January 31, 1909:

Year 1904-5	
Sidings	$ 9,575 05
Platforms	355 00
Track material and labour.	26,498 10
	$36,428 15
Year 1905-6	
To increase water supply	$ 19,243 04
Semaphores at stations	1,607 01
Sidings	10,929 62
*Fredericton and St. Mary's bridge	300,000 00
	$331,779 67

Which added to line and supplied. *Fredericton terminal.

Year 1906-7	
To strengthen bridges	$ 12,455 83
To increase water supply	3,634 48
Siding-Fredericton	96 00
Fencing portion of line not heretofore fenced	15,983 36
Air compressor at Gibson	1,780 91
Ice house at Gibson	2,138 76
	$ 36,089 34
Year 1907-8	
To strengthen bridges	$111,490 29
To increase water supply	11,559 88
Fencing portion of the line not heretofore fenced	11,979 24
Improving grades on line.	3,950 49
New turntables	3,348 08
Air compressors at Gibson.	361 54
Electric semaphores	512 26
Siding	2,382 28
To improve telegraph line.	2,498 23
Buildings	2,695 78
	$150,778 07
Year 1908-9	
To strengthen bridges	$ 8,650 94
To increase water supply	10,716 15
Fencing portion of line not heretofore fenced	11,267 94
Improvements at Loggieville	309 32
New turntables	1,035 09

Electric semaphores	$ 417 43
Land purchased	230 00
Sidings	2,303 15
Buildings	7,923 75
	$ 42,853 77
	$597,929 00

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Capital estimates 1909-1910—Canada Eastern Division.

Sutton Road—Siding to be made through 100 foot extension	$ 875
Ivory's—New shelter and platform	350
Maloney's—New shelter and platform	350
Cushman's—New shelter and platform	350
Upper Nelson—For shelter	150
Blackville—Loading platform $250; To convert old baggage room into waiting room 300	550
Forks—New shelter and platform	350
Upper Blackville—Building for baggage, coal and oil	250
Weaver's—New shelter and platform	350
Hurley Brook—New shelter and platform	350
Blissfield—New shelter	150
Doaktown—Loading platform	250
Carroll's—To provide a shelter	150
Carroll's—To lengthen crossing siding 10 cars, 400 feet	800
Boiestown—To provide additional siding accommodation 20 cars, 800 feet	2,000
Astles—Shelter	150
Clearwater—Shelter	150
Cross Creek—To provide a loading platform 70 feet long	300
Cross Creek—To change highway between Cross creek and covered bridge to eliminate 4 road crossings	$1,000
Covered Bridge—Loading siding to hold 5 cars, 200 feet	500
Nashwaak—To provide shelter and platform	350
Manzer's—To provide a shelter	150
Marysville — To provide loading ground, siding and platform—	
Land $1,000	
Siding 1,600	
Platform 350	
Grading for roadway 500	
Freight shed 800	4,250
To provide fencing for 30 miles of line not previously fenced	20,000
To put line between Indiantown and Blackville in condition for operation—	
Ballast $10,000	
Ties and rails 10,000	
Fences 5,000	25,000

3. Approximate value of rolling stock that has been added to that previously in service of the Canada Eastern Railway is $57,500, made up as follows:

7 engines at $5,000 each equals	$35,000
9 passenger cars at $2,500 equals	22,500
Total	$57,500

4. Approximate operating expenses of the Canada Eastern Railway from October, 1904, to March, 1908:

1904-5	$105,790 82
1905-6	152,850 33
1906-7	141,243 22
1907-8	198,054 37

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

STATEMENT showing the Earnings of the Canada Eastern section of the Intercolonial Railway from October 1, 1904, to January 31, 1909.

Months.	Passenger Traffic Earnings.	Freight Traffic Earnings.	Mails and Sundries.	Total Earnings.
1904.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
October	3,403 82	4,667 90	1,470 20	9,542 01
November	3,207 33	3,386 77	1,432 44	8,026 54
December	2,449 76	4,859 46	1,522 76	8,831 98
Total	9,060 91	12,914 13	4,425 49	26,400 53
1905.				
January	2,423 16	4,338 02	1,468 66	8,229 84
February	2,338 45	3,127 14	1,439 02	6,904 61
March	3,874 53	5,540 33	1,476 84	10,891 70
April	4,489 45	5,588 54	1,492 89	11,570 88
May	3,394 19	6,674 58	1,496 66	11,565 43
June	4,754 17	6,930 52	1,815 36	13,500 05
July	4,175 51	6,637 93	1,772 41	12,585 85
August	4,090 48	5,745 97	1,937 51	11,773 96
September	4,861 65	5,452 18	1,791 61	12,105 44
October	4,396 15	5,985 62	1,812 43	12,194 20
November	3,013 48	6,035 99	1,626 16	10,675 63
December	3,257 64	4,962 69	1,516 81	9,737 14
Total	45,068 86	67,019 51	19,646 36	131,734 73

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Concluded.*

STATEMENT showing the earnings of the Canada Eastern section of the Intercolonial Railway from October 1, 1904, to January 31, 1909.

Months.	Passenger Traffic Earnings.	Freight Traffic Earnings.	Mails and Sundries.	Total Earnings.
1906.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
January	2,733 62	6,803 07	1,498 16	11,034 85
February	3,055 23	6,518 73	1,467 88	11,041 84
March	3,040 31	6,912 77	1,482 60	11,435 68
April	4,785 54	5,621 41	1,271 95	11,678 90
May	3,549 38	7,232 67	1,406 96	12,189 01
June	4,200 87	7,249 41	1,622 33	13,072 61
July	5,747 58	6,425 32	1,532 46	13,705 36
August	3,971 98	6,824 72	1,309 46	12,106 14
September	4,577 17	6,550 16	1,290 14	12,417 47
October	4,961 93	6,145 43	1,432 80	12,540 16
November	3,559 43	6,434 26	1,529 59	11,523 28
December	4,192 50	5,770 31	1,542 92	11,505 73
Total	48,375 54	78,488 26	17,387 25	144,251 05
1907.				
January	2,858 37	5,776 20	1,187 56	9,822 13
February	2,946 20	5,861 54	1978 66	9,786 40
March	4,254 51	5,680 85	1,143 80	11,079 16
April	4,779 84	4,744 46	1,332 76	10,857 06
May	4,499 85	6,576 31	1,433 10	12,509 26
June	4,296 44	7,582 40	1,496 29	13,375 13
July	5,069 61	7,002 60	1,579 62	13,651 83
August	5,021 26	7,223 53	1,514 64	13,759 43
September	5,700 52	6,961 91	1,434 92	14,097 35
October	4,981 85	5,971 99	1,654 78	12,608 62
November	4,096 04	5,801 93	1,659 13	11,557 10
December	4,523 60	5,752 13	1,716 10	11,991 83
Total	53,028 09	74,935 85	7,131 36	145,095 30
1908.				
January	3,104 75	7,906 86	1,382 91	12,394 52
February	3,076 15	7,842 30	1,154 19	12,072 64
March	4,204 15	5,524 87	1,300 53	11,029 55
April	5,093 15	5,114 97	1,440 52	11,648 64
May	4,324 45	7,138 24	1,481 05	12,943 74
June	4,996 52	7,881 75	1,715 75	14,594 02
July	6,428 08	7,587 25	1,665 00	15,680 33
August	5,622 59	6,335 52	1,491 28	13,449 39
September	5,269 00	5,059 53	1,792 02	12,120 55
October	5,143 34	5,359 58	1,735 14	12,238 06
November	4,829 85	4,944 86	1,691 78	11,466 49
December	4,981 50	4,810 14	1,783 93	11,575 57
Total	57,073 53	75,505 87	18,634 10	151,213 50
1909.				
January	3,576 80	5,228 75	1,237 42	10,042 97

SUMMARY.

October 1 to December 31, 1904	9,060 91	12,914 13	4,425 49	26,400 53
Year 1905	45,068 86	67,019 51	19,646 36	131,734 73
Year 1906	48,375 54	78,488 26	17,387 25	144,251 05
Year 1907	53,028 09	74,935 85	17,131 36	145,095 30
Year 1908	57,073 53	75,505 87	18,634 10	151,213 50
Month January, 1909	3,576 80	5,228 75	1,237 42	10,042 97
Total	216,183 73	314,092 37	78,461 98	608,738 08

THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. Was the franking privilege used by any minister directly or by permission in the distribution of campaign literature issued in the interests of the liberal party after the 21st of July, 1908?

2. If so, by what ministers, up to what period and to what extent?

3. To whom was the minister's frank entrusted for the above mentioned use?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General. Yes—just as the same privilege was exercised by ministers of preceding governments. No record being kept of matter so despatched from any post office, it is impossible to tell the quantity franked or by whom. The minister's frank is usually entrusted to his private secretary, or some other official in the minister's office.

FREE MAIL DELIVERY IN CITIES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What are the names of the cities in Canada which were granted free mail delivery in the year 1908, and the estimated amount it will cost to deliver the mail per annum under present system in each city over the amount paid before free mail delivery was established?

2. How many mail and stage routes are in operation outside of the cities, towns and villages in Canada?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. During the year 1908 letter carrier delivery services were established in the undermentioned places at the estimated cost given below:

Office.	Estimated salaries of carriers.	Estimated cost of equipment.	Total.
	$	$	$
St. Catharines.....	3,916	344	4,260
Sarnia.....	3,526	301	3,827
Fort William.....	4,405	387	4,792
Port Arthur.....	3,916	344	4,260
Moncton.....	3,526	301	3,827
St. Thomas.....	3,526	301	3,827

As the salaries of carriers are determined by law the amounts payable to them will naturally increase, dependent upon length of service. Moreover, the growth of any particular city or town may call for the enlargement of area of delivery or more frequent deliveries, thus correspondingly increasing the cost. It is impossible to tell what increased cost has been involved by the adoption of the letter carrier system which is provided to prevent public inconvenience, pressure and delays at head office which would be occasioned where only a general delivery wicket was in operation, and which would otherwise undoubtedly call for an enlargement of public buildings as well as an increase in the clerical staff to attend upon the public.

2. A full list of all mail contracts appublic buildings as well as an increase in Report.

TOWN SITE OF COCHRANE—G. T. P.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. Is the government aware that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are said to be ignoring the site of the town of Cochrane, at the junction between the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific and laying out a town site a short distance away?

2. If said circumstances exist, is it within the power of the government to interfere, and is the government likely to take any action in this matter?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). 1 and 2. The matter is not under the jurisdiction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, but the Transcontinental Railway Commission state they have the question under consideration.

DOCK AT GRAND BEND.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. Is the government aware that there is not a public highway leading to the dock at Grand Bend? If so, will the government investigate the matter and try and remedy the grievance?

2. How much money was expended on the wharf at St. Joseph in 1908, and does the government intend completing said structure?

3. Is the government aware that the town of St. Joseph was sold for taxes in 1908, and that the reeve and clerk purchased the site for $700?

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

1. (a) Yes. (b) Steps are now being taken to expropriate land required for approach.

2. (a) Expenditure from January 1, 1908, to date, $748.25. (b) Resident engineer reports that since the approach of the wharf has been completed the whole work is in good condition.

3. The department has no information to this effect.

BOOKS ENTERING CANADA UNDER BRITISH PREFERENCE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. How many pounds of books entered Canada under the British preference in 1908, and what amount of duty was collected on same?

2. How many pounds of papers, magazines and other periodicals entered Canada under the British preference in 1908, and what amount of duty was collected on same?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1 and 2. The advertising pamphlets and other advertising matter entered under the British preference for the fiscal year ended 31st March, 1908, were as follows: Weight, 118,388 pounds; value, $23,661; duty collected, $11,838.80.

The customs returns do not show the weights of imported books, magazines, pamphets and periodicals, except in the case of advertising periodicals and pamphlets.

Books, including novels, periodicals and pamphlets, entered under the preference during the above named fiscal year were valued at $337,027.

Duty collected, $19,848.85.

(Exclusive of papers and magazines entered free from the United Kingdom).

FLOODING OF FRASER RIVER IN MUNICIPALITY OF DELTA.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR asked:

1. Has the government received a report from Engineer Coste, or other official, of damage to the banks of the Fraser river, in the municipality of Delta, through the flooding of the river last summer? If so, what action, if any, has been taken on the report?

2. Have representations been received from the municipality of Delta in this connection? If so, to what effect and with what result?

3. Is it the intention of the government to take any steps calculated to prevent similar damage during the period of high water this year?

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

1 and 3. Upon representations made by Mr. R. Jardine respecting damage done at Port Guichon through extraordinary changes in currents and formation of sand bars, Engineer Coste was directed to make an examination; he reported that the river required to be well studied out before a general plan of improvements could be adopted. A further and more thorough examination is now being made.

2. Yes, through Mr. John Oliver, M.P.P.; request under consideration, although I am not persuaded that this is a work which should be undertaken by the federal government.

EXPENSES OF ELECTIONS IN NORTH AND SOUTH ONTARIO.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE asked:

1. Have all the expenses incidental to the holding of the election in North and South Ontario on October 26, 1908, been paid?

2. If so, what were the amounts in each case, and to whom paid?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). All the expenses have been paid.

The amounts claimed and paid are as follows:

Ontario North:	
Total claimed	$822 39
Allowances paid to returning officer	806 55
Disallowed	$ 15 84
Ontario South:	
Total claimed	$890 65
Allowances paid to returning officer	888 68
Disallowed	$ 1 97

Note.—The detailed statements of allowances cover fifteen foolscap sheets. A copy can be supplied if required, or information will be given as to any particular individual's account.

ANNUAL ALLOWANCE TO ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. HERRON asked:

1. When will the additional annual allowance of $93,750 to the province of Alberta and Saskatchewan, in lieu of public lands, provided for in section 20 subsection 2 of the Alberta and Saskatchewan Acts, cease?

2. How much of such additional allowance has been paid to date and how much is still to be paid?

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

1. With the half-yearly payments due March 1, 1910.

2. $375,000 has been paid to each province to date, and $93,750 remains to be paid to each province.

ROYALTY ON COAL IN ALBERTA.

Mr. HERRON asked:

What was the total amount of royalty due and payable to the government on account of coal mined in the province of Alberta during the twelve months ending 31st March, 1908, and how much of the above was collected?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). From the returns of operations filed in the department the exact amount of coal mined subject to the payment of royalty in the province of Alberta during the above period of twelve months cannot be ascertained, as such returns are frequently received showing the quantity mined during considerable periods, and without showing the quantity which was mined during each of the months comprising such period.

The following amounts are therefore only approximate:

Amount which became due and payable	$ 52,604 00
Amount collected	15,720 00

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BONDS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

How much of the balance of the proceeds of the government guaranteed Grand Trunk Pacific bonds, stated by the Minister of Railways on page 1451 unrevised Hansard,' as $1,899,264, in hands of the government, is still available for the prairie section, and how much for the mountain section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway?

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

(a) Available for the Prairie Section, $1,572,517.09.

(b) Available for the Mountain Section, $326,747.69.

(c) The special account, in which the balance of the proceeds referred to is kept, stands at $1,911,337.23. The excess of this sum over (a) and (b) represents balance of interest accrued applicable to bond interest but not yet applied.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY—RESIDENCE FOR DEPUTY WARDEN.

Mr. EDWARDS—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the government under consideration the building of a residence for the use of the Deputy Warden of Kingston penitentiary?'

2. If so, have any plans been prepared, and by whom?

3. What are dimensions of the building and the estimated cost?

Hon. GEO P. GRAHAM (for Minister of Justice):

1. The advisability of building new quarters for the use of the Deputy Warden is being considered.

2 and 3. No plans or estimates have yet been prepared.

STEAMSHIP COMMUNICATION BETWEEN CANADA AND GERMANY.

Mr. FOWKE—by Mr. Calvert—asked:

1. Has the attention of the government been directed to the statement that a steamship line known as the Canada Line has been formed to offer direct communication between Hamburg, Rotterdam, Bremen and Canada?

2. If so, is it the intention of the administration to open negotiations with the German government, with a view to the entrance of Canadian farm produce to the markets of the German empire on better terms than now obtain, as between this country and that?

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

1. The Government have observed references in the public press to a proposed steamship line between German ports and Canada.

2. It is not deemed expedient in the public interest to make any statement at present concerning the commercial relations between Germany and Canada. The government will give all due consideration to any proposals which the German authorities may wish to make for the improvement of such relations.

NAVIGABILITY OF DIXON'S ENTRANCE, TUCK'S INLET AND HARBOUR OF PRINCE RUPERT.

Mr. COWAN—by Mr. Barnard—asked:

Has the government been furnished with any report, or copy of any report, made for the imperial government upon the navigability of Dixon's entrance ,Tuck's inlet, or the harbour of Prince Rupert?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The Department of Marine and Fisheries has no knowledge of any such report.

GRAIN ELEVATOR AT VANCOUVER.

Mr. COWAN—by Mr. Barnard—asked:

Has the government decided to build a grain elevator at the Port of Vancouver? If not, is the matter under consideration by the government?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The answer is 'No.'

MAIL DELIVERY IN CENTRAL PARK, B.C.

Mr. COWAN—by Mr. Barnard—asked:

1. Has the government received a petition from some 500 persons residing in the rural district of Central Park, in the province of British Columbia, praying for a rural mail delivery in that district? If so, has the receipt of the petition been acknowledged?

2. Is it the intention of the department to grant the prayer of that petition? If not, why not?

3. Has the department had complaints, or does the department know, that the post office facilities in that district are insufficient?

4. If so, does the department intend to improve these facilities, and how?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). A petition was received containing 338, not 500, signatures, asking for the establishment of rural mail delivery in the Central Park district, but through an unintentional oversight, its receipt was not acknowledged. The matter having been referred to the post office inspector for report, it was ascertained that a rural mail delivery system was not desired by the petitioners, but rather a free letter carrier delivery service, but, as such services are only established in municipalities having a population of at least 12,000 and a total postal revenue of $20,000, conditions were not such at Central Park as to warrant favourable consideration being given to the application. It might be added that the revenue of Central Park for the last fiscal year amounted to only $389.58.

The department is not aware that the postal facilities in the district of Central Park are insufficient.

MONTREAL WOOLLEN MILLS.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

Has the attention of the government been called to the press announcement that the Montreal Woollen Mills will be compelled to permanently close down by the 1st of April next, owing, as is alleged, to the unsatisfactory condition of Canadian Tariff Laws?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The government has no information on the subject beyond what has appeared in the press.

HOLLAND RIVER CANAL.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. Who were employed to value the land of the right of way for the canal from Holland river to Newmarket, and were these parties entrusted with any other duties than valuation of lands?
2. What was the remuneration of each of these valuators?
3. For how long were they employed, and upon what terms?
4. (a) What properties did they value, (b) at what amount or rate in each case, (c) what was the acreage of each property, (d) in how many cases, by names, were the valuations accepted by the owners, (e) in how many cases by names, were the valuations finally rejected by the owners, (f) in what cases were expropriation proceedings resorted to, and (g) with what result as compared with valuators' figures?
5. Have titles to all properties been required?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). This will be quite a lengthy return. My hon. friend had better let it stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. LENNOX. Will it make any difference in time?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, it will take the same length of time. It will take a great many sheets to contain the information.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

LEASE OF LAND TO N. & A. BOURBONNAIS.

Mr. LORTIE—by Mr. Lavergne—asked:

1. Is the place known by the name of Foret, in the parish of St. Ignace or Côteau du Lac, in the county of Soulanges, leased to any person? If so, what is the name of the lessee?
2. For how many years is it leased, and what is the annual rent?
3. Should the tenant desire to surrender his lease, would the government be disposed to grant his request?

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

1. Yes; to N. and A. Bourbonnais.
2. (a) One parcel of land containing 3 acres, as described in lease, at $18 per annum, during pleasure. (b) Second parcel of land containing 6½ acres, for a term of 21 years, at $39 per annum.
3. The government would have no objection.

UNPAID BALANCES IN CHARTERED BANKS.

Mr. S. SHARPE asked:

What is the amount of the dividends, deposits or balances which have remained unpaid for more than five years in the hands of the chartered banks, according to the latest returns required to be furnished to the government by the various banks by section 114, subsection 1, chapter 29, R. S. Canada?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Dividends, $3,864.19; deposits or balances, $556,332.91.

TIMBER PERMIT ISSUED TO T. A. BURROWS.

Mr. CAMPBELL asked:

1. What sections in townships 30 and 31, range 22, are included in the permit held by Theo. A. Burrows?
2. Are there any more sections granted to him under permit?
3. If so, what is the location and description?
4. What expenditure does the department make annually protecting these holdings from trespass?
5. How many years can these timber lands be held without operation?
6. Has the permit holder the right to absolutely denude these lands of every stick of timber?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior).

1. Township 30, range 22, west 1st meridian—section 5, south half and northwest quarter-section 7, northeast quarter-section 12, section 13, west half-section 15, southeast quarter-section 16, southwest quarter-section 19, east half-section, 23, south half and northeast quarter-section 24, north half and southeast quarter-section 25, north half-section 27, east half-section 28, section 31, southwest quarter-section 32, south half-section 34 and sections 35 and 36.

Township 31, range 22, west 1st meridian—west half of section 9, and north half and southwest quarter of section 31.

2. Yes.

3. Sections 6, 7, 18, 19, and 30, township 30, range 21, west 1st meridian; sections 6, 7, and 18, and the north half of section 19, township 31, range 21; sections 3, 5, 6, 7, northwest quarter 10, west half 15, section 16, east half-section 17, sections 18 and 19, west half section 20, section 21, west half-section 28 and section 30, township 32, range 22; and sections 1, 2, 12, 13, 14, 24 and 35, township 32, range 23.

4. None.

5. The berth comprising the above-mentioned lands is subject to cancellation if not operated to a reasonable extent.

6. The permit holder has not the right to cut timber of a less diameter than ten inches at the stump.

LAKE MANITOBA.

Mr. CAMPBELL—by Mr. Schaffner—asked:

1. Did the government send an engineer last fall to Fairford district, on Lake Manitoba, to inquire into the feasibility of lowering Lake Manitoba?

2. If so, what was his report of the feasibility, of the probable location of channel, and of the probable cost?

3. Does the government propose to go on with this work in whole or in part this year?

4. Has the government or any of the ministers received any petition from the settlers in that locality asking for such work to be undertaken?

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

1. Yes.

2 and 3. Resident engineer reports that, to afford permanent relief from high water, it will be necessary to incur considerable expenditure in increasing the outlet of Lake Manitoba, and also in erecting controlling works to regulate the flow and maintain the level of the lake at a constant elevation. To obtain an estimate of the cost of such a scheme would necessitate the carrying out of extensive surveys and investigations, which have not yet been made, at both the Fairford river and the Waterhen river. I am not satisfied that this is a work which should be undertaken by the federal government.

4. Yes.

ROUGH AND BROKEN STONE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. BLONDIN asked: (Translation.)

1. During the years 1906, 1907 and 1908, did the government ask for tenders for furnishing rough and broken stone for the use of the Marine Department on the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal?

2. If so, who were the tenderers, what were the prices asked, and what are the names of those who got the contract?

3. What quantity of broken stone and of rough stone did each contractor deliver, and at what price?

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

1. The department has asked tenders, and contracts were given in 1906, for broken stone, ballast, and rough stone. These contracts were continued during the years 1907 and 1908.

2. The following tenders were received for broken stone:

E. H. Germain and Leduc, at	$1.75	per ton.
Alf. Moreau	1.88½	"
A. Beauchemin and Co.	1.50	"
J. N. Beaulieu	1.48	"
The Railway Spring and Supply Co., Ltd.	1.78	"

The contract was given to A. Beauchemin & Co. Though the tender of J. N. Beaulieu was not considered the most profitable, because he had not the immediate facilities for the fulfilment of his contract; it was considered also that Beauchemin and Co. had furnished the stone required by the department the preceding year, and that they had given satisfaction; they had a good plant and machinery and they had also a large quantity of broken stone, ready for immediate delivery, besides that they were ready to reduce their price to $1.40 per ton, (the price asked for by J. N. Beaulieu) and the contract was given to them at $1.48 per ton.

The following parties had tendered for ballast and rough stone at the following prices:

E. H. Germain Leduc, at	$10.95	per toise.
Alf. Moreau	14.50	"
A. Beauchemin and Co.	12.00	"
J. N. Beaulieu	11.45	"
The Railway Spring and Supply Co., Ltd.	13.75	"

The contract was given to the lowest tenderer, Mr. Germain and Leduc at $10.90 per toise.

3. A. Beauchemin and Co. have furnished the following quantities of broken stone at $1.48 per toise.

During the year	1906	7,263	toises
" "	1907	1,800	"
" "	1908	1,214	"
Total		10,377	toises

Messrs. Germain and Leduc have furnished the following quantity of ballast at $10.90 per toise:

During the year	1906	1,086
" "	1907	813
" "	1908	1,298
Total		3,197

TELEPHONIC STATIONS BETWEEN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC FOR THE USE OF NAVIGATION.

Hon. Mr. ECREMENT asked: (Translation.)

How many telephone stations are there at present between Montreal and Quebec, for the use of navigation, and where are they situated?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation.) The telephone service on the river St. Lawrence for the use of navigation is composed of the following stations: Montreal, Longue Point, Verchères, Sorel, Three Rivers, Batiscan, St. Jean Deschaillons, Portneuf, St. Nicholas, Cap Rouge, Quebec, Crane island (below Quebec.)

ESCAPE OF BILL MINER.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR asked:

1. Was a letter sent on or about the date and in the terms indicated, or on similar terms, by any officials of the Department of Justice at Ottawa to the warden of British Columbia penitentiary, namely:—

Ottawa, September 28, 1906.

Dear Sir,—The minister has been pleased to authorize you to permit Mr. Alex. D. McIntyre, barrister of Kamloops, B.C., to see his clients in the penitentiary at any time during business hours in your presence or in the presence of Mr. Harvey or other officer whom you name. You will please permit Mr. McIntyre's clients to reply promptly to all letters from Mr. McIntyre to them.

Yours very sincerely,
DOUGLAS STEWART,
GEO. W. DAWSON,
Inspectors.

Warden White,
New Westminster, B.C.

2. If so, at whose request was this letter sent?

3. Had Mr. Alex. D. McIntyre applications before the department with respect to any clients, other than for permission to visit and receive communications?

4. Were any visits made or did any communications pass to and from the penitentiary as the result of an order in above or similar terms?

5. Was the convict Bill Miner one of the clients of Mr. Alex. D. McIntyre, and is this the Alex. D. McIntyre mentioned at the inquiry into the circumstances of Miner's escape?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (for Minister of Justice):

1. Yes.

2. By direction of the Minister of Justice, on the request of Mr. McIntyre.

3. No.

4. None, so far as the department is aware, unless it may be the visit of 'his lawyer from up country,' which Instructor MacKenzie stated in his evidence Miner had told him about.

5. (a) In applying for the permission given by the letter quoted, Mr. McIntyre stated that he was 'senior counsel for the prisoners,' and that it was necessary for him as counsel to communicate with the prisoners by letter or personally in order to prepare for an appeal from their conviction which he intended to take. This is, as the department understands, the same McIntyre who was mentioned at the inquiry into Miner's escape.

DISMISSAL OF O. J. C. LEBLANC.

Mr. CROCKET—By Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What was the cause of the dismissal of O. J. O. LeBlanc from the position of fishery overseer for the county of Kent, New Brunswick?

2. Was complaint made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries? If so, when and by whom?

3. Was the complaint communicated to Mr. LeBlanc before his dismissal?

4. Was it made the subject of an investigation? If so, how?

5. How long had Mr. LeBlanc held the position, and what was the date of his dismissal?

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

1. Offensive partisanship at the last Dominion election.

2. Yes. O. J. LeBlanc, M. P., through Honourable William Pugsley, 2nd December, 1908.

3. No.

4. No.

5. Since 18th June, 1894. 19th December, 1908.

EXPENSES *RE* LOAN OF JANUARY 27, 1909.

Mr. AMES—By Mr. Perley—asked:

1. With respect of the £6,000,000 loan of January 27, 1909, what were the charges, including discount for immediate payments, &c.?

2. What was the net amount of cash realized?

3. What was the total amount realized?

4. What was the annual effective rate of interest per unit?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The accounts of the loan are not completed. A portion of the moneys has not yet been paid in. It is probable that the effective rate of interest per unit will be as near as may be 4⅛.

GASPE-PERCE MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Perley—asked:

1. When does the mail contract from Gaspé to Percé expire?

2. Is it the intention of the government to call for tenders? If so, when?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. 30th of June, 1909.

2. Tenders will be called for at once.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing: 1. The number and names of the various dredges owned by the government.

2. When and by whom constructed, or when and from whom purchased.

3. The price paid for each dredge.

4. On what work each dredge has been engaged in each of the years 1905, 1906, 1907 and 1908.

5. How many months during each of these years each dredge was working, and how many cubic yards of material each dredge removed per month.

6. The cost of maintaining and cost of operating each dredge for each of these years.

7. The names of the dredges leased during these years, if any, to whom leased, on what terms, and what amounts were received each year under such leases.—Mr. German.

For a return showing, in respect of the election for the House of Commons, held in the county of Montcalm on the 26th of October, 1908, and in respect of each polling subdivision (a) the number of votes polled for each candidate; (b) the total number of valid votes polled; (c) the number of rejected ballots; (d) the number of spoiled ballots; (e) the number of voters on the revised voters' list; (f) the number of ballot papers in the possession of the deputy returning officer at the hour of the opening of the poll; (g) the number of ballot papers remaining unused in the hands of the deputy returning officer at the close of the poll; (h) the name and the address of the returning officer and the names and addresses of each of his deputies and poll clerks; (i) all correspondence between the government, or any officer thereof, and the returning officer, or any deputy returning officer or poll clerk or any candidate in respect of said election. —Mr. Ames.

For a return showing the amounts paid during the years 1903-1904, 1905-1906, and 1907-1908, by the following departments, (a) Marine and Fisheries, (b) Railways and Canals, (c) Customs, (d) Post Office, (e) Militia and Defence, and (f) Public Works, to the following persons, firms and companies, viz:—The Wilson Gas Buoys Company, the Canadian Fog Signal Company, James Murphy, William R. Blakiston, James Holliday, Allison Davie, J. B. Cote, Adolphe Huot, Joseph Samson, Samson & Filion, E. Pelletier, Napoléon Mercier, Sévérin Martel, Michel Thibodeau, Edmond Bélanger & Co., Marier & Tremblay, Terreau & Racine, Rock City Tobacco Company, J. N. Martineau, George Marchand, Jean Drolet, Elie Amyot, Charles A. Parent, A. N. Melvin, W. G. Robertson, Wm. Robertson & Co., Howell & Co., St. John Iron Works, Charles McDonald, John A. Moore, Wm. J. Vroom, John A. McAvity, McAvity Bros., George McAvity, Patrick J. Mooney, Polson Bros. or Polson Iron Works, Merwin & Company, F. L. Brooks & Company, F. S. Brooks, Safety Company, Submarine Company, Wm. J. Allan and Mr. Willard.—Mr. S. Sharpe.

For a copy of the report of the Conciliation Board in connection with the freight clerks of Halifax and St. John.—Mr. Crosby.

For a return showing what amount of money has been expended by the government for printing in connection with immigration matters during the fiscal year 1908 and up to 1st March, 1909; the amount of money that that has been expended for advertising in newspapers for the same purpose; the names of the said newspapers and the amount paid to each; what pamphlets were issued, their names, from whom they were purchased, by whom published, and what prices were paid for each.—Mr. Uriah Wilson.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) delivered a message from the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:

GREY,

The Governor General presents to the House of Commons supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending on the 31st of March, 1909, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
March 15, 1909.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, His Excellency's message, together with the estimates, was referred to Committee of Supply.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

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

That in the opinion of this House the system of election prevalent in this country fails to reflect, in our representative assemblies, correctly, and in accurate proportions, the currents of public opinion which should find expression by the votes of the electorate. It is therefore desirable to reform our electoral law, by the adoption of an improved method of proportional representation whereby the House of Commons may become the faithful expression of the will of the electors as manifested by their votes; that a select committee of this House be appointed to investigate the different systems of proportional representation adopted or suggested elsewhere, as an improvement upon our present methods of election, with power to extend said inquiry to all the various forms of the proportional representation laws proposed or in force.

He said: I deem it, Mr. Speaker, a privilege to have this opportunity of placing before the House, in support of the motion you have just read, some explanatory observations upon a subject which has engrossed the attention of public men in all democratic countries for the past quarter of a century. It is a large subject, but, however extensive its scope, I will endeavour to curtail my remarks as much as possible. I feel that the reforms which I have in view cannot be carried out immediately. I feel also that my present object ought to be merely to draw the attention of parliament and the country to the duty which now seems to be put upon us, in common with all other free peoples, of examining the anomalies and the abuses which have rendered these reforms necessary and even urgent, and in this manner helping towards a trial of some of the reforms which I am about to suggest—a trial which might be made in our own country, and which would serve to preserve our institutions from what I think might be termed complete ruin and failure. No one, I suppose, will deny that representative institutions all over the world have proved a comparative failure. Admissions of this fact can be found in the books of all writers of every nation who have treated this important subject within the past twenty or twenty-five years.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Is it according to the rules of the House that the hon. gentleman should read his speech ?

Mr. MONK. My object in quoting largely from my notes, Mr. Speaker, is to make my observations as short as possible but I will endeavour to conform to what is a very wise rule of the House. It has been claimed that our popular assemblies, in which is lodged the direction and control of the nation's legislative and administrative powers do not now reflect the opinions, the desires or the aspirations of the electorate at large. It is claimed that the representation which we now have in parliament is only a partial one, that in reality it is a distortion, that a very large number of the electors are quite unrepresented in the council of the nation,, and that the council of the nation, or parliament, ought to be an exact mirror of public opinion, and of the desires, the aspirations and the will of the people generally. The claim is that the direction of public affairs is in this manner very frequently placed in the hands of men who are all-powerful, and yet who represent only a bare majority, very often even only a minority of the electorate at large, and that the rest of the qualified electors have no voice, no control whatever, over the affairs of the country. The final result of this situation is that the unrepresented are not to-day in a very different condition from the unfortunate condition in which were the villains in the olden times. They were deprived of power; they had no voice in the affairs of the country; they were attached to the glebe; they were absolutely ignored. To-day those who are thus unrepresented are, if I may use the expression, the slaves of the urn instead of being as the villains were formerly. Under the outward signs of liberty they have not in reality a greatly improved position over that of the unfortunate men of bygone times. Now, what is the cause of this state of affairs, and of the consequent abuses which have so greatly, within the past twenty or twenty-five years, brought representative institutions into disrepute and created, what every one I think has noticed, a want of interest in the administration of public affairs and in the elections which have for their object the production in parliament of a faithful reflection of public opinion throughout the country ? There has resulted, as every body knows, not only a want of interest, but a kind of void between parliament, between the representative assembly, between the council, when one reverts to municipal affairs, and the electorate from which these assemblies emanate; and the real reason for that regrettable state of affairs can be found in our greatly deficient system of representation. The principle which ought to underlie the creation of a representative assembly surely is this, that it should afford representation not merely to a part but to the whole of the electorate; otherwise of course it loses its representative character. If the powers, legislative, administrative, executive, are unlimited, and if those powers are wielded by one-half, or one-half plus one, of the electorate, the other half less one of the electorate, who have no voice or control whatever in the country's affairs, are quite powerless; so that it is impossible to say that such an assembly is really and truly a faithful reflection of the nation that has called it into existence. Even admitting the necessity of this crude system of a bare majority which has prevailed hitherto, and which is repugnant to the idea of a truly representative body, as the founders of our representative institutions conceived that body to be, matters become very much worse when we find, as we often do, that instead of a majority, even a bare majority, being in power and ruling the people, as a matter of fact, through the numberless deformations of our electoral system, the majority in the representative body does not as a matter of fact represent the majority of the electorate, but in fact represents a minority. In effect, the country is governed by a minority, sometimes quite a considerable minority, of the electorate, who rule the majority, and the majority are left without any recourse whatever. Such instances are by no means rare. Let me give one from a foreign country. In the French Chamber of 1881, 1885 and 1889, the ruling party in parliament represented a minority of the electors who had actually voted and a very feeble minority of the electorate, if one takes into consideration those who abstained from voting at all. In numerous cases, not only in France, but in our own country, a considerable portion of the electors cannot be said to be represented since they have not cast their ballots. In France, in the cases which I have mentioned, the reality was in direct violation of the principle that in a democracy the laws must emanate from all the nation, or at any rate from the majority of the representatives of every part of the nation. In theory our legislation must be sanctioned by all our citizens or a majority of their representatives. In England electoral reform is one of the burning questions of the day. To show that the strange anomaly I have mentioned is not confined to France, I shall, with the permission of the House, quote briefly from an article which appeared in the 'Westminster Review' of September, 1907, on proportional representation. The writer describes the situation in England in a fair and forcible manner. He says:

Commencing with the general election in 1874, we find, according to Lord Avebury's figures, the Tories in an actual majority of

48, whereas upon the votes, they would have been in a majority of 38.

In 1880 the Liberals gained 44 more seats than they were entitled to upon the votes cast in their favour, but after deducting these and adding them to their opponents, they would still have been left with an actual majority of 78, fully entitling them to office.

The results of the general election in 1885 were not materially different, and the question of office would still have remained unaffected by the proper results of the election in 1886. Here the Tories, whilst entitled upon their votes to a majority of only 29, obtained an actual majority of 119.

So, too, in 1892. The party victorious at the poll was in any case entitled to the administration. With a majority of 200,000 votes, the Liberals secured a majority of 40 seats, although proportionately they were entitled to 30 only.

The climax was reached, however, in 1895. The Tories gained 411 seats, the Liberals 259. Out of 6,331,000, 4,792,512 electors went to the poll, 2,412,100 supporting the Tory party, and 2,380,412 the Liberals, showing a majority of 31,688 electors in favour of the former. And yet upon this insignificant majority of votes, the Tory party secured the enormous majority of 152 representatives in the House of Commons.

As each member represented on the average about 7,000 electors, it will be seen that the true majority would have been 4 to 5.

Further on he says:

The haphazard nature of the present system may be gauged by a comparison between the figures of the 1892 and the 1895 elections. In the former the Liberals, with a majority of 200,000 votes secured a majority of 40 seats only; in the latter the Tories, with a majority of 103,814 (taking the highest figures), obtained a working majority of 152. With half the number of majority of votes, they secured a majority of representation nearly four times as large.

It is sometimes said that the results of the contested elections should alone be used for the present comparison, because it is impossible to determine what votes would have been cast in the uncontested constituencies. In all the figures here given, those for the last contested election have been taken, and this is the nearest approach to accuracy which can be made. Some writers count the whole of the possible votes to the sitting member, a method entirely unjustifiable and unreliable. If in the 1895 election the figures for the contested seats alone are taken a remarkable result is obtained, little flattering to the Unionist party. The Liberals polled 1,800,000 votes and the Unionists 1,775,000 with the result that the latter secured a majority representation of 77 seats, whereas according to Lord Avebury, by proportionate representation the Liberals would have been in an actual majority of three seats. And I venture to again here observe that even this majority of 100,000 votes would probably have been wiped out by the abolition of the plural vote. In England and Wales alone, for the year 1886, there were 68,000 electors with more than one vote. The average number of votes possessed by each elector was consequently something at least greater than two. It was probably two and a half to three. As three-fourths, to put it moderately, of plural voters are admittedly Tories, even in the disastrous year of 1895, the Liberals would, under a real system of representation, including the abolition of the plural votes, have secured a small majority in the House, instead of occupying the impotent and ignominious position they filled.

The results of the 1900 election were equally unsatisfactory and manifestly unfair. With a majority of about 80,000 votes, the Unionists secured a majority of 134 members. Their majority, apart from the plural vote, should have been about 8. With the abolition of the plural vote, the Liberals would have been in a majority of about the same number.

The figures for the 1906 election are even more instructive. Omitting Ireland from consideration, out of a total electorate of 6,483,000, 5,426,000 went to the poll. Of these 56·4 per cent of the votes were cast for the government, and 43·6 per cent for the opposition. Upon this calculation the real proportional representation would be 316, instead of 428 members for the government, and 244, instead of 132, members for the opposition. Those figures are taken from the 'Pall Mall Gazette' and may be taken as approximately correct.

I shall not quote at greater length to show that in England the general elections have given quite different proportions in the House from what they have produced throughout the country. Upon several occasions within the past 25 or 30 years, a minority of the electors has secured a majority in the House, so that the country has been governed by representatives of the minority. Having shown what very grave instances have occurred both in France and England, let us turn to our own country and examine the results of the last election. But before doing so, I shall quote from a speech made by Sir Richard Cartwright on a motion in the Senate for reform of that body in 1906. On that occasion the right hon. senator spoke as follows of proportional representation, also of the present system, and of some very peculiar occurrences in his own native province of Ontario. He said:

I have long been convinced that our present system of representation is radically faulty, that in some important respects it is not merely vicious in theory, but vicious in practice. I want it to be distinctly and clearly understood that I am the last man to dispute the right of the majority to rule, nor do I desire in the slightest degree to dispute the consequent right of the majority to a majority of the representatives; but I do dispute the right of the majority to arrogate to itself an unfair proportion of the representatives of the people. I will illustrate my position. Let me suppose that one side controls 100,000 voters, and the other side controlled 90,000, and that there are 190,000 representatives to be elected. It is perfectly just and right, it appears to

me, that 100,000 voters should return 100 representatives, and that those who control 90,000 should return 90 representatives; but it is not fair that those who control 100,000 voters should return 150 representatives, and that those who control 90,000 should return but 40. Yet that is what I have seen; that is what our system tends to; that is what has occurred again and again, and will occur again and again under the system under which we are at present working. I know the common argument perfectly well, that it is as fair for one side as the other, that each has its chance in turn. This is true, and is all the worse. Each side in turn obtains more power than it ought to have; each side is tempted to abuse it; possibly each side does abuse it; and I may add that this system offers, as no other system does, a steady and perpetual premium to gerrymander and corruption. I propose to make good my words.

Continuing, the right hon. gentleman gives statistics for the province of Ontario to show that, beginning in 1882, and previous to 1906, there has never been a proportionate representation of the complexion of the electorate in the House of Commons. I do not feel justified in taking up the time of the House to quote these statistics, but I may say that the statement is an interesting one which goes far to establish the thesis I have the honour to defend at the present moment.

Let me now refer particularly to the last general election as illustrating the proposition which is under discussion. I have taken my figures in regard to the election from a newspaper which published the figures as official, the Toronto 'News' of January 19 last. Everything leads me to believe that these figures are correct. We find that the strictly Liberal vote amounted to less than half of the total votes given at the election. The majority of Liberal votes over Conservative amounted to 24,117. The independent vote numbered 24,893. Therefore, while there was a majority of Liberals over Conservatives of 24,117, there was a majority of Conservatives and Independents over Liberals of 776. The 'News' says:

> Revised figures for the recent general election are now available; it will be recalled that the first set of figures published was incorrect as regards several provinces. Even now some restatement is necessary, as the quasi-official statement put out makes no allowance for an independent vote of nearly 25,000, and allots all the votes polled to one party or the other. Making the necessary rearrangement; allowing the total of over 10,000 in Maisonneuve as Independent (Labour) and Mr. Martin's 2,000 in Vancouver; and omitting the Yukon, where the election has not taken place; we have the following:—

Provinces.	Lib.	Con.	Ind.
Ontario	223,501	235,509	2,730
Quebec	150,844	126,424	10,759
Nova Scotia	56,588	54,500	....
New Brunswick	40,716	34,945	....
Prince Edward Island	14,496	14,286	....
Manitoba	30,915	35,071	2,078
British Columbia	13,412	17,503	6,453
Alberta	23,777	19,746	2,439
Saskatchewan	33,415	25,563	434
	587,664	563,547	24,893

Three Acclamations.

Several remarks must be made. Three acclamations, Rouville and Comox-Atlin (Liberal) and South York (Conservative) are not counted. In Ontario the total vote for Mr. Russell, East Toronto, 4,039 in all, is credited to the Liberals. In Halifax and St. John, where electors have two votes each, both votes are counted; in Ottawa, where the same condition prevails, only one vote is counted. In Kings, Nova Scotia, Mr. Eaton, Sir Frederick Borden's opponent, is regarded as a Conservative, Mr. Robitaille in Quebec county is reckoned with the Conservatives.

It will be seen that the total vote polled was 1,176,104, and the proportions were:

Liberals	49.96 per cent.
Conservatives	47.91 "
Independents	2.11 "

Popular Majority Against.

The government thus fell just a few short of half the votes. There is a very small popular majority against it if we combine Conservatives and Independents.

Now, if these are taken as the figures—and I think we may consider them, if not absolutely accurate, at any rate sufficiently accurate for the purposes of the argument—let us consider for a moment what should have been, under that vote, the representation in the House of the electorate at large under a system of proportional representation. In order to arrive at the result, as I am not much of a mathematician, I have had the calculations made by an expert and absolutely reliable mathematician. And he has proceeded in the following manner: He has divided the total vote in each province by the number of seats allotted to that province, and has attributed to the Liberal column and the Conservative column respectively, and to the independent column where there was an independent vote, its proportioal representation. These are the results of that operation, which, I think, are well worth considering at the present moment.

STATEMENT of Proportional Representation based on figures of Dominion Elections, 1908.

(Yukon Electoral District omitted.)

Province.	Number of Members.	Liberal proportion.	Conservative proportion.	Independent proportion.	Unit of representation.
Ontario	86	41·6	44	Fraction.	5,369
Quebec	65	34	28·5	2·4	4,431
Nova Scotia	18	9	9		6,171
New Brunswick	13	7	6		5,820
Prince Edward Island	4	2	2		7,195
Manitoba	10	4·5	5	Fraction.	6,806
British Columbia	7	2·5	3·3	1·2	5,338
Alberta	7	3·6	3	Fraction.	6,566
Saskatchewan	10	5·6	4·3	Fraction.	5,941
* Total	220	109·8	105·1	3 + fractions	
Dominion of Canada	220	110	105·4	4·6	5,346

The expert who carefully worked out these figures, adds these remarks under the asterisk reference:

* This line, being the addition of the above columns, is put in to show that the above calculation must be right since it corresponds pretty closely to the lowest line. The figures in the lowest line are the correct ones for the Dominion, taken as a whole.

Now, sir, what follows from these statistics? It follows that to-day we are governed by a legislative and executive power which is created in reality by a minority of the votes of the whole country, and that, I say, is a violation, is a disregard of the fundamental principle of representation. Of those voters whose numbers I have just given, and who voted adversely to this state of affairs, there is not one who has any control, any direction of any kind, in the management of the country's affairs. On the other hand, the spectacle which our American neighbours offer in their own country, as regards the representative system there, and which has existed since the foundation of the republic, is not any better than the spectacle presented by the countries to which I have already referred, including our own. Indeed,I think we have admissions from American writers that the system there has produced even worse results in the great republic than it has produced in other countries enjoying the benefit of representative institutions. Let me quote from the excellent work of Prof. Commons on 'Proportional Representation.' He says, on page 1:

The American people are fairly content with their executive and judicial departments of government. But they feel that their long-aching bodies have painfully failed. This conviction pertains to all grades of legislatures, municipal, state and federal. The newspapers speak what the people feel; and, judging therefrom, it is popular to denounce aldermen, legislators and congressmen. When Congress is in session, the business interests are reported to be in agony until it adjourns. The cry that rises towards the end of a legislature's session is humiliating. The 'San Francisco Bulletin' is quoted as saying:

'It is not possible to speak in measured terms of the thing that goes by the name of legislature in this State. It has of late years been the vilest deliberative body in the world. The assemblage has become one of bandits instead of law-makers. Everything within its grasp for years has been for sale. The commissions to high office which it confers are the outward and visible signs of felony rather than of careful and wise selection.'

Every State in the union can furnish examples more or less approaching to this. Statements almost as extreme are made regarding Congress. Great corporations and syndicates seeking legislative favours are known to control the Acts of both branches. The patriotic ability and even the personal character of members are widely distrusted and denounced.

Much more is to be found written by Prof. Commons in support of a general denunciation of the representative system as it exists to-day throughout the United States, not only in federal affairs, not only in state affairs, but also in the transaction of municipal business. Now, sir, there is one point upon which all writers and reports agree, that is, in condemnation of the single member district, the small electoral district, with one member, as one of the principal causes of the present evil. They maintain that the singe member districts, the ward districts, in our municipal representation is often the chief and only cause of this regrettable state of affairs. All argue that the larger the area of representation, the better and more widely known, the more representative and invariably the more independent are the men who are brought forward as candidates

in those larger and multiple districts; the more varied also are the interests involved, and consequently the discussion will take a wider range. It will not be limited merely to local and parochial matters, to purely local issues. In the larger groupings the issues are brought before the people as being bound up in the interests of a larger district, and invariably the better men, the more independent men are selected for the representation. Small intrigue and petty clique dwindle into insignificance when you have a large electoral district instead of a small one. The result of the enlargement of the electoral district has been in every instance where it has been tried to produce a better class of candidates and, in the discussion there is an entire absence of small, personal issues, the real and fundamental interests of the country come to the front and the electorate have a far greater interest in the contest than they have in the case of smaller electoral districts.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, the great difficulty in the treatment of a subject of this kind is that as soon as you begin studying it you find it is a subject of great actuality and that the material placed at your disposal within the last 15 or 20 years is so considerable that it is difficult to exercise a judicious choice so as to be able to lay the subject before an assembly such as this within a given time, that is the reason that I have been obliged to condense the result of such researches as I have been able to make—and that condensation is one of the most difficult parts of the work, because as members of the House who have given some attention to the subject well know, we have moved forward a great deal since the days when the only classic works upon the subject of proportional representation was the well known work by Mr. Thomas Hare written in the early 50's and such support as John Stewart Mill gave to Hare's views in his own immortal writings.

When you left the Chair at six o'clock I was pointing out the great inconvenience, objections and dangers of the small single-membered constituency, and I had said that there was there the difficulty of choosing a candidate who would be acceptable to represent properly in the House the large interests of the country, the nature of a political campaign in a very limited constituency, the power of intrigue and political trickery of every description, such as we have all, if not known at any rate heard of in our political experience. All writers and all public men who have thought deeply upon the subject agree that in the enlarged constituency, in the grouping of constituencies, you do away with political corruption. There are no two opinions upon that subject; it becomes impossible in a very large constituency to have recourse to corrupt methods, to political trickery, to the work of obscure managers and organizations, and to that large number of devices used in politics which have for their object to defeat the proper, free and independent will of the electorate. I do not wish to insist upon that. Those members of the House who will study the question will all arrive at the conclusion to which the most eminent writers in every country have arrived, that this larger constituency does away with political corruption. From my own experience covering a number of years in our own country, I do not think the electorate of this country is what you would call a corrupt electorate. In our small single-membered constituencies with, I suppose, an average of 5,000 electors, I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that you will find 4,500 voters who are quite beyond the reach of corrupt methods, that there is no possibility of reaching them by any of the devices against which our laws, imperfect as they are, have sought to provide. But you will find within every constituency a certain number of voters who are absolutely indifferent as to the candidates, as to any question of political principle or political party, who are simply anxious to use their votes to gain money. Side by side with these men, who are the curse of our system, you will find a certain number of faddists, men of extreme views, who are not very numerous it is true, but who on account of the power they have in a small constituency very often render the member elect far more dependent than he really ought to be. These I think are general conclusions to which any member of this House who has observed our political atmosphere with any degree of care would undoubtedly arrive and to which he would adhere very readily.

I do not wish to refer at any length to the evil of gerrymandering which has become, as everybody knows, on this continent of America particularly, a very great evil indeed, in connection with elections; that is the dividing up of constituencies in such a manner by the party in power as to ensure almost as a certainty the result of any election held in a constituency. Before leaving the subject of the great evils of the existing system, let me repeat that it is my belief, which I have the honour of sharing with a great many men far more eminent than myself, who have written on that subject and thought deeply on it, that the root of the whole evil of our system lies in the small-membered constituency. Under that system we often see such strange occurrences as the following: You will find a constituency not necessarily gerrymandered

that has had leanings towards one political party. Perhaps ever since confederation that constituency has voted for one political party. What happens? Those of the minority having long ago given up any idea of obtaining any share whatever in the representation, of having any hope whatever of ever obtaining a voice in parliament, have ceased practically to take any interest whatever in the election of members. They cease to study the great questions of the day; they know that the election within the limits of their small constituency is a foregone conclusion, and they give up all hope of ever having a word to say in the administration of the affairs of the country. It has been urged I know as an answer to the undoubted evil presented by such constituencies that those who are in a minority in those constituencies have their opinions voiced and are in reality represented by members belonging to their party who are in other constituencies. That is an argument that should have no weight whatever with any reasonable man who knows anything of politics, because it would be idle to pretend that the aspirations, the feelings, the wants, the ideals of an electorate in one constituency can properly find expression in parliament through a member who has never seen the electors of that county, who knows nothing of them and has no mandate whatever to represent them. It would be absurd to suppose that a minority in a constituency, say in Ontario or even in some parts of Quebec which has voted Liberal since confederation, would be properly represented in this House by a member from some other constituency in some other province or even in the same province who happened to represent a constituency which voted exactly the other way. That contention has been sometimes urged, but I find that all writers of any experience and repute who have treated the subject consider it as absolutely unfounded. We have had the experience of what I might call, in a sense, the larger constituency, within the limits of my own province.

We have under our provincial representation the constituency of Hochelaga that surrounds the city of Montreal. It has grown during the past few years to quite enormous proportions. It is an extremely extensive constituency—I speak in reference to its provincial representation, because federally it has long ago been changed—the number of the electors approximating 40,000. You have there as a rule two candidates, and that constituency, which I understand is about to be sub-divided, has illustrated the argument which I am urging for larger constituencies. You have candidates who are well known, who enjoy a wide reputation, and it is impossible to resort to the methods of corruption, the political vices and tricks and the dominating influence of small politics. That is the experience which in a limited degree has appeared to prove some of the assertions which I have been making in regard to the advantage of large constituencies. In our own country, where the system of patronage prevails, or has prevailed, to what I think everybody will admit has been an odious degree, the objection to the smaller electoral district becomes still greater; because, for instance, in a very large constituency, say of the size of the entire island of Montreal, it would be impossible to resort to the promise of a great many small public works, which by the admission of everybody are not at present advantageous, when we have such immense problems to solve in connection, for instance, with the problem of transportation. Nobody in a grouped constituency within the limits I have just indicated, could advocate the construction of a small wharf or a small public building, but would be obliged to consider the relation of such a large territory as the island and city of Montreal to the all-important question of transportation. He would be obliged to lay before the electors, not promises of small and very often useless, though comparatively costly improvements, but the necessity of carrying out such a plan of transportation as was laid before the country and the government some years ago by a commission composed of very experienced men, who after considerable labour had in my opinion solved that very vital question in every part of the country. I have therefore endeavored to show that under present conditions you have not in parliament a faithful mirror of the feelings and opinions of the electorate, as it were a microcosm of the electorate, but as a rule exactly the opposite. You find, in many cases, in every country where the single-member constituency exists in actual operation, the government of the people by a minority of the electors; and in almost every case, even in England, where we are accustomed to look for what is right and proper and well calculated in electoral matters, an utter disproportion between the representation in parliament and the vote of the electors.

It goes without saying that the question I have treated, in a very limited and general way, has engaged the attention, in every country enjoying representative institutions, of most of the public men, and has resulted in the production of numerous works, by very competent publicists and writers, in every country in Europe; and I think most of these books have been written within the last twenty years. The question of reform is at the present moment the actual burning question in England. The question is, what kind of remedy can be applied to such a regrettable state of affairs? Of course, you cannot expect to find people who have thought of the subject to be of the same opinion. I wish to

point out as briefly as possible some of the remedies which have been resorted to. I will speak in the first instance of the general ticket, which was adopted for a time in France and is there called the scrutin de liste. Once the intolerable evils of the small single-member constituency or district had been fully realized, this remedy was resorted to in the first instance and tried in several countries, particularly in the United States, and there especially in the election of municipal school boards and other boards. The general ticket consisted in the abolition of the small district, the ward. Each constituency was enlarged and elected several members, and the elector had as many votes as there were members to be elected. What was the result of this innovation? There is no doubt that some of the evils resulting from the single-member district system were removed. Better, abler, more known and more independent men were chosen, and improper influences were diminished and curtailed. But, as will readily suggest itself to members of this House who are conversant with elections, in most cases the minority had no representation at all; the whole list or ticket went one way or the other. To give an instance among a great many illustrations that are to be found in Professor Common's recent and very able book on the subject, the city of Cleveland elected seven members of the school board under the general ticket system, all Republicans, with a vote of 110,000, and the seven Democratic candidates were defeated, when a displacement of only 2,000 votes would have produced a result exactly opposite. In France the scrutin de liste or general ticket was tried in only one election, with this result, that the Republicans with 4,300,000 votes secured 366 seats, when they would have been entitled proportionately to 311, and the Monarchists or Conservatives, with 3,550,000 votes, obtained 202 seats when they would have been proportionately entitled to 257.

The system of general ticket in France was abolished in 1889 and the method followed there to-day is exactly the same as in this country. That will, however, unquestionably undergo a change before very long, because in that country people have been giving a great deal of study to the proportional method, and a recent report by a government commission of very able men, who have studied that system carefully, recommends a change in the present one. One of those commissioners was Mr. Benoit, who has written a very able work on the subject. The report of that commission recommends the adoption of a proportional system similar to that which exists in Belgium, with some changes, in the direction of greater simplicity and freedom for the elector. I have endeavoured to obtain that report, but it has not yet been published in this country. It will be found, however, in a French paper called 'La Croix,' in its issue of the 8th or 18th of February last.

The general ticket system is an improvement undoubtedly on the system existing before, but it presents the obvious difficulties I have just briefly indicated, and it has been found not only to confine the representation to the two great dominant parties, giving no chance whatever to the smaller but still important groups, but also to give the political machine, the party managers and political organizers very great power indeed, which is a consequence rather to be deplored. Among other remedies suggested has been the system of limited voting. The limited vote is a modification of the general ticket system. It consists in this, that in a district where there are four representatives to be elected, an elector can only enjoy three votes. The result is to assure one seat, as a rule, to the minority. Of course a limited vote does not give proportionate representation. It insures some kind of representation to the minority, but does not secure in any sense proportionate representation or some mathematical proportion between the voters and the results of the election. As an example, the Boston municipal council, since 1893, has been elected under this system of limited voting. There are 12 aldermen elected at large annually and each voter has but seven votes. The result has invariably been to elect seven Republicans out of the twelve, and the remainder five Democrats, the constituency being essentially Republican. The five Democrats are elected because they get a sufficient number of votes, but no independent party can obtain any representation whatever, and and there is no chance of its having any voice in the conduct of municipal affairs. Furthermore, the elections are very often arranged for by the party managers in municipal politics. The same system was adopted for the election of aldermen of the city of New York, but was abandoned after a few years on account precisely of the results I have just indicated.

We have then, again, the system of cumulative voting. In this system, the elector has as many votes as there are representatives to be elected. You have a large constituency, and the men must be well and favourably known to be chosen; but the elector can plump all his votes on one or two candidates. That does not result exactly in proportional representation. In the case of a cumulative vote, the size of the constituency, of course, makes a considerable difference. In the small districts, where there are not many representatives to be elected, the result is very much the same as in the case of a limited vote. This system of cumulative voting was established in Illinois, as far back as 1870, and is, so far as I know, in force there to-day, so it

has had therefore considerable time for experiment. It has been found that there are 100 representatives on an average to be elected for the whole state and three in every constituency. The party in minority can always obtain one representative in the constituency. Therefore it cannot be said that there are parts of the state which are not represented by both sides. But on the other hand it dces not give proportional representation as one would like to see. It has not resulted either in procuring a very much improved class of candidates, and independent parties have not been able to elect any representatives at all. Of course, where there is cumulative voting, there is the difficulty presented of some powerful candidate getting an undue number of votes from what is called plumping. He receives a larger number of votes than is actually given for those who are running with him on the same side, and therefore it becomes the duty of the party bosses or organizers to remove candidates who would, by receiving a large number of plumpers, do great injury to the party. These candidates are otherwise in every way acceptable, but are considered dangerous and have therefore to be removed, and that is the reason why the system itself has been condemned in many parts of the United States where it has been tried for years. Where the limits of a constituency are very extensive, the system of plumping sometimes produces very remarkable results. Cumulative voting has been resorted to in many parts of the United States for the municipal elections, such as the elections of school trustees, and these elections have produced sometimes very curious results. I have in mind the case of a municipal election for the election of school trustees in the city of Manchester, where there were fifteen candidates and every elector had consequently fifteen votes. Although the city is remarkable for its ardent Protestantism and the strength of its labour element, the man who came out at the head of the poll, with 20,000 votes more than the next candidate, was the Rev. Canon O'Toole, a Catholic priest who, through the system of plumping, had succeeded in distancing all other candidates by a very large majority. That is a result which often occurs where the electoral district is large and there is cumulative voting.

So far I have as briefly as possible explained some of the reforms which are suggested and the demands made to mitigate the undue evils of the present system. It must be generally recognized by all experts who have considered the subject that these systems I have adverted to are a marked improvement on the old one and have in many cases procured the end in view, namely, some degree of proportionate representations and some voice for the minority, but they do not result in a true and mathematical representation of the opinions of the electors. Therefore, the matter has been studied more deeply by other writers, and I desire to say a few words to the House in regard to what is called strictly proportional representation. The name is an extremely long one, and it is to be hoped that those who are in favour of the system will invent some shorter formula than these two very long words to designate the movement. But, in reality it is a very simple system, and it is designated in shorter words where it has been brought into use on the continent of Europe, in Switzerland, in Denmark and Belgium. The system is advocated in England by a very important league called the Proportional Representation League. That league is composed of some of the most eminent men in England, both in politics—and on both sides—and outside of politics. And, as it states in its programme, it is not absolutely wedded to the single transferable vote. Perhaps the shortest way for me to make known to the House what the system is, is to quote the formula, if I may call it so, of the proportional league on the principles and methods of the society. I take this from 'Representation,' the journal of the society:

Our Aims.

1. To reproduce the opinions of the electors in parliament and other public bodies in their true proportions.

2. To secure that the majority of electors shall rule and all considerable minorities shall be heard.

3. To give electors a wider freedom in the choice of representatives.

4. To give representatives greater independence from the financial and other pressure of small sections of constituents.

5. To ensure to parties representation by their ablest and most trusted members.

Our Methods.

1. Unite existing constituencies into larger ones returning three or more members each, having regard to natural divisions of the country, such as large towns, counties or parts of counties; give each constituency so formed a number of members proportionate to its electorate, the total number of the House of Commons being the same as at present, or smaller.

2. Decide elections by a proportionate system, such as that known as the 'single transferable vote' under which

A. Each elector has one vote and one vote only.

B. The elector votes.

(a) By placing the figure 1 opposite the name of the candidate he likes best.

He is also invited to place

(b) The figure 2 opposite the name of his second choice.

(c) The figure 3 opposite the name of his third choice, and so on, numbering as many candidates as he pleases in the order of his preference.

C. A candidate, to ensure election, need not poll a majority, but only a certain proportion of the votes cast.

This proportion, which is the least number of votes sufficient to render certain the election of a candidate, is called the quota. Thus, in a single-member constituency a candidate who polls one more than half the votes must be elected; the quota is therefore one more than half. So, in a two-member constituency the quota is one more than a third, for not more than two candidates can poll so much; and in a three-member constituency one more than a fourth, and so on. Therefore, to ascertain the quota, divide the total of the votes by one more than the number of seats to be filled and add one to the result.

D. The returning officer ascertains the result of the election as follows:—

(1) He counts each ballot paper as one vote to the candidate marked 1 thereon; he also counts the total number of votes.

(2) He ascertains the quota.

(3) He declares elected the candidates who have received the quota.

(4) He transfers in strict proportions the surplus votes of those candidates who have received more than the quota, and credits them to the unelected candidates indicated by the figures 2, 3 and so on, as the next preferences of the electors whose votes are transferred. This operation renders all votes effective; votes are used and not wasted.

(5) He declares elected those candidates who, after the transfer of surplus votes, have obtained the quota.

(6) He eliminates the candidates lowest on the poll one after another by transferring their votes in accordance with the wishes of their supporters to the candidates indicated as next preferences. This process is continued until the required number of candidates, having each obtained the quota, have been declared elected, or the number of candidates not eliminated is reduced to the number of seats still vacant, in which event the candidates not eliminated are declared elected.

This system, as hon. members will see who will take the trouble to look at the formula which I have quoted, is in reality a very simple one. It has been made the subject in England of two important tests. One of these elections took place in 1906 and the other in 1908. Both were eminently successful. An account of each of these elections is given in the journals of the society. In the case of the last one, the names of 12 well known public men of England, including the former Prime Minister and the present Prime Minister were chosen. The newspapers in England, the great organs of public opinion, consented to give the greatest possible publicity to ballots containing these names. I think that the last day of sending in ballots was the 1st of December. The ballots were all returned to a central office in London. I may say that, in the first test, there had been only 6,000 votes. But, as evincing the increasing public interest in this question in England, I may explain that there were over 21,000 votes cast in this last test election. These votes were counted in Caxton Hall, Westminster, under the presidency of Lord Avebury the president and Lord Courtenay the vice-president of the league. There were present 40 volunteers to count the votes and the count began at a quarter to six o'clock; practically, the counting occupied from six o'clock to twelve o'clock, at which time the result of the election was proclaimed. This shows that the objection very often formulated against this system, that it would take too long to count the ballots, is absolutely without foundation. But there is no question as to that now; every one in England admits that under this system the ballots can be counted in a reasonable time.

I may say that the system advocated by this league in England, the single transferable vote, is advocated by a league in the province of Ontario, Mr. Robert Tyson, one of the principal citizens of Toronto, being the chief officer of that league. That system has been in use for quite a time in Toronto for the election of delegates from the labour council to the Labour Congress of Canada, and it has always given the most perfect satisfaction. Indeed I may say there is no country where the proportional system has been adopted that has manifested any desire to return to the old and defective system which is in force in this country. That system is not only attracting the attention of electoral reformers in England, but it has been actually put into operation in several British dependencies, in New Zealand and Queensland with excellent results. Bills for the adoption of the proportional representative system, and the single transferable vote, if I mistake not, have been adopted in some of the American states, and are, or were a short time ago, pending in many of the Australian states. They were pending a short time ago in South Australia. The system is about to be adopted in Tasmania; and Mr. Deakin, the Prime Minister of the Australian Commonwealth, is known to be an advocate of that system, and has evinced a disposition to see it adopted throughout the Commonwealth. It has been adopted quite recently in the new constitution of the South African confederation, which has not yet even received its ratification from the British parliament. In the 'Times' newspaper of the 10th February, I think, the scheme is published, and it proposes to adopt the system of proportional representation for the election of members of the executive members of provincial councils; it is to that limited degree embodied in the constitution. There is every expectation that an electoral reform on the lines of proportional representation will be introduced as soon as the Commonwealth of South Africa is definitely organized. At present it is in the constitution, and I

think the ' Times ' of February 10 contains, not only the constitution with that proviso, but a very able article calling attention to the progressive method adopted in the proposed new constitution, and generally advocating for England the system of proportional representation.

I have indicated these details because it is important to show that the system of proportional representation is actually being adopted in many of the great British dependencies, upon the same lines as it is proposed by the Proportional Representation Society of England; and it is of some importance, in view of the probable closer relations which are contemplated between the different parts of the empire, that we, too, in view of that movement throughout the empire, should give some consideration to this great electoral reform.

Now, Sir, in England itself, as I stated a moment ago, that is a question of great actuality. I would like to quote to the House the words of the Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, the Prime Minister, in receiving a few weeks ago a deputation organized by the Proportional Representation League, the deputation being composed of what I might call the very best men in England. They suggested to Mr. Asquith the immediate necessity, in view of the condition of affairs in England, of instituting an inquiry in regard to that particular phase of electoral reform. These are words of the Prime Minister in response to the delegation:

> Lord Courtney and gentlemen, I have received in this room and elsewhere many deputations, but I do not call to mind any one of them which, having regard to its composition—and here I speak not merely of the personal weight of the individuals but of the variety of opinions in the political schools which they represent—which is more entitled to have its appeal listened to with consideration and respect. I do not hesitate to say at the outset of the very few observations which I am going to ask you to listen to, that I am in entire agreement with your main position. I have said in public before now, and am therefore only repeating an opinion which I have never ceased to hold, namely, that there can be no question in the mind of any one familiar with the actual operation of our constitutional system that it permits, and I might almost say that it facilitates—but it certainly permits a minority of voters whether in the country at large or in particular constituencies to determine the representation —the relative representation in the one case of the whole nation, and the actual representation in the other case of the particular constituency, sometimes in defiance of the opinions and wishes of the majority of the electors. The moment you have stated that as a fact which cannot be disputed, and it cannot be contradicted by any one, you have pointed out a flaw of a most serious character, and some might say of an almost fatal character, when your constitutional and parliamentary system appears at the bar of judgment upon the issue whether or not it does from the democratic point of view really carry out the first principles of representative government. I therefore agree that it is impossible to defend the rough and ready method which has been hitherto adopted as a proper or satisfactory explanation of the representative principle. It is not merely, as more than one speaker has pointed out, that under our existing system a minority in the country may return a majority of the House of Commons, but what more frequently happens, and what I am disposed to agree is equally injurious in its results, is that you have almost always a great disproportion in the relative size of the majority and minority in the House of Commons as compared with their relative sizes in the constituencies. That is the normal condition of our House of Commons. I have had experience of some of the inconveniences which result. I have had experience in both ways.

The Prime Minister goes on to explain what those experiences have been, giving details with which I do not wish to detain the House. But after having said that the inquiry was absolutely necessary, the Prime Minister stated that the only trouble which he encountered was to know in what shape that inquiry should be carried on. He stated that in his experience, royal commissions, through an unfortunate circumstance in the past, had been composed of too many members. But the Prime Minister spoke of immediate consideration, and indeed only a few days ago the British government named a royal commission to examine this question, composed of eight very eminent men, with Lord Frederick Cavendish as chairman, and the Prime Minister promised that no measure of electoral reform, such as has been promised by the present governing power in England, will be presented to the House before the government is in possession of the findings of this important commission.

Now one word as to foreign countries. They have adopted the system of proportional representation in Denmark, what is called the Andre system, slightly different from the classic form of proportional representation advocated long ago by Mr. Hare and defended by John Stuart Mill; that is the system which they have with some variation in Denmark, with excellent results. In Belgium they have a most perfect system, the list system, but not the simple system of one list on which is based the programme of the Proportional Representation League. The list system give play to the parties, being a most excellent system in its results, inasmuch as it affords representation to minorities. That is the system which they have in Belgium. The voter has before him as many lists as there are parties, or an individual, or a very small group of individuals may present a list. One man may present a list. There is a vote for the list and a personal vote as well. It is what the French call 'la con-

currence des listes avec double vote simultané,' or a competition of lists, the conditions being that the voter exercises his own personal preference. That, I say, is the system which they have in Belgium and the calculation of the results is made by a very improved mathematical method which is known by the name of the system D'Hondt, after the inventor. I do not feel justified in explaining fully that system, but it is a very simple one and we find it nowhere better explained than in a very interesting report or blue book presented to the House of Commons in England. It is a 'Report of His Majesty's representatives in foreign countries and in British colonies respecting the application of the principle of proportional representation in public elections.' You have there a collection of the reports of all the representatives of the British government in foreign countries and also throughout the British dependencies, and you have there, from the ambassador at Brussels, or from one of the attaches at Brussels, an explanation of the Belgian system which makes it clear to the most ordinary intelligence. In this connection I might say at once, lest I forget it, that the objection is very often urged that these systems, excellent in their results and faithful to the principle of proportionate representation, are not susceptible of comprehension by the average elector and that it is impossible to find any ordinary elector capable of understanding the principle or the method adopted by the Proportional Representation Society or the scientific principle adopted in Belgium. The answer to that is that where these systems are in use there are less ballots spoiled than in the countries where the old system exists. Very few ballots were spoiled in the two test elections held in England, an infinitessimally small proportion, and in Belgium, and the British dependencies where the system exists the proportion of ballots spoiled is remarkably small. There is a story of a prominent advocate of proportional representation who was also an African explorer; he tried the system on a tribe in the centre of Africa and after explaining it to them an election was held in which there was not a single ballot spoiled. It is a mistake to imagine that the elector does not understand the ballot. I have often heard from returning officers that what you call the lower and less instructed class understand the ballot which we have without any explanation and that very often it is to the intelligent and educated that the deputy returning officers are obliged to explain the methods of voting.

I would say a word in regard to France where the system of single member constituencies, or scrutin d'arondissement, is in force to-day. It exists in France, Germany, Italy and Spain, but in France you have a host of writers who have studied the question. It is just as live a question in France as it is in England and there is a report by what is in France the equivalent of the Royal Commission in England in which they recommend the adoption of the Belgian system of lists with some modifications as to simplicity and the ensuring of greater liberty to the electors.

In the United States they have tried different systems of representation, all the suggested improvements of culmulative voting, general ticket transferable voting; there is no place where electoral experiments have been so numerous or varied as in the United States. But they too have their Proportional Representation League that quite recently, at one of its largest meetings at Saratoga, adopted a model Bill providing for proportional representation in congressional elections as well as for state and municipal elections. That model Bill can be found in the journals of the Proportional Representation Society of the United States. There was a Bill introduced into Congress by Mr. Johnson of Ohio as far back as 1892 in favor of proportional representation as applied to the election of members of the house of representatives. In Switzerland the system has been adopted with respect to the cantonal elections. It has been very often urged that with the system of proportional representation you cannot have a strong, stable government. It is suggested that after all, imperfect and tainted with vices as is the present system, you are pretty sure that you will have a strong and clear result even if the result gives an advantage to the minority of the electors. Yet, it is a question whether that contention is well founded. In France they have the single member constituency system and they have had numerous changes of government and not for many years what you might call a strong and stable government. That kind of argument would not apply to that country nor to Spain or Italy. It is suggested that with the present system you would have a division of the country into two great parties with no groups, no factions, no small grouping of electors. That contention is not well founded. In France, Germany and Italy you have groups, you have the electorate divided into groups which are quite numerous and for many years you have had these groups even in England. They have there Unionists, Liberal Unionists, Conservative Unionists, the Irish party, the Labor party, the Radical party and the Socialist party. I do not find that the proposition is well founded that the system of to-day has the effect of dividing the country into two strong dominant parties and that you are not exposed to factions under the present system or that you have an element of stability which you would not find

under proportional representation. I do not think that the proposition is well founded. However, there is a strong desire, even in England where the reform is earnestly desired, to maintain the division of party and to the authorities there and to many others it seems undesirable to depart suddenly from the division at present existing into parties and to have this one single list, freedom of course for the elector but one single list as proposed by the Proportional Representation League. Many who are in favor of the proportional representation consequently advocate the list system, they would not do away with the list system and they incline to view with favour the Belgian list system whereby each party would have its own list, and there would be apportionment of the seats between the two lists. There is strong ground for the contention that the men who take the liveliest interest in the Proportional Representation League are not averse to the recognition of the division of lists.

There is of course the difficulty of details as to the disposal of remainders. That is to say when you have with the quotient found a certain number of representatives who with the quotient are absolutely found in the number of votes on each list and some representatives still remain to be elected, how will you operate? This question has received many solutions. There is the solution adopted by the Proportional Representation League in England which is fair enough. The Belgians have a system which does away with the remainder completely. The only objection to that system, which is mathematically perfect and very easy to understand, is that while it gives small parties some modicum of representation it also has the effect of increasing the representation of larger parties. In some parts of the United States they proceed in a similar way and do away with remainders. I shall not go into that because I do not think time justifies my doing so but it is a very interesting question and has been fully treated by those who have studied the question, so that abundant material on this point is to be found in all the writers.

Another difficulty which I anticipate may be suggested in regard to this question is whether we are going to do away with by-elections, that very important element in our political life. That is to say in one of these large constituencies where there are from 7 to 15 representatives what could you do when a vacancy occurs? That problem has been solved in Denmark I believe, at any rate in Belgium, and in some other countries that have adopted the proportional representation system, by electing at the same time as the representatives are elected, supplementaries who are destined to fill vacancies. In other places the vacancy is filled by taking the man next on the list, who has come nearest to fulfilling the conditions for election.. This, however, does not seem to meet with approval in England and is repugnant to our ideas. A solution has been suggested in England in the maintenance of the present electoral divisions to this extent that in the grouping of constituencies to form the larger electoral districts, the older divisions could be maintained and the man elected, the one who would be first elected, who would have succeeded in having the largest number of votes, would be free to choose the particular subdivision he would represent. It is argued with, I think, great accuracy that the person would choose invariably the constituency with which he would have always been associated, from which he would have received the largest support, with which he was most intimately connected. There is no doubt about that and in this manner each of the candidates elected would have a choice of constituency, and an elected member would choose that division or subdivision with which he was most intimately connected. In that case, when the by-election became necessary by the creation of a vacancy, it would be possible, a very important element in our political life, to test public opinion by having one election in that particular district. I believe that with that adjunct the reform offers no very considerable difficulties, although the efforts I have made so far have been to make known to the House in a general way the nature of the reform which we contemplate, and its far reaching and beneficial results. I have been obliged to confine myself to very strict limits, to the question in its broadest possible aspects. I have not however, neglected the consideration of how the improved system might find application in our own country.

I shall not detain the House by going at length into details of conclusions on that particular point, but in the researches I have made in connection with this, I have found no obstacles to this great reform. It is true that in some of the vast tracts of the country, as for instance in British Columbia or in the prairie provinces, the grouping of constitunecies at first sight is a difficult problem, not so much the grouping as the obtaining of the result. One would be obliged in a constituency of very large area to await results. The operations themselves are simple and can be performed as quickly as in England, but you would have to wait. It is better in place of obtaining a result in a few hours which is an unsatisfactory result, which is associated with a system condemned by everybody, a crude system giving free action to all kinds of abuses, to wait a little longer and obtain satisfactory results under a satisfactory system. Where the aggregations of population are greater, as in larger

cities, there are absolutely no obstacles to the trial of that system immediately. It could be tried at once in large cities where you could easily group the constituencies and people would, upon that test, realize what an immense advantage in every respect these changes would bring about. Hence it would be a school where we could learn the advantages of the system and study the methods of applying it generally throughout the country. In my own province there are differences of race and religion which at first sight might present some difficulties, although, of course, the primary object of the system I am advocating is to ensure a representation of the minority within the province, and to ensure a satisfactory representation of the minority in the Dominion as well. There would be very little difficulty in applying that system within the limits of provinces where these diflerences of race and religion occur and the results would, I am sure, prove most satisfactory. I regret that I am not able to go into details in regard to that, although on some future occasion, if the government decide to give practical effect to the suggestions I have made this afternoon, I may be able to communicate the results of my studies on that subject to the House. Finally, I have endeavoured to show this: in the first place, the admitted failure of our present system of representation; the dissatisfaction with it which exists everywhere, not only in this country, but in every other country where the system is in force. I have endeavoured, secondly, to show the suggested improvement of the present condition of affairs by the adoption of some system of election which would secure the true manifestation in parliament of the opinions of the entire electorate. I have tried, in the third place, to show the changes which are at present being worked out in all other democratic countries, or are engaging the serious attention of public opinion. I can only add that the duty of our own country is to fall in with this great democratic movement all over the world, to take our place in the procession of improvement, to give this question serious study, either by the committee which this motion suggests, or, better still, by a small commission who would have the time and the means available for a complete study of the system proposed and its applicability in our country. It is our duty at the present moment not to remain indifferent, side by side as we are with the great republic, which is making considerable tentative efforts in the direction of reform. We too must show that the democratic spirit is alive amongst us, and we must equal, if not surpass, our neighbours in the way of reform.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House has listened with pleasure to the speech of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, in which he has brought to our notice one of the most interesting problems in connection with representative government. I do not rise for the purpose of offering any objection to my hon. friend's resolution—to its main purpose. On the contrary, I think we shall all admit, in the light of what he has presented to us, that the subject is worthy of study and investigation. My only purpose is to suggest to my hon. friend whether he has not, in the form of his resolution, gone a little farther than is necessary. I want to suggest to him that he might modify, not the purpose or the substance of his resolution, but only its form. In the early part of it he asks the House to commit itself to the principle of proportional representation. I would not think that was necessary to the purpose of my hon. friend. I do not understand that he presents this question to the House as a settled question upon which conclusions have been reached. I would rather understand from his speech that he regards it as an open question calling for investigation and study. I would therefore suggest to my hon. friend that he would serve his purpose and secure the co-operation of the House generally, if he would remove from the resolution the first portion, so that it would begin at the seventh line and read as follows:

That a select standing committee of this House be appointed to investigate the different systems of proportional representation adopted or suggested elsewhere as an improvement upon our present methods of election, with power to extend said inquiry to all the various forms of the proportional representation laws proposed or in force.

I can well understand that there may be some hon. members of the House who feel that the present system, with its admitted imperfections, is perhaps after all as effective as any other that we are likely to obtain. The question, interesting and important as it is, is by no means new, because for many years the question of minority representation or proportional representation has engaged the attention of students of constitutional government. Although very much has been said and written on it, the mother of parliaments, to which we naturally look for example, has up to the present time not been able to find anything better than the good old system of government by the majority of the people in the respective constituencies. I do not think my hon. friend finds it necessary to his purpose to ask us to declare to-day in favour of the principle of proportional representation. I rather think that the spirit of his whole speech, which we have listened to with so much interest and pleasure, is that this is a question that invites our attention, investigation and careful study. In that spirit I would suggest to my hon. friend

whether he might not modify his resolution in the way I have proposed, and in that form I have no doubt it will secure the unanimous approval of the House.

Mr. MONK. If I may be allowed, I would say that I am very well satisfied with the spirit in which the suggestion I have made has been received by the government. All I desire, and all I am sure that the members of this House desire, is to have the question examined, without committing ourselves to any special reform. I wondered, after I had given notice of this motion and after I had learned of the action taken by the British government, whether a commission would not perhaps be more satisfactory; but in the meantime the nomination of a committee would be very satisfactory to myself.

Mr. FIELDING. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he add to the resolution the usual words, 'with power to send for persons, papers and records,' which with his consent the clerk will add. I understand that my hon. friend consents to the amendment I suggest.

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Motion as amended agreed to.

THE RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald) moved:

That in the opinion of this House the vacancy on the Board of Railway Commissioners caused by the death of the late Hon. Mr. Greenway should be immediately filled by the appointment of an able and practical farmer of the west, in order that the best interests of the agriculturists may be protected.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the resolution which I have had on the Order Paper for some time, and which I now move, I do not desire to make any lengthy remarks, nor do I wish it to be understood that I am moving the resolution for the purpose of making any political capital or gain. I move it in the endeavour to impress on the hon. members of this House, and the government in particular, how important it is that the vacancy on the Board of Railway Commissioners resulting from the death of the late Hon. Mr. Greenway, should be immediately filled, and that the appointment should go to a practical farmer of the west. My reason for mentioning the west is that the board as at present constituted is composed entirely of eastern members. The man appointed to the position should be one who has had some experience in the pioneer life of the west, he should be an honest man, he should be a capable man, he should be a courageous and energetic man, not afraid to stand out for the interests of the agricultural class. There are many professions practised in this country with which it is a credit for any man to be connected. To my mind there is no profession more noble, more honourable, more important, than that of agriculture, and I regret to say that the agriculturists in this country have not got that representation in our legislative halls and on our boards and commissions to which they are entitled. I need not argue that agriculture is the principal industry of Canada. That has long since been conceded and it is admitted almost every day in this House. But what I cannot understand is that we should find hon. gentlemen apparently so anxious to stand up for the farmers, and yet when it comes to appropriate the necessary money for the development of the great industry, this government is parsimonious to an extreme.

On looking through the statistics, I find that there are in Canada at present 575,000 practical farmers, that is men who depend on the cultivation of their own farms for a living. And I find that out of a population of 6,500,000, 3,775,000 are depending on the operations of farming. I find that there is invested in agriculture in this country $2,440,000,000, and that the revenue from our agricultural sources amounts annually to about $700,000,000, which is more than that derived from all the other industries put together. I find further that the agricultural exports from the country amount to about $150,000,000 annually. Now, I am not going to take up time travelling from the Atlantic to the Pacific to show where those farms are located or where this large amount of capital is invested, but shall content myself with saying that the major portion of this immense capital is invested in the west and that our resources come largely from the west, notwithstanding the fact that these new provinces are still in their infancy. But notwithstanding the large number of people engaged in agriculture, the large amount of money invested and the large revenue coming from that source, I regret to say that the farmers, who can produce as capable representatives as any other class in this country, have but a small representation in our legislative halls and on our important boards. Let me refer for a moment to the parliament which was dissolved last summer, and I am not doing so for the purpose of making any invidious reflections. In that parliament, composed of 214 members, there were but 13 farmers. As to the number of practical farmers in this parliament, with its increased representation, I am not able to say, that I want to point out that 90 per cent of the constituents represented in this House are farmers, and that the farmers expect the members of this House to stand up for their interest when anything pertaining to it is in question. For that reason I claim that there is not one hon. gentleman in this House who can get away from supporting my resolution.

The Board of Railway Commissioners, which was created some six or seven years ago, is a very important body, I do not know that there is any legislative body in the Dominion whose work has been more beneficial to the general public than that board. When it was first suggested, by means of petitions from the municipalities throughout the Dominion and personal letters to the government of the day, both sides of the House were anxious to give to the people such a board as they desired; and the board parliament created was not long in operation until it was found that the work was too strenuous for the railway commissioners to accomplish without submitting themselves to a very severe strain. I believe that the excess of work imposed upon one of the brightest men that we had in this country, who was chairman of that commission, shortened his days. It was then found that it would be wise to reorganize the board. That was the stand taken by the leader of the opposition and agitated by him on the hustings, but the government did not see fit to reorganize the board in the manner suggested by the leader of the opposition but did see fit to increase its members; and when they came to make the extra appointment, we in the west were pleased to know that they put on that commission a practical farmer in the person of the late Mr. Greenway. And we all regret that his death prevented our having the benefit of that work which no doubt so able a man would have been able to perform. No doubt it is the intention of the government to replace Mr. Greenway, and I appeal on behalf of the farmers of the west to have that appointment go to a practical farmer. Many members will probably ask: have you in the ranks of the farming profession a man qualified for this position? I have had that question put to me since I put this resolution on the Order Paper. To that question I reply that in the ranks of the farming profession there are men as capable of filling this position as can be found in any other profession, and I believe that if the government will make a little effort they will have no difficulty finding in the west such a person. I claim that this vacancy should have been filled before this. There is no board to which it is as easy for the farmers to go as the Board of Railway Commissioners. In a sense, the board comes to them. And I believe that, had the board had in its membership a representative of the farmers, there would have been a better understanding of the grievances and obstacles with which the farmers of that western country have had to contend in relation to the transportation problem, which, after all, is the great problem in the development of the west.

I have already asked: Is such a man available? I need hardly remind the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) that the farmers of the west believe they have a proper man for that position. I do not know that it would be out of order for me to make mention of the name, for it has been in the press and has come to the attention of the government through petitions and personal letters, but I do not mention the name. The gentleman is a voter in the constituency I have the honour to represent. And, while he is politically opposed to me I can assure the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways that they will make no mistake in giving to the farmers that particular person as their representative in the Railway Commission.

I claim that the farmers of this country are not getting justice; they are not getting, if you will allow the expression, a square deal. Some person is responsible for it. If I may be permitted, I would say that the man to whom we first look is the man whom the farmers have sent to represent them in the ministry. This hon. gentleman is placed in that position to champion and advocate the interests of the farmers. But we find, as I have already intimated, that we are not getting the necessary money to develop the industry of agriculture. We have heard the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) state, time and again, that if he had the necessary money, he would have no difficulty in giving to the farmers the consideration to which they are entitled. I am not here particularly to complain of the small sum of money we are getting, but I do complain that the minister is not putting up the fight he should to get his share of the appropriations that are made. The Minister of Agriculture is given about half a million dollars, where the Department of Marine and Fisheries gets $5,000,000 annually and the Department of Militia about $5,000,000. True, the Minister of Agriculture tries to explain that in the last parliament his annual oppropriations amounted to about $1,000,000. But if he will leave aside the items which ought not to have been charged to his department, he will find that I am not far astray in saying that the farmers are only getting about half a million. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what right has the Minister of Agriculture to allow the large item of archives to be charged up to agriculture? What has census statistics to do with agriculture? What have criminal statistics to do with agriculture? What has the Year-Book, what has Historical Data Regarding Canadian Families? What has the Patent Record to do with the Department of Agriculture? Yet the Minister of Agriculture allows these to be charged up to his department. It would seem that, as the ministers sit at the council board, when they find an expenditure which no department wishes to shoulder, the Minister of Agriculture says: Charge it up to the

Department of Agriculture, because the poor farmer, in his ignorance will never know that is charged to the Agriculture Department. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) laughs. But I want to say to him that the farmers do not treat this as a laughing matter. The Minister of Agriculture appears to go away out of his sphere in much that he does. He wants to be in all the big debates in this House, he wants to introduce legislation such as the Civil Service Bill—yes, and the Militia Bill. But I do not know that he has made a great success of the legislation he has taken charge of; I find about as much complaint about it, as about the department of which he has the honour to be in charge.

I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture what he has been doing when these appropriations were under discussion? What was he doing, for example, when the Department of Militia asked for and succeeded in getting, last session, appropriations amounting to about $5,000,000? Where was he when $90,000 was being asked for the erection of dwellings for servants at the Royal Military college, making a cost of $6,000 to $7,000 for each house, every one a modern residence equipped with electric light and all other modern conveniences. Did the hon. Minister of Agriculture think of the people he is supposed to represent? Did he think of the people who had paid this money? Did he think of people who had to go out to the far prairie or to the backwoods there to hew down timber to build a shanty or construct a hut of sods? Had the minister given the consideration to his department that he should have given, he would have said: No; I will not allow such an amount to be appropriated for such a purpose. When they were appropriating a large amount of money, more than $20,000, to build a residence for the chief astronomer, could not the minister think of a better way to utilize the money than to build a comfortable home for an official already well paid? Then take——

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples) understand the question before the House? I have allowed a certain amount of latitude, but I think——

Mr. STAPLES. Speaking to the point of order you have raised, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not a point of order, it is merely to call attention to the question before the House—the appointment of a railway commissioner.

Mr. STAPLES. I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I was trying to explain that the farmer is not properly represented, as the resolution states. However, Mr. Speaker, if I am getting wide of the mark I will be only too pleased to bow to your wishes. I do not intend in any case to take up much time. I only intended to bring this matter before the government and ask them to give the agriculturists representation on that board. I feel, and the farmers of the west feel, that they are entitled to have a farmer placed upon that board, a farmer who has had to go through pioneer life in that country, a man who understands the obstacles that the early settlers have to overcome in the development of that country. There is no class of people who have done more to build up this great Canada of ours than the farmers, there is no class who have contributed more in taxation and otherwise to build up this country than the farmers, and in my opinion there is no class who are receiving so little consideration as the farmers. I hope that the Minister of Agriculture will take heed to what I suggest to-night. I hope that when this government ask for any more appropriations to equip a vessel like the 'Montcalm,' with silver spoons and silver teapots costing $18 or $20 a piece, they will remember the pioneer who is away out on the prairie, or in the backwoods, and use some of the money for his relief which is now being wasted in other directions. In conclusion I again appeal to this government on behalf of the farmers, because they constitute, as I have said, about ninety per cent of the voters in the western constituencies, and are consequently deserving of much more consideration from the government than they are at present receiving.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). In rising to second the motion of my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) I shall detain the House but a short time. Nevertheless, I realize that this is one of the most important and far reaching questions that has been presented to this House, or will be presented to it, during the present session. I shall endeavour to show to this House that the farmer is more largely interested in freight rates and passenger rates than any other class of citizens in this country, and if I can show that the farmers are as large or larger supporters of the railways than any other class of citizens then surely, Mr. Speaker, the motion of my hon. friend deserves the support of this House and of the government. I do not wish to confine my remarks to the farmers of the west, although I have the honour of representing a very important farming constituency in the western country, but I wish to broaden my outlook and to include all the farmers in this country. I ask this government to place a representative of the farmers upon the Board of Railway Commissioners, a body which has been organized to hear the real or alleged grievances of the farmers, and to adjudicate them in the best interest of all parties concerned. Sir, I do not need at this time to expatiate on the great importance of the Board of Railway Commissioners in this country. I desire to give

this government credit for inaugurating that splendid institution, I believe it is one of the best institutions we have in this country. It is only five or six years ago since this country decided to do away with the old Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and to replace it with what is known as the Board of Railway Commissioners. Although a board of railway commissioners may be somewhat new to this country, it is no new thing to our friends to the south of us. We find upon examination that nearly every state in the union has its board of railway commissioners, not so large, I think, as ours, not having so many members as we have upon our board. Besides having a board for each state, they have established a great central convention, in which representatives from the various state boards meet yearly and discuss matters involved in the great question of transportation. They consider their object so important that they have decided to establish a permanent time and place of meeting, the time being the month of October, and the place the city of Washington.

Now, Mr. Speaker, although we have followed the example of our friends to the south in establishing a railway commission, we have not followed them so closely as I would like in selecting the personnel of that railway board. Last session, on the occasion of the appointment of the late Mr. Greenway, I made some remarks along that line. They are the sentiments of my heart, and I intend to express them here again, believing that although they come from a very humble member of this House, they are worthy of the consideration of this country. Our friends to the south do not select the members of their various boards from one political party, they select them from different political parties, and I believe that fact means more than it might appear at first sight to the members of this House. In some of the states, especially in the great State of Minnesota, no two members can be selected from the same political party, and I believe that mode of selection greatly enhances the confidence which the people have in the board. I have said that I gave this government credit for establishing the Board of Railway Commissioners, but I fear they have not done all they might or ought to have done to make this board as efficient as possible in the performance of the important work entrusted to it. I want to say that so far as the appointment of the late Judge Killam was concerned, notwithstanding that he was a Liberal of the Liberals, if this government had searched from the Atlantic to the Pacific, they could not have found a more capable, a more fair-minded gentleman to be chairman of that commission than the late Judge Killam.

We had a very interesting discussion not long ago upon the subject of deaths from preventable diseases. Everybody knows that the late Judge Killam did come to his death by an acute disease, but every medical man in this House knows that these acute diseases are much more easily contracted and that we are less able to resist them if our constitutions are worn out by overwork. I believe that Judge Killam was overworked. I believe that the Board of Railway Commissioners has been and even yet is a one man board to a very large extent. It is very good to have critical men, literary men, if you like, on that board, but I believe that if the curtain was raised, that if we knew more of the inner workings of this Railway Commission, we would find that there are some men who are more anxious to see that every 'i' is dotted and that every 't' is crossed than to give the chairman of the board the help that he should have in order to carry on the work successfully. I cannot speak of the present chairman as I can of Judge Killam, because I had known Judge Killam fairly well for some twenty-five years, but I believe that the gentleman who has succeeded him is fulfilling all the duties that he has been called upon to fulfil in connection with the chairmanship of this important board. But I do ask the government, in making appointments to this very important board, to rise above politics and opportunism and place upon the board a proper class of men. I am so earnest about this board that I intend now to offer a criticism in regard to one of the recent appointments. It may not be the proper thing for me to do it, but I have seen opportunism entering into an appointment to this board. Why did not the government keep right on appointing men of the stamp of Judge Killam and Judge Mabee to that board? What occurred recently every member on either side of this House knows. An election was coming on and the first minister wanted some new blood in his cabinet. Every portfolio was already filled, he could not make any new appointments, but he had to get rid of some of the old men and to my mind it is as clear as A B C that in order to get rid of some of the old ones something had to be done, and in connection with that bargain, for I can call it nothing else, a gentleman was called to that board who, I do not think, was fitted for that position. I would like that we on both sides of this House should be big enough and broad enough that when we wanted to appoint a man to this commission we would forget race and creed and appoint a man suitable for the position irrespective of race and creed.

Now, I want to give a few figures to show the importance of the farmers in this country. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) has done it well, but I desire to add a few words to what he said. I do not suppose my hon. friend counted me as being among the honour-

able thirteen, but I want to say that I represent a farming constituency and I do not believe, farmer as my hon. friend is, that there is any man who takes more interest in the welfare of our farmers than I do and why?—because I know that I cannot benefit the farmers without benefiting the doctors, lawyers and everybody else in the country. My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), in answer to a question, obtained some figures about the farmers. My hon. friend from Macdonald referred to some of them and said that the farmers numbered 575,000. He also said that those dependent on the farmers numbered 3,788,000. That is not right. If there are 7,000,000 people in this country then there are 7,000,000 people dependent on the farmers.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not want to be misrepresented by the hon. gentleman. I said that 3,788,000 were depending directly upon the operations of the farmers.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I am very pleased to accept my hon. friend's explanation. He never makes a mistake. The number dependent upon the farmers was given in answer to a question, and the statement of my hon. friend was 3,788,000, but I maintain that if there are 7,000,000 people in Canada there are 7,000,000 people directly dependent on the farmers. True it may be that like Macawber's wife's twins, for a time we are permitted to draw our nourishment from nature's fount, but we have not travelled very far along the journey of life before we switch off and become dependent upon what the farmers produce. The figures which I propose to quote are appalling. We wonder how it is that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), out of all the revenue of this country, can only get the paltry sum of from $500,000 to $700,000 for the farmers. Let me give the following figures to the House:

Invested in agriculture, 1908.. ..	$2,440,000,000
Farm buildings	395,815,143
Farms and lots	1,007,454,358

Taking these two last items together we have $1,403,269,501 as the value of farm property including buildings and land. Now, let me make a litle comparison between this and the amount invested in the manufacturing industries of this country. We have lands and buildings used by the manufacturing industries valued at $467,274,905, and capital invested, $846,585,023. The value of farm products in June, 1908, was as follows:

Horses..	$264,000,000
Milch cows..	99,000,000
Horned cattle..	122,000,000
Sheep..	15,000,000
Swine..	31,000,000
Total..	$531,000,000

I am endeavouring to show the support that the farmer gives to the railway. Until recently the Board of Railway Commissioners devoted themselves almost absolutely to the question of transportation. The number of animals exported in 1908 was 157,279. If you take 30 to the carload you have 7,863 carloads of cattle that the trains were called upon to carry during the year 1908. Last year we grew in this country over 112,000,000 bushels of wheat. The area under wheat in 1908 was 6,610,300 acres. From that production of wheat we must deduct a little over 9,000,000 bushels for seed. Deducting also the amount required for home consumption, we have left for transportation about 75,000,000 bushels of wheat. This would make 75,000 carloads, 25,000 train loads and, averaging 20 trains to the day, it would take the railways 125 days, or about 4½ months to ship out the wheat grown in this country in one year. Does not this give the farmers some just claim to representation on this Board of Railway Commissioners?

Take apples. We grew in 1891 something over 7,000,000 bushels. In 1901 that had increased almost three times, it had grown to 18,626,186 bushels. In 1906 we grew in Canada 25,000,000 bushels of apples. Three bushels to the barrel would reduce this to 8,000,000 barrels which, at a reasonable price, say $1.25 a barrel, would be worth $10,000,000 and would fill 44,480 cars or, at 30 cars to the train, 1,481 train loads.

I might make an estimate of these combined. The value of farm animals and their products for 1908 was $531,000,000. The crop values of 1908 came to $432,534,000. The cheese, butter, milk, condensed milk and apples of this country amounted in 1908 to over $100,000,000, and apples to $10,000,000, making a total of $1,073,534,000. The beauty of this is that although this country was able to produce crops of such enormous value the land was left in just as good condition as ever to produce as large or larger crops in the next year. It is not so with the mines. You dig a hole and extract gold or silver and you have nothing left but the hole—I am told that in many mines the hole is all you ever do have. It is not so with the products of the farm, you can take this great amount one year and your farm is in just as good condition next year.

I may be met with the argument that this is a new country and that you cannot expect that the manufactures of this country will have become as important as the farming industry and its products. Let me call attention to the United States which is surely not a young country. If the agricultural products of the United States have increased in equal ratio and have kept ahead of the other industries of that country, have I not the right to argue that the same condition of affairs will exist in this country as now exist in the United States?

In 1905 the capital invested in manufactures in the United States was over $13,000,000,000. The capital invested in railroads was $13,000,000,000. The capital invested in agriculture was not $13,000,000,000 but more than twice that amount, it was over $30,000,000,000. The net return from products, manufactures, was $2,093,893,976; from railroads, $616,341,657, and from agriculture, net return, $2,945,461,200. If that is so it is high time that the representatives of this country, even although they may not be as practical farmers as my hon. friend (Mr. Staples), should realize from a business point of view the great importance of the farming industry. I want to warn the Minister of Agriculture that the farmers are beginning to wake up. I shall not take up that issue to-night. I intend to take it up later and to show not only the government supporters but the leader of the opposition and every one on this side that they will waken up one morning and find that the farmers are going to do what they ought to do, that is run this country.

As to the Board of Railway Commissioners, no body of men in this country are charged with graver duties or burdened with severer responsibilities. I say without fear of contradiction that no question approaches in magnitude, in difficulty or in importance, this great question of transportation. Let us meet it fairly and squarely. I do not ask parliament that a farmer from the west should be chosen, although I would be justified in doing so. The four great provinces of the west, Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia are the great agricultural provinces, they are the great sources of profit to the railways. Why are the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway so anxious to get into that country? Not for fun, they are business propositions, they are anxious to get there because they know the farmers of that country will produce the stuff that will give business to these railways. Let us not consider creed or nationality, but in the appointment of men to this important institution let us recognize the claim of the farmer. I hope that the appointment has not gone so far that the minister cannot adopt the suggestions so eloquently made by my hon. friend from Macdonald and place upon the Board of Railway Commissioners a practical farmer.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I would not have to say a great deal had it not been for the delicate attention the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr Staples) has bestowed on me. It seemed to me that he had rather more at heart the showing up of my own delinquencies than the needs of the farmer or the constitution of the commission. His colleague (Mr. Schaffner) has said that his hon. friend does not make mistakes. I am sorry I cannot agree with that, because it will be my duty to show that he has made a few mistakes in the remarks he has made. In the first place he says that the Department of Agriculture has received about $500,000 in respect of agricultural work in the estimates. If he had studied the estimates of this session for the ensuing year he would have seen that after taking out all the estimates which he mentioned for extraneous subjects in the Department of Agriculture that department is asking the House for $782,000. I would like, however, to refer to the figures of a few years ago, and just out of curiosity I sent for the Appropriation Bill of 1895, the year before we came into office.

Mr. STAPLES. I am not criticising the late government.

Mr. FISHER. I know that my hon. friend would not criticise the previous government. I dare say that when that government was in power, my hon. friend knew very little about public affairs in Canada; if he had, perhaps he would not have said everything he has said to-night. Under that government, in 1895, the purely agricultural oppropriations for the benefit of the farmers came to $161,000. There was $40,000 more of advances to be made for dairy purposes, but that did not stay with the farmers, but came back into the public treasury; so that $161,000 was the amount by which under the Conservative regime the treasury of Canada was the poorer for the benefit of the farmers.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the hon. minister in fairness tell the House how much money was being expended in the Dominion of Canada previous to 1896, and figure out what proportion the farmers got ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. Roughly speaking, the expenditure has increased by a little more than double for the whole of Canada, while the expenditure on agriculture has amounted to nearly five times as much. I can give the exact figures to my hon. friend, if he is seeking information, which he is sadly in need of. My hon. friend dwelt upon my iniquities in charging to agriculture the archives, the patent record, the census and statistics, the statistical year-book, and so on. I said a few minutes ago that my hon. friend probably did not know much about political questions in Canada when his party was in power some thirteen or fourteen years ago; but if he will look back to that time, he will find that these expenditures are placed under the control of the Department of Agriculture by statute; and being a law-abiding citizen and minister, I keep them in the Department of Agriculture. The hon. member, if he goes back a little further, will find that these laws were put upon the statute-book by the old Conservative government, and if he goes

back through the eighteen long years during which the Tory party ruled this country before 1896, he will find that under that regime the law-abiding ministers of that day, Tory though they were, put the archives, the patent record, the census and statistics and the year-book also under the Department of Agriculture; and if the Department of Agriculture is that omnium gatherum which the hon. gentleman describes it, it is due to the fact that under the old Tory regime all these outside services were put into that department—why? Because it did so little for agriculture that its then minister had nothing to do, and the Tory party put under his control any thing and everything the other ministers wanted to get rid of. But we have been doing something for agriculture, we have been increasing the expenditure on agriculture, we have been enlarging the Department of Agriculture until to-day it is doing five times the work it did in those days, spends five times the amount of money, and shows five times that appreciation of the interests and the power of agriculture that our predecessors showed. My hon. friend from Souris has said that the farmers were rising in their might and were going to wake up and run things in this country. I can tell my hon. friend that since the ministry at present in power have come in, they have been largely run by the agricultural vote; and if to-day, and during the last election, and the election before, and the election before that, and the election before that again, the Liberal party have been able to defeat the Conservative party, it has been largely because the agricultural vote of Canada has supported the Liberal party. We have shown consideration for the farmers in every respect, we shall be glad to show it in the future as we have done in the past, and if at any time the agricultural interests are not carefully safeguarded before the Railway Committee, I am quite sure that this government will see that they are looked after.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, I cannot congratulate the hon. Minister of Agriculture on his speech. My hon. friend here points out the importance of the farming interest in the Northwest, the immense development and production of that section, and claims that the expenditure for agricultural purposes is not large enough. The minister replies with the tu quoque argument. Whenever you find a gentleman using that argument, you may conclude that he has no other argument to offer; it is an admission that the hon. gentleman who spoke before him is right. The hon. minister says: I sent for the statutes of 1895, and I find that the Tory government expended only $161,000 on agriculture. Suppose it did. The Tory government established the Department of Agriculture and appointed the first minister. If we have a Department of Agriculture to-day, it is due to the Conservative government. The hon. minister forgot to tell us that from 1874 to 1878, when these gentlemen were in power, not one cent was spent for agricultural purposes. If the Northwest has to-day products amounting to $180,000,000, it is due to the progressive Conservative government which built the Canadian Pacific Railway in spite of the opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite. Everything that is in the Department of Agriculture amounting to anything was initiated by the Conservative government, and the hon. gentleman has done nothing but follow the example set by them.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I have listened with great interest to the speeches of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) and the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples). But I heard with regret the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). It was certainly a humiliating position for a minister specially charged with the advancement of the greatest industry in this country, to take when, in reply to the fair criticisms made on his department, he gave us nothing but politics of the smallest description. Just let us go back ten years and find what this minister has done for the agriculturists of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Hon. gentlemen may well say oh, but if they will follow back his record what will they find? They will find him first introducing his scissors policy, in which he invented a pair of scissors to cut the peaches off the tree—peaches that had no stems. Then they will find him with his chicken fattening stations, established in different parts of the country, at the expense of tens of thousands of dollars, where he was trying to educate our farmers' wives to line up their chickens and fatten them with a squirt gun. Then what about his cold storage proposition? Have we not been pounding at his door for years trying to impress on him the necessity of improving our cold storage system and giving us a better means of transportation. But what has he been doing? I need hardly tell you the history of that cold storage system of his. It has been a perfect farce. Look at the money he has spent in equipping vessels to carry our perishable products across the ocean. He has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in that direction and yet has no control over the temperatures in the boats or on the cars. Year after year we have been trying to convince him that he should have control over the temperatures of these boats and cars, but he keeps on making appointments in his depart-

ment and piling up the expenses but doing nothing to make our cold storage transportation what it ought to be. Compare for a moment the system of cold storage across the Atlantic from the Dominion to the markets of the world with the system in operation from New Zealand, or the system which brings the chilled meat from the Argentine Republic and lands it in the British market. I might go on to tell you about the improvements he has attempted to make with regard to the fruit marketing Act and about his squandering of the people's money in other measures he has brought before this House. In nearly every one of them, he has made a complete failure. And to-day we find him rising in his place and condemning my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) for trying to urge on the government the necessity for appointing a practical farmer to the Railway Commission. What has he done towards helping to remove the cattle embargo in the old country? Why, you find him standing up and telling the people that they do not want mutual preference in the British market. Nor will he make an effort to get our goods into the German market, the second best market in the world. A few months ago we found him telling the farmers in his own province that they do not want rural free mail delivery.

Mr. NESBITT. What has rural free mail delivery to do with the question before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is raising a point of order, he should do so definitely and not in the form of a question.

Mr. NESBITT. My point of order is that the hon. gentleman is not speaking to the resolution before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The purpose of the resolution appears to be shown in the last few words: 'In order that the best interests of the agriculturist may be protected.' That certainly opens up agricultural questions, but I think that these agricultural matters should be discussed in the light of the preceding part of the resolution, and that is how they are to be protected by the appointment of an agriculturalist to the Board of Railway Commissioners, rather than by a close study of other matters connected with agriculture.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I quite recognize that several of the hon. gentlemen who preceded me have wandered somewhat afield, but I think that the Minister of Agriculture was responsible for having introduced a number of subjects into the discussion not expressly covered by the resolution.

Mr. NESBITT. But what has rural mail delivery to do with it?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sorry to see the hon. member for North Oxford taking the position he does. I am sorry to see that he does not take sufficient interest in matters pertaining to the farming interests to have them discussed on the floor of parliament. But I feel satisfied that when he goes back to his constituents and meets the different farmers of his constituency—and I have no doubt there are lots of brainy men among them—he will find that they will resent the position he has taken, in attempting to criticise any hon. member for trying to show up the sins of the Department of Agriculture. Coming back to the question before the House, I wish to point out that the hon. gentleman from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) was perfectly justified in urging on the government the necessity for appointing a practical farmer on the Railway Commission. I know he does not intend that the appointment should be limited to practical farmers from the west, because he recognizes that the farmers in the east are also in need of representation on that board. I need hardly call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that an immense quantity of perishable products go out of our country every year, and that these require to be handled by men who understand their transportation, and consequently some one acquainted with that subject in particular should be on the Board of Railway Commissioners. I might also mention that the express companies have a great deal to do with the transportation of perishable products. I have in my mind one man who last year paid out $50,000 to the express companies for the transportation of perishable products, and I know of many others in our farming districts who pay out large sums to these companies. We need, therefore, on that commission a man thoroughly conversant with that subject. We need also one conversant with the question of railway crossings, and it must be admitted that the one class most interested in these are the farming class. Then there are questions of drainage which come before that board and in regard to which it is important to have some farmer, who thoroughly understands these questions, on that Railway Commission, for very important questions of this kind come before the Railway Commission from time to time. The question of the carriage of the mails to distant districts claims the attention of the people living in the rural parts of Canada. The independent telephone and telegraph companies are also interested in having a man to represent them on the Board of Railway Commissioners. I do not intend to take up further time. I content myself with expressing the earnest hope that the government will support this resolution, and, that when the time comes to appoint a man on the railway commission a man

thoroughly conversant with the farming interest will be appointed.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Speaker, I think the House will be in pretty general agreement with me when I state that if, as the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) said, that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) threw down the political gauntlet, it is certainly equally true that the hon. member himself showed great readiness in taking that gauntlet up. He introduced into his opening remarks an amount of heat which, to my mind, is utterly foreign to any agricultural question. I think the spirit that should animate us is one of pastoral calm, but I failed to catch that mood in the remarks of the hon. member. The Minister of Agriculture needs no defence from me; but, after all, I should venture to urge that he has the right of every other member of the House to defend himself when he is attacked— and he was very strongly attacked, for a mild mannered man. I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture has left; I should have offered him a little consolation. I am told that the late Sir John A. Macdonald used to say that if you want to find the best apple tree you do not need to look at the branches,—find the tree with the most stones lying under it. Judged by that standard the House and the country will agree that, in the Minister of Agriculture we have a man who gives most punctiliously careful, able and successful attention to the duties of a very important office.

Now, to turn to the resolution before the House, if it comes to a vote I intend to vote against that resolution. It did not suit me to give a silent vote, because I happen to resemble both the mover and the seconder of the resolution in that I represent an agricultural constituency. I have the advantage of at least the seconder of the resolution in that I not only represent an agricultural constituency but am myself a farmer, so far as Canada is concerned.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. So am I as much a farmer as the hon. member (Mr. Michael Clark). How much does he farm—how many acres?

Mr. CLARK. I am going to prove still that I have the advantage over my hon. friend and interrupter; I am a farmer; I have never done anything but farm in Canada. Can my hon. friend state that also? He is silent now. He admits that I have the advantage over him. I am not sure but that, if I were a careful man, the fact that I am a farmer would make me careful about voting against the resolution because, after all, the appointment to the railway commissionership is a kind of rig a man could drive. The Minister of Railways and Canals need not take that remark in any spirit more serious than the spirit in which I make it.

I think that the mover of the resolution clearly proved too much. If I understand his argument, his attempt was to prove that where the farmers' interests are particularly concerned, a farmer was the man to do the business of the position. Then the hon. gentleman immediately started out to disprove his own position by proving that a horrible mistake had been made in the case of the Department of Agriculture by appointing a farmer to the position. If the Minister of Agriculture, being a practical farmer, is such a horrible failure in his position, surely that ought to warn us against supporting the mover of the resolution. In regard to the seconder of the resolution, I am bound to say that, as I listened to him, I wondered how he ever had the conscience, being, as I understand a medical man, to sit as the representative of an agricultural community. If he holds the farmer to be of such importance as his language describes him, if he was not merely repeating that kind of speech which all of us make more or less when we are appealing to an agricultural community—for I believe it is a common saying in this country that everyone is a farmer at election time—if he was not merely repeating one of these speeches, he should retire from his present position and let a farmer succeed him to represent a purely farming constituency. What did the hon. gentleman say in regard to the farmer? He also proved too much. He said that the farmer's importance is such that everybody knows it. If that be so, you cannot pick the wrong man for the position of the Railway Commission. For, if everyone knows the importance of the farmer, whoever you appoint will look after the farmers.

Now, I wish, in a couple of sentences, to give the House the reasons why I object to the principle of the resolution. My hon. friends the mover and seconder of the resolution will, at any rate, give to me the credit that I cannot be speaking for my constituents' support, nor am I speaking from any selfish or grafting reason, because I am a farmer and a representative of farmers. My first reason for objecting to the principle of the resolution is that I have held the political creed known as the Liberal creed all my life, and it forbids me to make class distinction. I had a friend who spent his early years in Australia. He was one of the best men I ever knew in the north of England, and one of the best farmers in my native county. In the days when he went to Australia, in many places throughout the empire there was a property qualification for voting. A paper was sent to him containing a column, which he was to fill up stating the qualifications by which he claimed to be put

upon the suffrage, and in this column he wrote the one word: 'Manhood'. In my Liberal creed, it is a greater thing to be a man than to be a farmer, it is a greater thing to be a man than to be a cabinet minister. Manhood is the test of citizenship, with me, it is the true test in making any appointments. Following this line, what are you going to look for in a railroad commissioner? Capacity for work, qualifications for the position, ability to examine into, not only the needs of the farmer, but the needs of the whole community. You want judicial qualities in a man, you want a man who can procure and appreciate evidence from all classes. I feel perfectly sure that the government, in making an appointment, will look for those broader tests, and look away from the narrower tests called for in the resolution.

My second reason is this, that I do not believe it is right to restrict the choice of the government to any particular class in making this nomination. If I may venture to mention one thing that has struck me with surprise in this House, and I do so with great modesty, it has been the amount of sectionalism, the amount of provincialism, the amount of class thinking which has characterized the debates that I have had the honour of listening to in the short time I have been a member of this House. We want, if I understand the needs of my adopted country which I have learned to love, we want to develop in this country a sense of nationhood, and if that be our aim, we must place no restriction upon the government that they shall make their nominations from any particular class of people. If you are animated by the spirit of nationhood, in selecting a man for any position, I do not care whether it be deputy speaker of the Senate, or speaker of the House of Commons, or a member of this House, or a member of the cabinet, you will not look to any class, even though it be the great class to which I am proud to belong, but you will look in every case for a Canadian and a man.

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL (Dauphin). It is with great pleasure that I rise to say a few words in favour of the resolution introduced by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples). I do so, not only from a sense of loyalty to him, but from a sense of the duty I owe to the farmers whom I am here to represent. I do it moreover because I am also a farmer, and I have the honour to represent in this House over 9,000 farmers in the Northwest. I say, therefore, it is a pleasure for me to speak on this question, because it affords me an opportunity of advocating their interests. But while I rise with pleasure to support this motion, my pleasure is tinged with a very sincere regret when I remember that the cause of this debate is the demise of a gentleman who stood high in the records of Canadian history. It is the demise of the Hon. Thomas Greenway which has furnished the occasion for this discussion. For twenty-five years Mr. Greenway took an active part in the politics of Manitoba. Although he made some political mistakes, from my point of view, still he was a man who did much to build up the great Northwest. He was a man of many parts, a lovable man in many ways, a man who was a strong personal friend of mine, though a political adversary. Many of the laws which he was instrumental in placing upon the statute book of Manitoba were, I believe, in the best interests of the people of that province. He was the leader of the great Liberal party in Manitoba, and might yet have been the leader, had he not been misled by the same influences that I told the First Minister had misled him with regard to the late elections in Manitoba.

I regret that this discussion has drifted into party politics, whereas we are, or should be, discussing the advisability of placing a representative of the farmers on the Railway Board in succession to the late Mr. Greenway, who was himself one of the most trusted and representative farmers in all Canada. Sir, we who advocate this resolution are not here representing only a fraction of the people of Manitoba, we are here representing over 140,000 farmers. It is their dictum we are asking this House to follow and it is their interest we are asking this government to consider. This House, through the Minister of Railways, has been asked by the farmers of the west to appoint a man whom they can trust, a man who sympathizes with their interests, to a position on the Board of Railway Commissioners. This is not a matter to be laughed at, as was done by my hon. friend who has just spoken, and by the Minister of Agriculture, it is a matter for the serious consideration of the members of this House, a matter to be discussed on common sense lines. Now let me point out the importance of these 140,000 farmers to Canada as wealth producers. Take my own province of Manitoba. The farmers of Manitoba last year raised farm produce to the value of sixty-six and a half million dollars, the result of the toil of their hands and the sweat of their brows. In Saskatchewan they produced thirty-seven and a half million dollars worth. They did not find this wealth by chance, they had to toil for it, and have they not a right to be listened to? In Alberta they produced fourteen and a half million dollars worth, a total for the three provinces of $118,500,000. Surely these people ought to be recognized as a factor in governing the appointment of members of the Board of Railway Commissioners. Looking east, we find that from the eastern boundary of Manitoba to the Atlantic ocean, agricultural products last year amounted to no less a sum than $236,000,000. And yet the Minister of Agricul-

ture dares to get up here and say that he is not here to listen to them. I say he is here to listen to them, he must listen to them, and this House must listen to them.

In speaking of the value of the farm products of the west, I have not said anything about the stock holdings there which roughly are as follows :

	Horses.	Cattle.	Sheep and hogs.
Manitoba ..	$24,000,000	$10,000,000	$11,500,000
Saskatchewan.	35,000,000	10,000,000	1,500,000
Alberta	24,000,000	20,000,000	1,000,000

Showing a total of $116,000,000 worth of stock, and yet the Minister of Agriculture, who is here representing the farmers, says that we are not here to listen to those people, but that we will make the appointment as we choose. I hold that these farmers have to be listened to. They have the right to be listened to. They are the wealth producers of the great western country, and were it not for them there would not need to be a railway commission at all. I have not taken into consideration the fact that millions of dollars worth of property are owned by the farmers of Canada. The farm buildings and real estate owned by the farmers of Canada, as quoted by my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner), amount in value to—buildings—$395,000,000 and—real estate—$1,007,000,000. Surely that is a sufficient reason for asking this government to consider the claims of the farmers in this regard. When the late Hon. Thos. Greenway received the appointment this government congratulated themselves and pointed out to the people of Canada that they had appointed to that position a man who was a practical farmer. They said, prior to the election: We have put an actual farmer into that position to look after your interests. What do they say now? The Minister of Agriculture derides hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who get up and make the suggestion that what the farmers ask for should be granted. To be accurate I wrote down the words of the Minister of Agriculture with reference to a computation, amounting to half a million dollars, made by my hon. friend from Macdonald and the words of the minister were these: 'However, that is as near as he can get to the actual facts.' I leave it to any member of this House to say if, in our experience, since we have been going through the estimates this year, it is possible to get any minister nearer to the actual facts than that. I think that if he came within a quarter of a million at a guess he would be very lucky. The Minister of Agriculture went on to apply the tu quoque argument and to say that the census, the archives, and the patents were introduced into the Department of Agriculture by the Tories. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have been twelve years in power. They condemned everything we did when we were in power and they have had twelve years to correct these things, but they have not done it, and they use them as excuses for their own misdoings. When you plant twigs in a nursery and they grow up there comes a certain time when they must be transplanted, and we are trying to tell the Minister of Agriculture that it is now time to transplant and to allow of a maturer and larger growth of those matters which concern the farming interests. That is what the farmers are asking. The hon. gentleman, instead of agreeing, as he should have agreed, being the Minister of Agriculture, with many of the things said by the gentleman who preceded him in the debate, sneered at him for lauding the farmers. It is the laughing stock of Canada that the Minister of Agriculture poses as a farmer. It is time he knew it and I am glad to tell him if he did not know it before. The only kind of farmer that he is is the kind that farms the farmers and that is the wrong kind for a Minister of Agriculture. He establishes chicken fattening stations and says to the farmers wives that if they spend about ten cents more per lb. on a chicken than they can possibly get for it on the market, they will be successful. That is the kind of a Minister of Agriculture he is. He is the kind that sits there in his seat and allows the Department of Militia to grasp the public money that ought to be spent for the benefit of the farmers instead of being spent in making—shall I say—carpet knights. There is no money available for the advancement of the interests of the farmers, who are the greatest wealth producers of the country. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) reprimanded hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for having introduced politics into the debate. I want to tell that hon. gentleman that I never in my life saw any one follow a bad example to a greater extent than he has done. He handed out a very nice certificate of character in the first place to himself, and later on to the Minister of Agriculture, and he said that he regretted the attack, the onslaught, that was made on the Minister of Agriculture, whom he described as a very mild mannered man. I would bring to his attention a quotation from Ralph Balderwood which, to my mind, possibly applies to his description of the Minister of Agriculture. Sir Ralph Balderwood, in speaking of a very bad character, said:

> A milder mannered man never cut a throat or scuttled a ship.

Having reference to the present occasion, I think the hon. gentleman will admit that

Ralph Balderwood's words were absolutely prophetic. The hon. member for Red Deer made what I regard as a little slip of the tongue when, in speaking of himself, having previously been referring to the minister, he said: , I, at least am not speaking with any selfish or grafting motive,' I characterize that as a slip of the tongue because it would be a very harsh criticism and a very severe reflection upon his own minister from the hon. member for Red Deer. It might be all right coming from me. The hon. member for Red Deer prided himself lastly on the fact that he had taken a certain stand in politics. Among the tenets of his peculiar political creed, and I might say that in this he does not agree with the rest of his party, is that he does not believe in class distinction, but in the next breath he said: 'I am a farmer.' Is that not taking credit to himself for belonging to the great party of Canada?

Mr. M. CLARK. I did not ask to be made a commissioner on that account.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The manner in which suggestions from this side of the House are treated is most regrettable. If a Conservative introduces a resolution which is in the interests of Canada, the other side, for political reasons, I cannot attribute it to anything else, absolutely reject it. I would remind my hon. friend of the words of Holy Writ, 'Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?' I am strongly in favour of the resolution proposed. The farmers of the west, the farmers of all Canada, are desirous of having representation on that board. They represent the wealth-producing people of Canada. They have a right to be heard, they have a right to be listened to, and their wishes should be granted.

Mr. J. P. MOLLOY (Provencher). I am surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Macdonald in criticising the qualifications of the present Minister of Agriculture. I believe and the people believe that he is the best and most competent Minister of Agriculture Canada has ever had. He is just as much a farmer as the hon. member who has just spoken, and a great deal more; I believe he pays more attention to the farming interest of this country. I have heard it stated during the last campaign that the three previous Ministers of Agriculture were not aware that milk came from a cow.

Is it necessary that this appointment should be made at once? Did the member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) introduce this resolution because a constituent of his is looking for the appointment? Because he has canvassed members from the west for assistance to get that position. Perhaps it is. The hon. member says he is a political opponent, but in that case my information is not correct as I was informed before this resolution was written that this gentleman is a supporter of the hon. member.

Mr. STAPLES. The hon. member has asked a question and I have a right to answer.

Mr. MOLLOY. I did not ask a question.

Mr. STAPLES. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has the floor.

Mr. MOLLOY. Whether he is a supporter or an opponent of the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) makes no difference to this House or to the people of this country. I am surprised—and pleased to hear——

Mr. STAPLES. I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Provencher has stated that I mentioned a particular individual to be appointed to that board.

Mr. MOLLOY. No.

Mr. STAPLES. I never mentioned any name.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not a point of order.

Mr. MOLLOY. I am glad that the late hon. gentlemen who had a seat in this House and who was appointed to the Railway Commission, now that he is dead, received some credit from his political opponents. They say in the west that the dead Indian is the good Indian, and I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite think that the good Grit is the dead Grit.

I hope that this appointment will be made shortly, although there is nothing on record to show that the country is suffering. I believe that the present members of the commission are quite capable of handling the business that comes before them to the satisfaction of the country, and it is admitted by hon. gentlemen opposite that the work is being well done and in the interests of the country as a whole. I cannot accept or follow the advice given by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) that we should follow the example of the United States and entirely eliminate politics in such appointments. I hope, if it is necessary, as I believe it is, that the vacancy on the board will be filled as soon as possible and this government is quite well qualified to make that appointment at the proper time. I said I hoped it would go to the west because I am a western man. So far as I am concerned, I would have pretty nearly every appointment paid for by the people of Canada go to the west. Let them all go to the west, and I hope this one in particular will go to the west, and if a farmer is the best available man, let us have a farmer by all means. If the best available man is not a farmer, then we do not need a farmer and I hope one will not be appointed. The very fact of

appointing a farmer might be detrimental to the interests of farmers. A farmer might be appointed who would not be as well qualified to fill the position as the next man in line. Is that not true? Is there any guarantee that if this government does appoint a farmer he will be the best available man and will fill the position better than any one else? I do not think so. It does not necessarily follow. We hear particularly at election time, from some speakers and candidates in rural districts, the cry 'the farmer, the farmer, the farmer, I will do anything on earth for the farmer.' It is just stage play, the greater part of it. Sometimes the Grits are guilty as well as the Tories. The greater part of it is in vote-catching, and I believe this resolution is intended as a vote-catcher, but I believe it will fail.

Mr. STAPLES. I rise to a point of order. I ask the hon. gentleman to retract the statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think that is a point of order.

Mr. STAPLES. He says it is a vote-catcher and I say it is not.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has the floor.

Mr. MOLLOY. I have to repeat that if there was a strong move made by that strong organization known as the Grain Growers' Association, it is being used by the hon. member for Macdonald as a vote catcher. It was a vote catcher for the next election, which is at present a considerable way off. I hope that the appointment will be given to a western man, that he will be the best available man for the position, and that he will be a farmer. That is all I have to say.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt). Mr. Speaker, when I first saw this resolution on the Order Paper, I was glad to feel that there was a certain ground on which I could stand shoulder to shoulder to some extent with a political opponent from the west. In the heat of elections we are apt to say of the other side. 'Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?' When I first saw the resolution on the Order Paper I was inclined to give the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) a good deal of credit; but after listening to his remarks in support of it, I have to retract a great deal of that credit. I had supposed that the hon. member was moving the resolution in the interest of the western farmers; but the tenor of his remarks has been more in the interests of the political party to which he belongs. I have the honour of having been elected by the votes of the farmers of a district in what I consider to be the banner province of western Canada, Saskatchewan, and I want to say that the farmers of the west appreciate the importance and value to the west of the Board of Railway Commissioners instituted by the present government. The farmers of the constituency I represent have no serious fault to find with the present government for the treatment they have received from that government since it has been in power. In the first place, the need of a board of Railway commissioners for Canada grew out of the transportation policy of this Liberal government. Until 1896 there were no transportation questions to solve in this country by a board of railway commissioners, because we had in the northwest only one railroad, what I conceive to be the greatest railroad monopoly on the continent of North America, the Canadian Pacific Railway. The few farmers who were in the west prior to 1896 were in the hands of that powerful corporation, because under the terms of the contract by which the railway was built, the government had practically no control over it or the way it did business. It could charge whatever rates for freight and passengers it pleased, and it had the farmers of the west completely in its power. The first remedy that came to the western Canada farmer was the vigorous action of this government in the construction of lines of railroad that would compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Having thus created the need for a board of railway commissioners, this government proceeded to establish that board, and it is something to the credit of this government that members of the opposition, when they speak on this question, are compelled to give the government that credit. Before this government came into power the farmers of the west needed relief in the very worst way; they came to this parliament again and again asking for relief; they came to this parliament asking for bread, and were given a stone. It was not until this government came into power that the farmers of the west received any of that consideration which his place in the industrial economy of this country entitles him to. The western Canadian farmer does appreciate this board of Railway Commissioners. It is a convenient court of appeal. It is a means of reaching the solution of the many transportation problems of the west that he never had before. With regard to that part of the resolution dealing with the appointment of a man to the vacancy brought about by the demise of the late Hon. Thos. Greenway, I believe that if a vote of the farmers of the west were taken on this question, they would not vote in favour of the resolution moved by the honourable member for Macdonald. The farmer of the west is not a sentimentalist, but is above all things a practical man, who looks for results, and is not above taking advantage of every kind of inventive and mechanical skill and using it for the betterment of his

condition. What he wants is to obtain results from the efforts of this Railway Commission. If a farmer were appointed to it just because he is a farmer, and did not ably represent the farming interests and all the interests of all the people of Western Canada as well as the farmers, the farmers of western Canada would be the first to condemn the government for appointing such a man. What the farmer of the west wants is that the government, in making the appointment, shall not consider any class distinction of any sort whatever, but shall appoint a man who has every qualification necessary for the proper carrying out of the duties of the office. I did not hear very distinctly all the remarks of the hon. member for Macdonald when he was introducing this resolution; but it did seem to me that he was endeavouring to bring it down to a very fine point. If I am not mistaken, he had reference to some man in his own constituency who had been highly recommended by the farmers of the west and whom he himself would be pleased to have appointed. These remarks from the hon. member from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) could not but lead to the conclusion that there was a coloured gentleman somewhere in the fence, and when he came to that part of his speech I felt that we had at last discovered the location of that coloured gentleman. Then the hon. member for Souris, who undertook to second this resolution, tried to impress on the government the necessity of filling this vacancy with a western Canadian farmer. Is it not rather peculiar that the hon member for Souris does not see the position in which he places himself by supporting this motion? The hon. gentleman, like myself and some others in this House representing rural constituencies, is not a farmer but follows another profession. No doubt he thinks that in electing himself, a medical man, to represent them in this House, his constituents made the best choice possible. But he does not wish his own election to be taken as a precedent in the filling of the vacancy on the Board of Railway Commissioners, that vacancy must of necessity be filled by a farmer. But if the contention of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) be correct, the hon. member for Souris should not occupy a seat in this House because his is a rural constituency, and the hon. gentleman should have seen that a farmer was sent here and not himself. I wish to say this, that so far as I am concerned, I am in sympathy with the word 'western' which is used in this resolution. When this House established the Board of Railway Commissioners, they made the number six, and there are only five at present. If this House saw fit in its wisdom to establish a board of six, and one seat becomes vacant, that seat ought to be filled. And in my opinion the board requires a man who thoroughly understands and appreciates the conditions in the west. I am prepared to go that far in support of the resolution. I would like to see a western man appointed, and I think the government, when making a selection, ought to cast their eyes over the territory from Lake Superior to at least the Rocky mountains. I suppose a British Columbian would say to the Pacific coast. I mention this because I think that a western man, probably in the majority of cases, understands the western conditions better than any other man probably can. But having said that much, I must deprecate the unseemly haste expressed by it. This resolution calls for the immediate filling of this vacancy. But I am not aware that the country is suffering very seriously at present. It may be true that five men are doing the work of six. It may be that the western interests will be better represented on this board when a new appointment is made and a western man is given the appointment; but so far as that is concerned, the main thing in these appointments is to get a man who will fill the position in the best possible manner. And I think the government should take sufficient time to look over the ground carefully and consider the possibilities of the situation thoroughly before they make a selection of such grave importance.

There is no amendment proposed and I do not, for my part, intend presenting one, but I do not think it would be a good thing for this House to pass the resolution in its present shape. It would restrict too much the choice. I think it urges undue haste in the making of this appointment, and therefore in conclusion I would say that I am prepared to support the view that the appointment should be filled, and I would be glad indeed if the government would see their way clear to appoint a western man. But the other part of the resolution, which limits the choice to that of a farmer and demands the immediatte filling of the office, I cannot conscientiously support.

Mr. A. MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie). I had not intended addressing the House on this resolution because I did not anticipate that it would meet with the opposition that it has encountered. I have been rather amused at many of the reasons to which hon. members have had to resort in order to bring themselves into line with the party whip and lead themselves to what the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has described as a conscientious conclusion to oppose the motion. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), took very high and mighty ground. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy) got down to something much more practical and made rather a frank statement of his position. He was followed by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) in much the same fashion; and I want to discriminate just for a

moment or two and contrast the reasons advanced by the hon. member for Red Deer with those advanced by the hon. member for Provencher. My hon. friend from Red Deer says we know no class or community in this country, no distinction of times and place, and that the only consideration which ought to move this government should be that of qualification. That is to say from whatever part of Canada, race or creed a man may come, he ought to be selected if he be the ablest and best qualified to fill the vacancy. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) however, in deference to the wishes of his constituents—and no doubt also in deference to the hope he has of being elected again some four years from now—trusts that the appointment will be given to a western man.

The hon. member for Provencher would go a little further—he would step down another grade from the position of the hon. member for Humboldt, and hopes that the new commissioner will be a western man and a farmer. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has a considerable task before him in this House, as was pointed out by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) some weeks ago. He has many conversions to effect in the ranks of his own party. The resolution declares that in the opinion of this House the position of commissioner made vacant by the death of Mr. Greenway should be filled. The hon. member for Humboldt, who knows that this vacancy has existed for six months, acknowledges that it ought to be filled, but in order to make himself absolutely conscientious in opposing it he says that for it to be filled within six months is unseemly haste. The resolution goes on to declare that the position should be filled by the appointment of an able and practical farmer. In the first two positions that the appointment should be made and it should be made shortly, the hon. member for Provencher agrees. And I agree with him. In the next point — that is the appointee should be an able and practical farmer he agrees, and I agree with him. In the next point, that this farmer should come from the west the hon. member for Provencher coincides, and I coincide with him. He also agrees that the reasons are that the interests of agriculture should be looked after; and I agree with him. Wherein does the hon. gentleman differ from me? I propose to vote for this resolution and he proposes to vote against it. I agree with the resolution in all its details and every phrase it utters. The hon. member for Provencher does the same, but he comes to the conclusion that he will vote against the resolution, while I come to the conclusion that I will vote for it. The reason for the hon. member's conclusions, I am afraid, is that the government has decided that they cannot support this resolution, and the hon. member for Provencher supports the government.

I desire to devote just a moment in answer to the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer (M. Michael Clark). He told us that the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) proved too much: he says that that hon. gentleman proved that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) was not capably administering the department over which he presides; that the Minister of Agriculture is a farmer, and therefore this proof should act as a warning against the appiontment of farmers. And the hon. member for Provencher who evidently has been studying the appointments made by this government, warns the House, that if the government appoints a farmer that is no warrant that he will be a man able to fill the position. This resolution does not call for the appointment of a farmer because he is a farmer, but calls for the selection of a man in every respect fit to fill the position, and a farmer besides. It may be that the Minister of Agriculture is a farmer, but it is impossible to argue from that that a man could not be selected from among the farmers of Canada who would be a good Minister of Agriculture. The Board of Railway Commissioners, as has been stated by hon. members, is a most important body. No one appreciates more than I do the importance of that board. I should have thought it would be enough for the hon. member for Humboldt that the member who moved the resolution and gave credit to the government for the inauguration of that board to be able to state that as a reason for his determination to support this resolution, and not be drawn away from that position because the hon. member for Macdonald chose to criticise the Department of Agriculture. I should think it would be enough to prove to him that the hon. member was not animated by party feeling when he so freely gave credit to the government for the appointment of the railway board. I join in giving that credit, because the appointment of this board was a distinct step in advance for the people of this country. We must remember, however, that the establishment of the Railway Board was brought about much in the same way as the reforms we are now trying to bring about by this resolution—by petitions from the farmers of this country, by the agitation of municipal bodies and the strong and earnest effort of members on this side of the House. When, under these circumstances, we are willing to accord to the government credit for the appointment of the board, surely that should be enough to allow these hon. members at least to follow their first and virgin determination and support the resolution.

Now, membership on this board, I admit, demands a high standard of qualification. I believe that the duties devolving upon the members of the Railway Board are of equal difficulty, in many respects, with those devolving upon the Supreme Court. A member of this board needs to be of Supreme Court calibre, perhaps not in legal attainments, but certainly in general mental qualification. But I am not one of those who believe or fear with the hon. member for members for Red Deed, Provencher, and Humboldt, that men of that calibre cannot be found in the ranks of our western farmers. There are men among these western farmers who are quite competent to fill the position if the government will make a choice among them. Believing that, knowing it as a matter of actual knowledge, I should be derelict in my duty did I not vote for this resolution. The hon. member for Humbolt strikes the key note when he says that a man familiar with western conditions will best be able to perform the duties. The hon. member for Red Deer states that we should know no class, no locality, in this matter. But he is a supporter of the government that has always followed the principle which has been recognized ever since confederation, that one member of the cabinet should come from this section and another from that. We only ask for the extension of that principle to the Railway Board. How can the hon. member for Red Deer logically support the one position if he is not prepared to support the other? What is the principle that is thus recognized? It is that a member from New Brunswick better understands New Brunswick conditions, that a member from British Columbia better understands the conditions of that province. Similarly, on the Board of Railway Commissioners a member who has had to do with railway conditions in a given province will better understand the needs of that province.

On that principle I support the resolution, which requires that one man at least should hold a seat on that board who understands the distinctive features of transportation in the western country. Now how can the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) support that feature of the resolution and fail to go further and support the feature which calls for the appointment of a farmer? If a man from New Brunswick, or a man from the west, for that matter, is better qualified to speak for the west, to legislate for the west, why then is not a man who comes from the farm, and who has devoted twenty or thirty years to practical farming, not better qualified to speak for the farmer in the deliberations of that board? There is no logic whatever in the position taken by the hon. member for Humboldt. What we ask is that, other things being equal, a qualified farmer be appointed to the board, on the principle that the farmers, so numerous in this country, have a right to be represented there. Now what are the problems that come up for decision on that board? A large proportion of them concern the farmers more directly than any other class of people. More than one-half of the time of that board is taken up with questions involving the interests of the farmers, on the one hand, and sometimes altogether. That board,since the death of Mr. Greenway, six months ago, has been without any man who understands class interests, and this resolution demands that that state of affairs be remedied by the selection of a farmer. Now the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) says also that the member for Souris proved too much, when he proved that a farmer could better understand farming conditions than any other man, because he said, if that principle were carried out, the farmers would not have elected the member for Souris, who is a doctor, to represent that constituency. Now surely a resolution like this demands more serious consideration than that at the hands of this House, it demands the exercise of some degree of reason. We all admit that conditions may not be equal in all cases, and that it would be possible for the constituency of Macdonald, or the constituency of Souris, to send a farmer to this House who would not make a desirable representative, but we are not prepared to admit that in sending the present members they are not sending the best men they can find. Now I desire to be understood, I would not for a moment advocate any appointment to the Board of Railway Commissioners which would lessen the efficiency of that board. I would not do anything to lessen the efficiency of that board, even at the demand of the Grain Growers' Association. or of any other body of men, but I believe that a condition now exists in which the interests of the Grain Growers' Association, as well as of the municipalities and the farmers, can be consulted, and the efficiency of that board not be interfered with at all, and for that reason I shall support the resolution. And I further say that he who votes the other way at this time, acknowledging the immense interests as members have freely acknowledged, to be represented by the character of appointment aimed at, proclaims to his country and to his constituents by that vote, that in his opinion there is no practical western farmer qualified to measure for the office, and he must take the full responsibility for that position.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina). Representing as I do a western constituency, and a constituency whose electors are for the most part farmers, I must necessarily take

an interest in this resolution. As a matter of fact, in nearly all western constituencies a majority of the electors are farmers; this being the case, the resolution before the House is one that we must necessarily consider from their standpoint. I must, however, express some surprise at seeing a resolution moved by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples), a representative of the Conservative party, calling upon the government to appoint a farmer to the Railway Commission. I have only to point out the fact that three of the Ministers of Agriculture under the Conservative government, were a brewer, a lawyer and a doctor. I have no fault to find with those appointments, doubtless they were good appointments, but it does appear to me a little inconsistent for a Conservative member of parliament to move a resolution to force the government to appoint a western farmer on the Railway Commission. I think we ought to take a broader view of the resolution which is before the House. So far as I can gather, hon. gentlemen opposite support this resolution for no other purpose than to make it apepar that they have the farmer's interests specially at heart, and they desire to gain a little political capital on that ground. That is a very narrow view to take of so important a question. If that is not the object of the hon. member for Macdonald, then the only other object he can have in view, it seems to me, is to force the government to appoint a man from his own constituency, which is a still more narrow view.

Now let us see what this resolution calls for. In the first place, it calls for an immediate appointment. Now, is there an immediate necessity for this appointment being made to the Railway Commission? I do not know whether any hon. gentleman opposite has any evidence that there is an immediate necessity for the appointment of another member of the Railway Commission, and unless there is such evidence, I think this House would be ill-advised in forcing the government to make an immediate appointment of any person. Let us see who compose at present the Board of Railway Commissioners. We have first of all, Mr. Justice Mabee, a gentleman of undoubted ability, and who stands as high perhaps in his profession as any other man in this country, a man thoroughly well equipped to deal with any question coming before that commission. Then we have Mr. Bernier, who was Minister of Inland Revenue in this government for some years, who was a farmer in the province of Quebec, and at the same time a notary public. Now if I understand the business of a notary, he is a man who has to do conveyancing and deal with other matters which bring him in close touch with the farmers. Then we have Dr. Mills, formerly principal of the Agricultural College at Guelph. Then we have Mr. D'Arcy Scott, and Mr. S. J. Maclean, who helped to organize the Railway Commission in this country. So the farmers have already two representatives on that commission at the present time, and they are well represented by these two gentlemen. It is to be remembered that had it not been for the Liberal party coming into power in 1896, there would have been no necessity of bringing forward a resolution in this House to consider the appointment of a railway commissioner, for there would have been no Railway Commission in Canada. Prior to that time railway companies were allowed to do as they pleased. We had nothing but railway monopolies. Since that time conditions have been considerably alleviated owing to the foresight of this government and the administrative ability shown by the Railway Commission in dealing with railway problems.

The other side of this resolution deals with the appointment of a western farmer to the Railway Commission. We must all admit that we are dependent upon the farmers. Several hon. gentlemen have said so during this debate and there is no use of disputing that fact. The farming community represents a very much larger amount of capital than any other industry in Canada and it is the most important class as far as the production of material wealth is concerned. But, let us see where these appointments came from considering the connection of the word 'western' with the resolution. Of the five representatives upon the Railway Commission four are from the province of Ontario and one from the province of Quebec. Members from the maritime provinces have just as good a right to move a resolution advocating the appointment immediately of some man from the maritime provinces as we who come from the west have. I think that we are all too much inclined, not excepting the members from Saskatchewan, to adopt a policy of sectionalism and provincialism when we are advocating any principle in this House. If a resolution is introduced you will find certain members from one province speaking upon it, when another resolution is introduced it will be discussed by another set of members, whereas we ought to approach these questions in a broad, national spirit and keep in view the interests of Canada as a whole. If we would devote our time to the consideration of large Canadian questions and forget that we are citizens of Saskatchewan or of Manitoba remembering that we are dealing with the affairs of a great country and are interested in building up a united national spirit, not forgetting our connection with the mother country, we would be doing something to promote the welfare of Canada as a whole. As far as the appointment of a farmer is concerned I do not care whether it is a farmer or a doctor or a lawyer,

a mercantile man or what kind of a business man it is as long as he is a man properly equipped to fill the position of Railway Commissioner if it is necessary to fill that position at the present time. I will say this however that in view of the importance of the transportation problem to western Canada—and it is the most important question in western Canada at the present time—and in view of the fact that possibly this question concerns western Canada more than it does any other portion of the Dominion, western Canada should be represented on the Railway Commission. I would urge upon the government the necessity, of endeavouring, in filling that position, if it is to be filled at the present time, to appoint a western man. Since these are the views I have on this question I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Provencher, that all the words after 'that' in the resolution be struck out and that the following be substituted:

The duties of the Railway Commission are such as to demand the appointment of the most capable man available who is acquainted with western railway conditions.

I move this amendment to the resolution having the fullest confidence that the government will exercise a wise discretion in making the appointment to the Railway Commission, and that it will select the very best man available, a characteristic which it has so well exhibited in the past.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, at this very late hour I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House with any very lengthy argument. I merely wish to put myself on record in connection with this matter and to express my regret that a representative of the great province of Saskatchewan should get up and argue against the terms of this resolution, which should commend themselves to every westerner and to every representative of the farming community. In regard to the amendment which has been proposed by my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. W. M. Martin) it is just as well that he did put that amendment before us in set terms, because I defy any member of this House to know what he was driving at in his speech. First, he argued that we ought not to ask that a westerner be appointed to the Railway Commission. He argues that we should do away with all sectionalism, and then he gets up a moment later and moves an amendment to the effect that the man who is to be appointed to the board should be acquainted with western railway conditions. Let me point out also that the hon. gentlemen who have spoken from that side of the House are very much divided in their opinions as to what are the necessities of the case in connection with this appointment. Two or three of them have argued that the appointment should be made immediately. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) said that the one thing that he wanted was that the appointment should be made at once, and others have asked that it should be made immediately. Now, we have the hon. gentleman who has moved the amendment taking the ground that there is no necessity for an immediate appointment to the board, and other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have also taken the same ground. I promised that I would not take up any length of time in debating this question at this late hour. I would like to put myself on record in this way: I believe, first of all, that the board should have a man thoroughly acquainted with western conditions. Western conditions are certainly very dissimilar in a great many respects from eastern conditions. Secondly, granted that the new member for that board should be a westerner, and my hon. friend opposite apparently now considers that he ought to be a westerner, then I consider that the man who would be most in sympathy with western conditions and needs would be a farmer of the west. Man for man I suppose that the farmers of the west come into more immediate contact with the railway companies than persons belonging to any other part of the Dominion. Farmers ship their own wheat, order their own cars and come into actual communication and business negotiations with the railway companies. They understand the immense difficulties that they are up against in the shipment of their wheat. They know what delays to their cars mean, they know what the difficulties are in getting the right kind of cars, they know the difficulties in the way with regard to the weighing of their grain and they are familiar with all other questions in connection with the shipment of their wheat. Only the farmers, I contend, can look at these questions from the farmer's point of view. It has been said over and over again in this House this evening that the farmers are very important members of the community and should carry very great weight in it. They are entitled to more representation than they have at the present time. We have heard a very able speech this afternoon upon the question of proportional representation. I regret to say that in the nature of things the farmers are unable to get proportional representation in this House, but hon. gentlemen opposite could very well give them proportional representation in the administration of the affairs of this country and particularly I think the government could give them proportional representation by placing one representative farmer from the west on the Railway Board. I trust they will reconsider their decision and that they will vote in favour of the motion proposed by my hon. friend from Macdonald declaring that the

appointment to the Railway Commission should be made immediately, that the person to be appointed should be a western man and a practical farmer.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL (South Oxford). I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on the resolution that is before the House. I had no intention of speaking when the discussion opened but because of some remarks made by the mover of the resolution and one or two of those who followed him in reference to the government's action and policy in regard to transportation matters I feel constrained to make a few remarks.

Dealing with the resolution first, I do not think there is a member who would not agree that the legislation which was enacted by this government in the constitution of a board of Railway Commissioners, has been the most important piece of legislation in the interest of the Dominion of Canada that has ever been put upon the statute-books. The commission have justified that statement by the work they have accomplished during the few short years they have been constituted as a board. The men who have been appointed from time to time, have been in every way eminently fitted for the position. Words of appreciation have been given from time to time by our friends on the other side of the House as to the personnel of the commission, and I cannot recall any adverse criticism in connection with the appointments to that board. I find from to-day's papers that two members of the Board of Commissioners have been through western Canada to the Pacific coast dealing with disputed questions and out of 333 cases that have come before them they have settled at least 90 per cent promptly and satisfactorily. The few that have not been dealt with are held over for expert information in order that the board may arrive at a proper conclusion. As to the immediate appointment of a commissioner I think the government know best whether there is need for one being appointed at once or not, and I favour the amendment that has been moved, to leave the appointment in the hands of the government to deal with when they consider that the appointment is opportune or necessary. As to whether the appointee should be a farmer or not, I am glad to hear so many members anxious to qualify themselves as farmers; doctors and lawyers seem to vie with each other in giving the impression in the House that they are farmers, or if not they would like to be. It is a good omen, it is at least an appreciation of the good work that is being done by the agricultural industry of Canada. The work accomplished by the Minister of Agriculture during his twelve years of office has conduced very materially to the high position of the agriculturist in Canada to-day.

An attempt has been made to criticise the policy of the government in connection with cold storage. The member for South Lanark (Mr. J. Haggart) claimed that cold storage was established before 1896. It was spoken of then but I do not know of anything practical being done by the government prior to 1896 towards the establishment of cold storage on cars or steamships.

Mr. BRODER. The hon. gentleman is not correct; cold storage was installed on two railways and on a number of steamships before this government came into power.

Mr. SCHELL. The Conservative government did what they could to induce the steamship companies to instal a cold storage system but in 1897 the present Minister of Agriculture entered into an arrangement with the Allan line to equip two or three of their steamers with cold storage plants, giving a subsidy, and the system proved so satisfactory and necessary that other steamship lines were compelled to introduce a similar system without any assistance from the government. The opposition claim some credit that prior to 1896 the government undertook to supervise or instal a system of cold storage on steamships plying to European ports.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will not forget that the question before us is an appointment to the Railway Commission. Of course I have allowed considerable latitude because the subject has a bearing on agriculture but to go back to 1896 would be rather an infringement.

Mr. SCHELL. I entirely appreciate your remarks, Mr. Speaker. I felt the discussion was irrelevant when it was introduced by the mover of the resolution and one or two who followed him. The member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) made practically all his speech in criticism of the government system of cold storage.

Mr. BARKER. I rise to a point of order. You ruled, I think, that the gentleman is out of order. At this time of the night I do not think that should be persisted in.

Mr. SPEAKER. The time of night has nothing to do with it. A speech on any specific question having no relevancy to the motion would be out of order but an allusion to such a subject would not.

Mr. SCHELL. With a due appreciation of the form the debate has taken I shall not detain you with more than one or two statements. If hon. gentlemen do not care to hear them I suppose it is an evidence that they feel the cause of the opposition is not very good, that their position is not sound. The results of the system of cold storage that has been introduced—

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Order.

Mr. SCHELL. —are so apparent and important that the exports of this country have increased in a wonderful ratio.

Mr. LAKE. I rise to a point of order. The words of the amendment read:

That the duties of the Railway Commission are such as to demand the appointment of the most capable man available who is acquainted with western railway conditions.

I appeal to you, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is not in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the amendment.

Mr. SCHELL. I certainly will do so; I appreciate the point of order thoroughly. I believe that the same judgment, the same discernment, the same appreciation of the needs of this country, that the government had when they provided for a Board of Railway Commissioners, will continue to actuate them in dealing with this appointment. I believe that the government appreciates the needs of the great western part of this Dominion as well as the eastern part. The west is great; I do not know that it is any greater than the eastern part of the Dominion; but we appreciate it as fully as anybody can possibly do; and I believe that the government, in the appointment they will make, will consider not the agricultural interests alone, as the resolution specifies, but the interest of the people of this Dominion as a whole. If they can find a farmer in every way qualified, I believe the government would as readily appoint him as a lawyer or a doctor or a business man or a journalist, or any one else. I support heartily the amendment to the resolution moved by the hon. member for Regina.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). I do not intend to weary the House at this time of the night with more than one or two observations. The two points that have come up in this debate are whether the new commissioner should be from the west, and whether he should be a man who has a practical acquaintance with that great business which is the basis of Canadian prosperity, namely, agriculture. As far as I have followed the discussion up to the present time, I do not think there is much dispute in the minds of hon. gentlemen of the proposition that it is extremely desirable that the new commissioner should be a man from the west, and one who is thoroughly acquainted with western conditions. That is true, from the fact that the late commissioner, whose demise we all deplore, the Hon. Thomas Greenway, was essentially a western man. When we consider the vast and growing progress of the west, we must realize the importance of having a western man appointed to the vacancy. The mover of this resolution spoke of the desirability of having a practical farmer appointed. I have no doubt that he has conceived his resolution in the broadest spirit, and meant to include the great sister industry of horticulture. I speak of this more particularly for this reason, that although it is true that in this country horticulture is a subsidiary industry to that of grain growing, it is an immensely important one, far more important than most men in the west realize. I may say that ten acres in fruit will produce as much transportation as 100 acres in grain, and the day is not far distant when the fruit industry of the west will be one of enormous interest to the Railway Commission. I am sure that my hon. friend who moved this resolution will understand that I assent to it because I believe it to be broad enough to include both horticulture and grain growing.

Mr. STAPLES. That was the intention.

Mr. BURRELL. Now, I do not want to be behind any hon. gentleman, on either side of the House, in expressing the approval we in the west all feel of the creation of the Board of Railway Commissioners. I have always said, in every campaign in which I have taken any part against the present government or its representatives, that the creation of that board was one of the best things the present government ever did. Three years ago, when I had the honour of representing the province of British Columbia at a fruit conference in Ottawa, I was asked to represent that province in an interview with the Prime Minister to request him to have put under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commissioners the great express companies which have so much important work to do in carrying our fruit products; and it was satisfactory to us to find that the government enlarged the jurisdiction of the commission to embrace those companies. I am perfectly sure, therefore, that any man who is largely concerned in horticulture would be as anxious to carry out the aims of the wheat growers of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, as any man on their part would concern himself with our problems in connection with the transportation of fruit. I am going to support the resolution, because the mover of the amendment simply asks for the appointment of a man who understands the railway conditions of the west; and having been connected for a quarter of a century with agriculture and horticulture, I think that this resolution fills a need that the amendment does not fill, because it directly connects the vacant commissionership with land products and the shipment of land products. I can only say in closing that I hope the government, in making this appointment, will appoint a western man who is directly and largely interested in the raising of either grain or

fruit and its transportation, and that they will make it as soon as possible.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, lest my silence might be misunderstood, I think that I should say a few words on this question. The country is divided into very many classes. We have merchants, bankers, mechanics, artisans, farmers. You cannot fool any of these classes very long at a time; and when we attempt to make a certain distinction in selecting men for certain positions, the duties of which are applicable to all classes, I am inclined to think that the class to which we appeal will not take it seriously. What the farmers want is somebody on the board who will see that they get their products carried at a fair rate. Outside of those who would be willing to accept the duties of such an office, and their friends and others who might be interested in their welfare, the great mass of the farmers, as everybody else, want a man on this board who will see that they get fair play in the carrying of their products, both as to price and as to speed, and they are not particular whether the man appointed to this office is a farmer or not. Naturally, like the rest of us, just as journalists are pleased when a man in their ranks is appointed to a certain position, so are the farmers. I could get a petition from all the journalists of Canada asking for the appointment of a journalist to a certain position. I had representations from the telegraphers that, as they were well versed in the running of railways, they ought to have a man on this board. I have been asked time and again by gentlemen representing the commerical travellers to place one of their number on this board, as they not only travel more than any other class, but are interested in having freight rates right, because the quantity of orders they get depends largely on the transportation afforded for the goods they sell. The railway engineers asked me to put one of their number on the board, as they understood everything connected with the running of trains, and the services of such a man would be very valuable.

Every class is interested in this transportation problem, and I am not objecting at all to the farmers urging that one of their class should be appointed. We all would like to see men in the same walks of life as ourselves put in these responsible positions; but the main duty of the government is to see that the man placed in such a position is one who will fulfil its duties ably and impartially, regardless of class or section. If we are selecting a jury to try a case brought by a merchant before a court, no one would think of insisting that we must have merchants on the jury. What we want is men who will give the case a fair trial without regard to class. It is a mistake to think that this board is to be composed of men who are to act in the sense of pleaders or advocates for any particular interest in the community. On the contrary they are to hear the representations of all and give fair play to all. The arguments advanced by some hon. gentlemen in favour of the resolution are the strongest against it. If a farmer is to be appointed and he is to act, as they insinuate he ought to act, in the interest of the farmers alone, he is not fit to be on the board and ought not to get the position, because he would be simply there as an advocate of the farmers' interests. Every member of the board is supposed to hear the cases that come before him and adjudicate fairly between farmers, railway men, merchants, shippers and others. He is supposed to find out the right thing to do and do it regardless of any particular interests and not act as the advocate of any particular class. The moment he takes the latter course, he ceases to be an independent member of the board and might as well be engaged as a solicitor to plead the cases that come before the board.

Just one more remark before I get through. It has been argued that only a small amount of money has been given to benefit the farmers, but the hon. gentleman who made that argument answered it in five minutes, because he pointed out, as a reason why a farmer should go on the board, that the farmers are the greatest customers of the railways. Well, if they are the greatest customers of the railways every dollar spent in aiding a railway to carry their produce to market gives them more benefit than any other class. Consequently the $450,000,000 given to aid railways and solve the transportation problem have been given to the largest extent to the farming community. This is not a one man commission. It is not a commission with any one idea. What we want is a board that will do its work well and treat all with equal impartiality; and I submit, notwithstanding what has been said that the Board of Railway Commissioners is one which has been filling the requisite. If this vacancy is to be filled, it must be filled by some one, no matter to what class he belongs, who will see that every one who comes before the commission shall be fairly dealt with, just as fairly as if he were acting as the sole commissioner. But if the contention of hon. gentlemen who favour the resolution before the House were to be carried out, he would give his decisions always in favour of his own class. The first requisite of every member of this Board of Railway Commissioners must be that he will be a man who will act with even justice; and unless such justice rules in the findings of that body it

will soon lose public confidence. I am not adverse to having a western man on that commission. If we were to apply to that board the principle which is theoretically right, we would select the best man regardless of anything else but his qualifications for the position. But the same argument would apply to other positions. The theory is a good one but we do not carry it out in practice. The west has great interests, the traffic from the west across our railways is most important, and I fully believe—and am not backward in asserting my belief—that when this position comes to be filled, everything else being equal, the man who fills it ought to come from that part of Canada. But I do object to having parliament nail us down in our selection to any place or class because that might impair the efficiency of the board, and as a member of the government and responsible to the people, I am not prejared to do that.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). I do not rise to discuss the question as to who should be put on the railway board, but wish to correct the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Schell), with regard to cold storage.

Mr. SPEAKER. The discussion of cold storage is not relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. BRODER. I merely wish to answer a question put by the hon. member who asked when the cold storage system had been inaugurated. In the sessional papers of 1896, vol. 29, No. 5, I find in the report of the Minister of Agriculture of 1895. sessional paper No. 8, in which appears the following paragraph:

> This action was followed by the inauguraton of the cold storage service, in which arrangements were made whereby refrigerator cars for butter were run during the summer on the main lines of railways leading into Montreal. These were used to pick up small lots of butter offered weekly. The shippers of butter by these cars and routes, were allowed to ship at the usual 'less than carload rates' without any charge for the icing or special service
>
> Ten steamships were fitted up; 35,605 packages of butter were carried in isolated compartments.

Mr. TALBOT. In what state was that butter landed?

Mr. BRODER. It was shipped to England and landed in good condition.

Mr. J. HERRON (Alberta). I merely rise to put myself on record in favour of the motion moved by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples). Just a word with reference to a remark of the Minister of Railways. He said that a number of journalists or merchants would not be likely to call in farmers to adjudicate.

Mr. GRAHAM. I made no such statement or anything near it.

Mr. HERRON. Let me illustrate my point another way. Suppose a dispute arose between journalists or lawyers or manufacturers, would they be likely to call in a number of farmers to settle them? Is not this a case where practical farmers are required? The interests of the western farmers have attained such an extent today that they should be represented on the Board of Railway Commissioners, and for that reason I shall support the resolution. I am much surprised at the attitude taken by a number of western men, particularly at the action taken by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) in moving an amendment in order to side track this very important resolution. I cannot understand why members from the prairie section should oppose the placing of a practical farmer on this Railway Board.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). I shall detain the House but a moment in order to point out the significance of the amendment. The amendment says that the man to be appointed should be one well acquainted with western railway conditions. I think that the House would have adopted the amendment without question had the word 'railway' been changed to 'farming.' The hon. Minister of Railways has said that we should not narrow down this question to any particular class. But, as a matter of fact this amendment narrows it to some railway man. I cannot see it in any other light. I do not wish to cast a silent vote, for I think that whoever is appointed should be thoroughly familiar with the farming conditions of the west. The railway conditions are only a part of this question and for that reason I think it in the interest of the commission that whoever is appointed should be as well versed in farming conditions as in railway conditions.

Mr. GRAHAM. Perhaps I may be allowed to make a suggestion. It might meet the difficulty if we were to change it to 'transportation.'

Mr. LENNOX. It will take a lot of changing——

Mr. GRAHAM. It's all right; I was changing for the benefit of hon. members opposite, not for myself.

House divided on amendment (Mr. W. M. Martin.)

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	McCraney,
Beauparlant,	McGiverin,
Beland,	McIntyre (Perth),

Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Calvert,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Essex),
Congdon,
Conmee,
Currie (Prince Ewd.),
Delisle,
Demers,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Ecrément,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fowke,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Graham,
Harty,
Hodgins,
Hunt,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Lavergne,
LeBlanc,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Low,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
MacNutt,
McAlister,
McColl,
McKenzie,
McLean (Sunbury),
McMillan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Regina),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Molloy,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Oliver,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Robb,
Roy (Montmagny),
Rutan,
Savoie,
Schell,
Seguin,
Sinclair,
Smith (Middlesex),
Smith (Stormont),
Talbot,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Turgeon,
Verville,
Warburton,
White (Victoria, Alta),
Wilson (Laval).—94.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Ames,
Armstrong,
Barker,
Barnard,
Barr,
Blain,
Blondin,
Boyce,
Bradbury,
Broder,
Burrell,
Campbell,
Chisholm (Huron),
Crosby,
Currie (Simcoe),
Daniel,
Doherty,
Edwards,
Fraser,
Goodeve,
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Herron,
Hughes,
Jameson,
Kidd,
Lake,
Lennox,
Maddin,
Marshall,
Meighen,
Monk,
Nantel,
Northrup,
Owen,
Paquet,
Perley,
Reid (Grenville),
Rhodes,
Roche,
Russell,
Schaffner,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Stanfield,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor (Leeds),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thoburn,
Thornton,
Wallace,
White (Renfrew),
Wilson (Lennox and Addington).—54.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Borden (Halifax),
Borden (Sir Fredk.),	Sproule,
Macdonald,	Lancaster,
Gordon (Kent),	Henderson,
Lemieux,	Haggart (Lanark),
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Sifton,	Foster,
Sutherland,	Cowan,
Guthrie,	Maclean (York, S.),
Bickerdike,	Elson,
Pardee,	Clare,
Smith (Nanaimo),	Macdonell,
Black,	Osler,
McIntyre (Strathcona),	McCarthy,
Law,	Wright,
Martin (Wellington),	Crocket,
Knowles,	Worthington,
McCoig,	Bristol,
Fortier,	Lortie,
Girard,	Forget,
Miller,	Lalor,
Devlin,	Arthurs,
Champagne,	Crothers,
Roy (Dorchester),	Donnelly,
McLean (Huron),	Magrath,
Paterson,	Price,
Sealey,	Smyth,
Chew,	Middlebro,
Todd,	Lewis,
Harris,	Beattie.

Amendment agreed to, and motion as amended agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. On a motion to go into Supply, the Minister of Railways will make a statement concerning railways, and proceed with his estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1 o'clock a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 16, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 105) relating to the water carriage of goods—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 109) to amend the Government Annuities Act, 1908—Mr. Fielding.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC LOAN.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that on Friday next the House do go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to advance by way of loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway

Company a sum not exceeding ten million dollars for the purpose of aiding the company in the completion of the construction of the prairie section of the western division of the National Transcontinental Railway, the sum so advanced to bear interest at the rate of four per centum per annum, payable half yearly, and to be repayable in ten years from the time the loan is made, or if advanced in instalments, then in ten years from the time the first of such instalments is so advanced; and to provide,

That such sum, whether advanced in one or several instalments, shall be advanced upon the pledge of an issue of bonds, bearing interest at the rate of four per centum per annum, payable half yearly, to be made by the company as collateral security for the payment of such sum and interest, the principal amount of the bonds received in pledge to equal the sum advanced, such bonds to be secured, subject to any prior lien or charge, by a mortgage, or deed of trust by way of mortgage, of the prairie section, and of the undertaking, equipment and property, tolls, rights and franchises of the company in respect of said section, and to be guaranteed as to the payment of the principal and interest thereof by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada; the form and provisions of such mortgage and of the bonds to be secured thereby, and of the guaranty thereof by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, to be substantially as set forth in the schedule of the Act to be founded on these resolutions;

That His Majesty, in the event of default in the payment of half yearly interest, or in default in the payment of the principal sum advanced under the provisions of such enactment, in addition to and without prejudice to any right or remedy against the company in respect of such default, and in addition to and without prejudice to any right or remedy His Majesty may have as pledgee of the whole or any part of such bond issue, shall, for the purpose of remedy, be deemed to be the holder of such bonds and entitled to all rights and remedies available to bondholders arising according to the terms of such mortgage when default is made in payment of interest or principal of such bonds; and that default in payment of interest on, or principal of, any advances made under the provisions of such Act, shall be deemed to be default in payment of the interest on or principal of such bonds to the amount accrued thereon according to the tenor thereof.

That the Governor in Council may, in addition to the sums now remaining unborrowed and negotiable of the loans authorized by any Act of parliament heretofore passed, raise by way of loan, in accordance with and under the provisions of that portion of chapter 24 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, relating to the public debt, and the raising of loans authorized by parliament, such sum or sums of money not exceeding ten million dollars, as may be required for making the advances contemplated by these resolutions.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING.

CATHOLIC IMMIGRATION.

On the orders of the day being called

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I observe in Monday's 'Mail and Empire' and in other papers, the following item:

Limited to Catholics—Emigration Agent in England says he was so Instructed.

(Canadian Associated Press Cable.)

London, March 14.—Speaking on church prospects in Canada, Archdeacon Renison, of Moosonee, yesterday told how, travelling in England lately, he met an emigration agent of the Canadian government. This man was a German, who had built up a prosperous home in Canada, and asked the Canadian government to appoint him as an agent. For the last few years, he had been working in his native country, bringing out bands of emigrants and settling them in Alberta and Saskatchewan.

This man told Bishop Renison he had instructions to bring out only emigrants of the Catholic faith. Hundreds of German Roman Catholics were being planted year after year by the Canadian government in the great western prairie lands.

I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior whether there is any truth in that statement?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). As far as I am aware there is none whatever.

FISH SLIDES ON TRENT CANAL.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). I have received a communication of rather urgent importance. My correspondent writes on behalf of himself and a large number of others living along the line of the Trent canal, pointing out that in the construction of the dams on the Trent canal no provision is made for fish slides. He further points out that large quantities of food fish pass up the river and the construction of the dams in this way will have the effect of entirely excluding the fish from the river. If that is the case the minister's attention should be given to it at once.

PAY OF MILITIA AT HALIFAX.

Mr. A. B. CROSBY (Halifax). I am credibly informed that the militiamen and soldiers in Halifax have not received their last pay which is long overdue. I would like to know why this is so and when the men may expect to receive their money.

Mr. FIELDING. I shall be glad to call the attention of the minister to it. I am unable to give the hon. gentleman the information at the moment.

PORT OF OSHAWA.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). On the 11th inst. I put a question regarding the

Port of Oshawa, which both the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Public Works attempted to answer, I asked who was the collector of customs at Oshawa Harbour and what was his salary. Oshawa Harbour is not Oshawa town, and while the customs regulations may state that the port of Oshawa includes both the town and harbour, my question was so framed as to require an answer only for the harbour. I asked also what revenue has been collected at the port of Oshawa each year since it was taken over by the government and from what source was the revenue derived. I presume that, in giving the answer he did, the minister was technically correct, because the port of Oshawa includes both the town and the harbour. But what I want to get is the return from the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) or the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Customs or the minister of any other department of the government showing what has been collected at the harbour of Oshawa—not the official port. I want a return of what comes in by water into the harbour at Oshawa, and not what comes by rail into the town. If necessary, I will repeat the question in another form.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I do not know whether we will be able to divide the two and give the harbour distinct from the town.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It will be very easily done. There is nothing.

Mr. FOWKE. I can help the hon. gentleman out of his difficulty. He asked for information as to the amount expended by the government since taking over the port. I think what he meant to do was to ask who was the harbour master. The revenue through that officer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is the point.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I understand it is a matter which refers to my department, and will make inquiry.

FRAUDS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways if there is any truth in the report in the press under the heading of 'Frauds reported on the Intercolonial Railway,' to the effect that many thousands of dollars of a shortage are found in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, and that some of the officials have been suspended.

Mr. GRAHAM. So far as the department is concerned, the only information we have is what we have seen in the newspapers. I wired the general manager on the subject and have not yet received a reply. These things occur in every railway and I imagine —though I do not wish to express an opinion—that this must be much exaggerated. There will be a thorough investigation, if there is anything in the report.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURN.

Mr. BRADBURY. On the 17th of February two returns were ordered which I moved for. One was for copy of correspondence or petitions received from F. W. Colclaugh and the other for copy of correspondence between J. H. Davis and the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Why have these not been laid on the table?

Mr. BRODEUR. The return with regard to Davis is ready. It has been sent to the Secretary of State and when it comes back to my hands I will lay it on the table. The other is in course of preparation.

Mr. BRADBURY. On the same day I moved for an order of the House showing the amount of money paid by the government to the Logberg Printing Company and my motion was granted. What is the cause of the delay in bringing down that return?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). I will have an inquiry made about it.

Mr. FOSTER. I again call attention to certain returns ordered by the House and not brought down. The Finance Department and the Public Works Department are the two chief sinners.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). In the case of the Finance Department, my hon. friend himself is the chief sinner. He made a motion and the information was being prepared, but he discovered that he had made a mistake and asked that the form of the order be enlarged. I said we would be very happy to enlarge it at his suggestion, but I do not think he should blame us for the little delay thereby occasioned.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked for a return of all the loans which had been made from 1896 up to the present with their charges. I explained the matter to the deputy minister almost immediately, and I think he has had that information some time. There is another matter, that with reference to loans since January, 1907, which has not been brought down. Also the armouries under the charge of the Minister of Militia. And two stand to the debit of the Minister of Public Works, who is behind as usual.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These returns have not been overlooked. I have ordered that they be brought down as soon as possible, and I have been informed that they are being prepared with all possible speed.

SUPPLY—THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

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

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). As is the custom at some stage during the session, when you are about to leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of allowing the House to go into Committee of Supply, a general statement is made concerning the government railways of Canada and dealing incidentally with the larger problems which confront this country on the matter of transportation. The questions now inviting attention of the Canadian people are of such great magnitude and import that interest in them is not confined to the Canadian people, but reaches the entire world; and in making comparisons between Canada and any other country regarding the facilities afforded for transportation of our products, the records show that we, as a people, have greater courage than any other on the globe in this particular direction. Per head of the population we have the greatest mileage of railways of any country in the world; and that this work is being continued and that mile after mile of railway is being constructed throughout this country shows two things.

It shows, first, that Canada has resources that require greater development, and, second, that the Canadian people, though comparatively few numerically considered, have unbounded faith in the country in which they live. When we stop for a moment to think that the question of the carrying trade of Canada's great west is being partially solved by utilizing the route from the Pacific across Mexico to the Atlantic, and thence to the European market. we are filled with wonder. It need not surprise us that people of other countries look in astonishment at our efforts to solve this problem which has come before us within the last few years. And when we consider that the proposition is now before the country, and the government intends in dealing with it, to add another channel for the great traffic of the west, this one to be via Hudson bay, it is all the more astonishing, I say again, that the courage of the people of Canada has reached such a climax. Were it not that we have unbounded confidence in the resources of the country, the undertaking of such great projects would stagger us. It is true that at the present moment the financial condition does not warrant us in launching out in great new schemes involving large expenditure. It is, nevertheless, true that the people of Canada look forward to the time when they will have greater avenues of trade, greater outlets for the carrying of our produce from our own country to the doors of the consumers without undue expense, and this at no distant day.

I have unbounded faith in this country; and, notwithstanding all the money that we are expending in railways, in canals, in deepening our waterways and improving our harbours—notwithstanding all the money spent in opening up these various channels for transport—I still have faith that the products of this country will be sufficiently great to tax all our carrying facilities, no matter what we may be able to make them. I have already said that we have in Canada a great railway mileage. On June 30 last we had 22,966 miles of railway in the Dominion, the increase last year being 514 miles. Shortly after that time 750 miles were put in operation, so that at the present moment—and I am stating the figures conservatively—there are in operation in the Dominion of Canada 23,716 miles of railway. In this matter we compare favourably with any country in the world. On June 30 last there were under construction in the Dominion of Canada 4,327 miles of railway. This means a great deal to the people of Canada. But, in discussing this question of railways, I desire to say that the prime object of a railway is not so much the development of other industries; the prime object in the interest of the people of Canada is that the railway may sell transportation at a fair price. Anything that conduces to the bringing about of this result is in the public interest. Sir, we have one transcontinental line already built, we have another under construction, and, in a few years, I believe we shall have a third, when the Canadian Northern gets its lines linked up. In this connection I am sure it will be interesting to hon. members for me to read and place on 'Hansard' a letter which is, in effect, a short interim report by Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, chief engineer of the western division of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. The letter is as follows:

Office of the General Consulting Engineer
to the Goernment.
Ottawa, Canada, February 5, 1909.

The Hon. George P. Graham,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—Knowing your desire to be kept fully informed as to the progress made, from time to time, with the works of construction upon the western division of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, I summarize the position on December 31, 1908, as follows:

Prairie Section.

From Winnipeg to a point 8½ miles west of the Battle river, a distance of 683½ miles the—

Grading and bridging is completed, and the track is laid over the whole distance with suitable sidings at each station, of which 92 miles has a full lift of ballast, 502 miles has a first lift and 89½ miles is a skeleton track having no ballast.

Station buildings.—The following are com-

pleted: West Winnipeg, Melville, Portage la Prairie, Nokomis, Rivers.

Others are in course of erection at Biggar and Wainwright.

Whilst the following are under contract: Scott, Iwana, Allan, Lazare, Kelliher, Semans, Leney, Punnichy, Bradwell, Goblenz.

Engine houses—have been erected at Rivers and Melville, and others are in course of erection at Watrous, Biggar and Wainwright.

Water services.—The following have been built: Beaudry, Elie, Harte, Rivers, Lazare, Welby, Gerald, Melville, Watrous, Bradwell, Earl, Biggar.

Water services—are in course of construction at: Portage la Prairie, Squirrel Creek, Pope, Quadra, Miniota, Uno, Atwater, Birmingham, Ituna, Mostyn, Touchwood, Wainwright, Quinton, Raymore, Nokomis, Iwana, Landis, Reford, Unity, Winter, Yonker, Artland, Dunn.

Grain elevators have been erected at: Cabot 2, Ingelow 1, Justice 2, Rivers 1, Pope 1, Uno 1, Spy Hill 1, Fenwood 2, Lazare 1, Gerald 1, Atwater 1, Waldron 1, Cana 1, Melville 2, Birmingham 1, Semans 1, Tate 1, Venn 1, Young 1, Bradwell 1, Iwana 1, Kinley 2, Landis 1, Scott 1, Nokomis 1, Watrous 1, Allan 2, Clavet 2, Juniata 1, Leney 1, Reford 1, making in all 39 elevators completed.

Loading platforms have been constructed at: Cabot, Barr, Caye, Deer, Exira, Firdale, Gregg, Harte, Ingelow, Justice, Knox, Levine, Rivers, Myra, Norman, Oakner, Lazare, Welby, Spy Hill, Gerald, Yarbo, Zeneta, Pope, Atwater, Bangor, Melville, Waldron, Cana, Fenwood, Kelliher, Tate, Nokomis, Undora, Venn, Watrous, Young, Allan, Bradwell, Clavet, Duro, Grandora, Iwana, Juniata, Kinley, Leney, Landis, Reford, Scott, Raymore, Unity. Making 52 in all.

Fencing.—There has been erected on each side of the railway 345 miles of fencing.

Telegraph line.—There has been erected a two-wire line from Winnipeg west for 672 miles, and a single wire line from the 672nd mile to Battle River 1 mile, and a stub line 2 miles—3 miles—making in all 675 miles.

This section of the road was opened for public traffic on the 21st September, 1908, since which it has been successfully operated to the great convenience and benefit of the public, especially to the population contiguous to the line.

Battle river to Wolf creek (western end of the prairie section), a distance of 241 miles.

Battle River bridge.—This steel viaduct and bridge was completed on the 11th December, 1908. This important structure consists of 51 spans of 50 feet and one of 151 feet, making in all 2,700 feet long and is 180 feet high.

Grading and bridging.—This work is practically completed from the Battle River bridge to a point 50 miles west of Edmonton, a distance of 172 miles, so that there is now no impediment to the laying of the track over the whole.

Clover Bar bridge.—This bridge over the north Saskatchewan river was completed on the 26th December, 1908.

From 50th mile west of Edmonton to Wolf creek (the western limit of the prairie section), distance 69 miles, about 75 per cent of the grading is done and a number of culverts have been built. There are two gangs of men engaged in driving piles for pile and trestle bridges. The grading and bridging on this section should be finished by July, 1909, which will complete the grading and bridging upon the prairie section.

The work is practically closed down for the season on the prairie section, with the exception of the pile driving for bridges, the concrete piers and pedestals for the steel bridge over the Pembina river and some grading in rock cuttings and in muskegs between the 65th mile west of Edmonton and Wolf creek.

Mountain section.

The first 100 miles from Prince Rupert easterly is under contract and fair progress is being made with the grading which is composed largely of solid rock. 633,396 cubic yards of solid rock, 94,970 cubic yards of loose rock and 94,407 cubic yards of earth have been excavated, and 32 culverts have been built; a capacious wharf and warehouse have been built at Prince Rupert.

There are 1,850 men and 90 horses and mules employed upon this work. This is short of what is required to finish the work in reasonable time, but I understand the contractors are making great efforts to largely increase the force.

This is the only work in progress on the mountain section, which is about 836 miles in length.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER,
Chief Engineer, West Division, N. T. Ry.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total length of the prairie section?

Mr. GRAHAM. From Winnipeg to Wolfe creek, 916 miles. The mountain section is 839 miles. Now I do not intend to go into any details of the Grand Trunk Pacific, as they will probably be discussed on another proposition. But I thought it would be interesting to the House and to the country to know just what progress was being made up to date with the western and prairie sections with regard to practical work. Coming east of Winnipeg, as hon. gentlemen will have noticed, I laid on the table of the House a day or two ago an interim report of what has been done on the Transcontinental, that is, the line between Winnipeg and Moncton, the government section. Since the end of the fiscal year, March 31 last, I have endeavoured to make a short summary of the contents of that report, and I think it would be interesting to give it to the House:

A summary of the interim report of the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, from the 31st of March, 1908, to the 31st of December, of the same year, being a period of nine months.

During this nine months they expended $18,866,212,84; making a total expenditure, from the initiation of the work to the 31st of December, 1908, of $45,924,156.88.

668.65 miles of grading were completed; and 309·12 miles of track was laid.

The entire line is under contract, with exception of the entrance into Winnipeg. Con-

tracts for steel superstructure and viaducts, amounting to 23,765 tons, have been awarded; and 6,995 tons have been practically completed. Contracts for 174,818 tons of 80 pound steel rails have been awarded, of which 105,692 tons are being furnished by the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, and 69,123 tons by the Algoma Steel Company. The necessary fastenings for these rails have been ordered through Canadian manufacturers.

During the nine months just mentioned, contracts have been awarded as follows :

McDonnell & O'Brien, for the construction of section in district "C," a distance of 107 miles; to the same firm, from a point still farther to the west, a distance of 114 97 miles.

O'Brien & McDougall, the construction of section about 126 miles in districts "E" and "F," being a contract about north of Lake Nipigon and westerly to a point at or near Dog lake.

A second contract to the same firm, O'Brien & McDougall, about 24 miles, from a point at or near Dog lake to the Peninsula Crossing.

M. P. and J T. Davis; construction of section in districts "D" and "E," from the westerly end of Fauquier Brothers' contract, (Abitibi), in a westerly direction, a distance of about 104 miles.

M. P. and J. T. Davis; a second contract of about 100 miles; this contract being about 60 miles west of the easterly boundary district "D," and westerly to the end of Fauquier Brothers' contract.

Contracts for first and second class railway ties have been awarded in district "C"; to the Eastern Construction Company and John G. Hearn—amounting, to about 200,000 ties.

The McArthur contract for the construction of the section between Winnipeg and the Fort William branch line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway has been, approximately, 82 per cent completed; and the work is to be finished so as to permit of the operation of the line in September next.

That is the expectation and anticipation.

Certain items of classification were disputed, between the engineer acting for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the engineer acting for the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway: Mr. Kelliher, chief engineer for the company and Mr. Lumsden, chief engineer for the commissioners, found that they did not agree in every particular with regard to the classification; and after going into the matter, they ultimately decided upon resorting to arbitration proceedings, under the National Transcontinental Railway Act. Accordingly, Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, C.M.G., has been named as the third arbitrator. Of course, no further progress can be made until the snow disappears from the ground.

Here is an item that I think will be of great interest to the country, and it only confirms what has been discovered by explorers sent out to that country a year ago by the Ontario government, that is, in reference to the amount of arable land found along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific. This does not cover all the fertile land to be found in the clay belt in the province of Ontario, but merely, as I take it, refers to the land contiguous to the Transcontinental.

Mr. GRAHAM.

One item, that, I am sure, will be of very great interest to the country is: On the line of the Transcontinental Railway there is an area, in district "C," commencing about 4 miles east of the Bell river and extending to the western boundary of Quebec, of about 5,800 square miles, or 3,712,000 acres, of which it is said that 2,500,000 acres will make good farming land; and that most of the rest of the area can probably be drained so as to make a fertile country. The whole territory is well watered, and interspersed with fine lakes and rivers. For instance, the Hurricanaw is a good navigable river for steamboats, 60 or 70 miles in a southerly direction from the Transcontinental Railway. The land is said to be a good clay soil, easily drained, and the expectation is that the arable area extends much farther north than is now shown.

District "D" commences with the Ontario boundary and extends to the 74th mile or mile 185 on the map. There are about 2,100 square miles, or 1,344,000 acres of arable land, fit for cultivation upon clearing. From mile 185 on the map, to mile 285, there is an immense tract equal to any agricultural land in Canada, being a succession of long ridges, interspersed with swamps which can be readily drained. The country is well watered, and has an abundance of good fuel. There is an area of 7,500 square miles, 6,000 of which, or 3,800,000 acres, can be considered to be good arable land. It is a timbered country at present, covered with small spruce, balsam and white birch, with some occasional clumps of white pine. From mile 285 to mile 325, the soil is of a more sandy nature. It is stated that the valley of the Missanabie river contains some excellent land, the area of which would be, approximately, 500,000 acres of good arable land; 300,000 of medium quality, the balance suitable for pasture—and rocky well wooded land. There is another large area of tributary good land which will require drainage, as the country to the south is flatter and contains many swamps with low clay ridges, but all with a good sub-strata of clay.

There are reports and information from the Ontario land surveyors' explorations in the same territory, which show that the clay belt extends much farther north than that described in the area shown on the map and described herewith; which has been put in from personal observation and reports to the commissioners.

From mile 325 to mile 355, there is good agricultural land, comprising about 1,000,000 acres. The soil is a good sandy loam, well watered and timbered, with small spruce, birch and balsam. From mile 355 west to mile 475, the arable land area is much more restricted, so far as the reports go, being confined to the valleys of the large rivers. It is estimated, however, that there are 600,000 acres in this tract.

This will, I am sure, be information much appreciated by the House and the country, as it discloses that there is room for settlement along the line of the Transcontinental Railway between Nipigon lake, on the west, and La Tuque on the east; equal to that now occupied in the cultivated section of the old province of Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister able to say in what way that information has been gathered?

Mr. GRAHAM. These are reports received by the commissioners, which have been put in from personal observation and reports by the engineers in charge.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the information gathered by surveying engineers.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is, in short, what it is.

The through mileage from Moncton to Winnipeg is 1,804.84.

Now as to the work done on each one of these districts, I have had it placed in shape so that it can be readily understood by the House when they see the 'Hansard.'

Description of the Districts into which the Eastern Division of the National Transcontinental Railway has been divided.

Per cent of work done.

District 'A,' 39 %.—From Moncton to the New Brunswick line, 255·10 miles.

District 'B,' 53 %.—From the last named point to Clear lake, in the province of Quebec, in the vicinity of long. 74° west, 398·74 miles.

District 'C,' 0.—From the last named point to near the provincial boundary line dividing the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, 272 miles.

District 'D,' 4 % about.—From the last named point to near long. 84° west, 248 miles.

District 'E,' 0.—From the last named point to near long. 89° 30′ west, 258·91 miles.

District 'F,' 87 %.—From the last named point to Winnipeg (east bank Red river), 374·66 miles.

There are some other figures in connection with that subject giving the facts in detail, but I will not detain the House by reading them. Now, Sir, this is the large work in which the Dominion of Canada is at the present time interested and in which it is engaged. I am not going further into details with reference to this work as there will be ample time and opportunity for discussing it under another proposition which is before the House.

I want, in order not to be too tedious and to weary the House, now to proceed to consider a question that has been discussed by the press of the country and refer to one of its phases at least which was very ably discussed in the House by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) and several other hon. members. I now wish to take up the Intercolonial Railway. A good deal has been said about the Intercolonial Railway. As long as I can remember, or since I have been able to read the newspapers and later to help to manufacture them, the Intercolonial Railway has been a subject that has been discussed by both parties, and it depended to a certain extent which party was in or out what view they took of that railway. I am not prepared at all to admit, Sir, that the Intercolonial Railway is not a well managed road. It has its difficulties, as has any project started as the Intercolonial was, not as a money making undertaking but rather as the result of an agreement in order to bring the outlying provinces into closer touch with the markets and the trade conditions which existed in what was then called Canada. It is as well managed as any road could be under those conditions. I shall endeavour in a moment to show by way of comparison what I mean. Taking the revenue account of last year I beg to submit the following figures:

Revenue Account.

The gross earnings and the working expenses for the year compare as follows:—

Gross earnings..	$9,173,558 80
Working expenses..	9,157,435 53
Surplus..	$ 16,123 27

The earnings from passenger traffic were: $2,711,416.98.

The earnings from freight traffic were: $6,054,493.55.

The earnings from mails and express freight were as follows:—

In 1907-8..	$ 407,648 37

I find that out of the amount of $9,157,435.53, working expenses, we procured a large quantity of rolling stock to say nothing of other improvements to the line. Out of revenue we purchased the following rolling stock:

1 first-class sleeping car.
1 dining car.
2 postal and smoking cars.
2 express and baggage cars.
100 box cars—60,000 capacity.
100 platform cars—80,000 capacity.
3 refrigerator cars—60,000 capacity.
92 hopper cars—30,000 capacity.
9 stock cars—60,000 capacity.
8 vans.

Sixty-nine of the 100 box cars replaced that many of smaller capacity.

The 100 platform cars all replaced smaller capacity cars.

The 3 refrigerators all replaced smaller capacity cars.

The 92 hopper cars replaced the same number of small hoppers of 6 and 8 tons capacity.

The 9 stock cars all replaced smaller capacity cars.

It does not require any explanation to convince the practical men who occupy seats in this House that it has become a necessity during the past few years to do away, as far as possible, with the smaller sizes of cars and locomotives and to replace

them with rolling stock of a large capacity. If we did not the railway could not compete with other railways that carry large amounts of traffic at a small cost.

Mr. HUGHES. To what account were those cars charged?

Mr. GRAHAM. They were charged to revenue. These things were purchased out of the $9,000,000 odd of working expenses charged to revenue. We could have made a good deal better showing if we had refrained from purchasing this rolling stock out of revenue. I want to point out, in this connection, that had the wages of the employees remained the same in 1907-8 as they were in the year 1906-7, the Intercolonial would have shown a surplus of $221,000. At the beginning of the year 1907-8 there were granted to the different classes of employees certain increases aggregating $205,989, or practically $206,000. These increases were as follows:

Aggregate increases.	Per annum.
Trackmen	$ 50,000
Mechanical department employees	100,000
Station staff	27,605
Stores department employees	3,024
Electrical department employees.	720
Ferry service employees	600
Watchmen	600
Officials and clerks	23,440

That is for the Intercolonial alone and I will again call the attention of the House to the fact that if the wages of the employees had remained as they were the year before we would have had a surplus, notwithstanding the falling off in the revenue during the part of the year, of $221,000. I want to point out this fact particularly to those who are sometimes inclined to tell us in the House that we are not paying fair wages on the Intercolonial Railway. I want to make the statement and to make it clearly that I believe the Intercolonial employee is as well off as the employee of any line on this continent. Also, in fairness to the men, I wish to say that I believe that the employees themselves of the Intercolonial will compare favourably with the employees of any line on this continent.

The capital expenditure on the Intercolonial for the year ended March 31, 1908, was $4,382,494.01, the principal items of which were:

Rolling stock additions	$1,805,462
Strengthening bridges	245,168
New locomotive shops and car shops, Moncton	645,598
Machinery	85,864
Engine house, Chaudière Junction	66,314
Sackville, improvements	58,344
Ste. Rosalie improvements, yard and buildings	75,992
Amherst, new station	33,937
Shops at Halifax and yard improvements	519,951
St. John improvements	$ 48,973
Mulgrave "	39,641
Truro "	86,594
Pictou "	45,138
Extension to Sydney Mines	48,993
Indiantown and Blackville branch	35,855
Increased water service	54,330
Additional sidings	27,196

Large amounts have been and are being expended on the different shops but I will only refer to one of these, and I think it is only fair to the House that I should do this because a large amount of money has been expended there and a large amount in addition will be expended. But as these shops at Moncton will provide in a large measure the terminals for the Grand Trunk Pacific I think it will be interesting for the House to know just what kind of shops we are constructing.

Mr. FOSTER. That is at Halifax?

Mr. GRAHAM. At Moncton.

Mr. CROSBY. It should have been at Halifax.

Mr. GRAHAM. Halifax will be one terminus and St. John the other terminus when we have all the railways down there as we shall no doubt in time. At the risk of wearying the House I wish to give a description of the shops at Moncton because I submit with all modesty that there are few of the members of the House who understand just what work has been done on the Intercolonial. I would go further; I think there are probably few people in Canada who know the Intercolonial as it really is, as a first-class railway. The shops that are being constructed at Moncton will serve the Grand Trunk Pacific also, and in that connection it will be interesting to have the following description of the buildings into which we are putting our money :

DIMENSIONS OF SHOPS RECENTLY CONCTRUCTED FOR THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY AT MONCTON, N.B.

Freight car repair shop: 362′—0″ x 134′—8″. Area covered 48,700 sq. ft. Net floor area 47,400 sq. ft. Gross cubic contents 1,573,000 cubic ft. Net contents 1,541,000 cubic ft.

This building is composed of concrete foundations; reinforced concrete wall columns, curtain walls, and roof slab; steel trusses and purlins. There are two longitudinal rows of steel columns within this shop. Floors between rails are of 3″ plank; between tracks the floors are of mastic cement.

Six repair tracks run through the building, providing working accommodation for 48 cars.

Reinforced concrete air ducts are placed beneath the floor.

Planing Mill: 202′—8″ x 81′—10″; together with a fan honse 20′ x 20′. Area covered 17,100 sq. ft. Net area of floor 16,400 sq. ft. Gross cubic contents 550,000 cubic ft. Net contents 523,000 cubic ft.

This building is composed of concrete foundations, surmounted by a steel frame, with curtain walls and roof slab of reinforced con-

crete. The bottom chords of trusses are designed to carry 3 ton trolleys, and the floor space is entirely free from obstruction.

The floor is of hardwood.

Reinforced concrete air ducts are placed beneath the floor.

Passenger Car Repair Shop: 361′—8″ x 100′—0″. Area covered 36,100 sq. ft. Net area of floor 371,000 sq. ft. Gross cubic contents 887,000 cubic ft. Net contents 856,000 cubic ft.

This is a transverse shop with 18 tracks, besides an area at one end of 36 ft. x 100 ft. which together with a mezzaine floor 18 ft. x 100 ft. is for use as a cabinet shop.

The building is of reinforced concrete throughout, having four longitudinal rows of columns. Between the rails plank floors are provided; between tracks the flooring is of concrete.

Reinforced concrete air ducts are placed beneath the floor.

Passenger Car Paint Shop: 361 ft.—8 in. x 100 ft.—0 in. Area covered 361,000 sq. ft. Net area of floor 371,000. Gross cubic contents 887,000 cubic ft. Net contents 856,000.

This building is practically a duplicate of the repair shop. The end area, not occupied by tracks, and the mezzanine floor being devoted to upholstering and varnishing.

Storehouse and office building:—343-ft.—8-in. x 51-ft.—8-in..

Area covered by building 17,700 sq. ft. Net area of floors, 50,800 sq. ft.

Area covered by platform, 7,900 sq. ft. Net area including platform, 58,700 sq. ft.

Gross cu. contents exclusive of platform, 674,000 cu. ft. Net contents, 610,000 cu. ft.

The building is of reinforced concrete throughout, except the office partitions which are of porous tile.

The building consists of two stories and a basement. The greater part of the upper floor is devoted to offices. The building is provided on two sides and one end with a concrete platfrom designed for heavy loads. Freight elevators connect the different floors.

The interior is well finished. Floors are of hardwood except in basement which is of concrete. An ample supply of plumbing fixtures has been provided, and the building equipped for steam heating.

Locomotive shops { 408-ft.—4-in. x 178-ft.—4-in. / 375-ft.—1-in. x 157-ft.—9.in / 375-ft.—1-in. x 102-ft.—3-in

Area covered 171,000 sq. ft. Net area of floors 168,000 sq. ft.

Gross cubic contents, 7,360,000 cu. ft. Net contents, 7,270,000 cu. ft.

This is a group of buildings comprising;

Boiler shop:—375-ft.—1-in. x 102-ft.—3-in. In two bays, with riveting tower at one end of the erecting bay. The tool bay is served by a 10 ton electric travelling crane; the erecting bay by a 35 ton crane; and the riveting tower by a 30 ton crane. Plank floor on timber sills.

Locomotive erecting shop:—375-ft.—1-in. x 81-ft.—1-in. This shop is arranged with a central longitudinal pit, flanked upon either side by individual pits arranged in herring bone pattern. There is standing room for six locomotives upon the central pit, and for sixteen locomotives upon the side pits. Two electric travelling cranes, each of 60 ton capacity, command the shop. Flooring is of plank resting upon timber sills.

Forge shop:—375-ft.—1-in. x 76-ft.—8-in. This shop is served by jib cranes. The flooring is of earth.

Machine shop:—408-ft.—4-in. x 132-ft.—6-in. This shop is in two bays, each of which is commanded by a 10 ton electric travelling crane. The flooring is of plank, supported by a concrete base.

Machine Shop Annex, 408 ft. 4 in. x 44 ft. 10 in.

This includes the bolt room, tool room, brass room, brass foundry, with lavatories upon a mezzanine floor.

The foundations of all these shops are of concrete, the skeleton is of steel, with curtain walls and roof slabs of reinforced concrete. Travelling cranes command all floor space except that of the forge shop and the machine shop annex. Reinforced concrete air ducts are placed beneath the floors of all these shops forming the locomotive group.

Power House, 203 ft. 2 in. x 69 ft.

Area covered, 14,000 sq. ft.; net area of floor, 13,300; plus basement, 1,400; gross cubic contents, exclusive of basement, 477,000; net contents, 460,000.

This building consists of concrete foundations, surmounted by a steel frame, with curtain walls and roof slab of reinforced concrete. The engine room is served by a 15 ton travelling crane operated by hand. The engine room is provided with a hardwood floor, supported by steel framing over the basement portion.

Gas-producer House, 40 ft. 10 in. x 38 ft. 10 in.

Area covered, 1,600 sq. ft.; net area of floors, 2,750 sq. ft.; gross cubic contents, 61,600 cubic ft.; net contents, 52,700 cubic ft.

This building consists of a single story with a basement. It is a steel frame structure with reinforced concrete walls and roof slab. The basement floor is of concrete, the charging floor is of steel.

Dry Kiln, 57 ft. x 25 ft. 4 in., 17 ft. 4 in. x 16 ft. 8 in.

Area covered, exclusive of platform, 1,730 sq. ft.; net area of floors, 1,550 sq. ft.; gross cubic contents, 22,500 cubic ft.; net contents, 14,000 cubic ft.

This is a brick and wood combination building, upon concrete foundations. There is a platform on either side, 6 ft. in width.

Lumber Shed, 150 ft. x 20 ft.

Area covered, 3,100 sq. ft.; net floor area 2,800 sq. ft.; gross cubic contents, 46,500 cubic ft.; net contents, 36,000 cubic ft.

This is wooden structure upon concrete foundations.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What is the capacity of these shops? how many locomotives and how many cars can you build in a year?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not that information but I will get it a little later on.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Oh, never mind.

Mr. GRAHAM. These shops, are I am told, very superior both in structure and capacity, and in referring to them it is perhaps not out of place to quote from an interview that was given to the 'Moncton Transcript' by Mr. Quesnel, who is the

International Vice-President of the Boiler Makers' union and who visits Moncton occasionally as he does I believe all railway centres on the continent. Mr. Quesnel certainly does know what is required in the construction of shops of this kind as he is conversant with the shops of the various American railways, and he makes this statement:

> The extent of the shops and their equipment certainly surprised me. When completed and equipped they will have no superior, not merely in Canada but in the United States, and I have visited every railway shop of any importance in North America.

That testimony coming from a man of such experience as Mr. Quesnel puts beyond all cavil the high class of the workshops being constructed at Moncton.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total cost of all these?

Mr. GRAHAM. Speaking subject to correction, including a new piece of railway which we must construct in order to make a cut off leading from the city, the cost will be in the vicinity of $2,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Will that include machinery?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so, but of that I am not sure. When you get into such large figures it is hard to be definite.

Now, I shall refer for a moment to the Provident Fund. To this fund the railway employees contribute a certain amount and the government contributes an equal amount. The fund has been established as a provision for those who retire from the service because of old age or other causes. In Committee of Supply I shall be able to give some more details as to the number of employees retired. Hon. gentlemen will please note that the government contribution to this fund comes out of the revenues of the Intercolonial. All the best railways on the continent have adopted such a system, and I am glad to know that the government railway is not behind any of them in this respect. The following table explains the position of the Provident Fund:

During the fiscal year the contribution of the employees amounted to	$ 82,707 74
The contribution by the railway amounted to	82,707 74
A total of	$165,415 48
The total expenditure was	27,700 63
Leaving a balance of	$137,654 85
To which is to be added the interest	1,594 36
Making a total amount to the credit of the fund on the 31st March, 1908	$139,249 21

Mr. FOSTER. What is the rate of interest?

Mr. GRAHAM. The rate of interest is not stated, but I imagine it is the bank rate of 3 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. By the way, is that fund invested in any way or is it a debt owed by the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think it is invested but as to that I would not be sure. At all events it comes out of the receipts of the railway and not out of consolidated revenue. In reference to that fund let me say this: A few of the employees of the Intercolonial Railway, noting that the expenditures did not at all equal the income in this fund, formed the idea that the rate charged each year and set aside by the employees could be reduced; but I pointed out to them, and I believe the House will agree, that this is a fallacy. We cannot make that fund too strong and it is the history of all such funds that for the first few years not many are withdrawing, but every employee on the Intercolonial is growing one year older every 12 months and is getting that much nearer superannuation, so that instead of reducing the amount to be collected annually, if I had any advice to give it would be that the amount be increased in order to make the sum substantial to those who in a few years will go into the retirement class under the Provident Fund.

Leaving the Intercolonial Railway proper, I take up the Prince Edward Island Railway. For the benefit of the country who perhaps do not give this careful study, I might repeat that there are two branches at least of the government owned railway, one the Intercolonial Railway, 1,500 miles long, and the other the Prince Edward Island Railway, which brings our total government railway up to something over 1,700 miles. This railway, of course, has its beginning and its end, its Alpha and its Omega on Prince Edward Island. It is an industry by itself and so far as it can it has a monopoly.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a belt line.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a belt line.

The gross earnings and working expenses of the Prince Edward Island Railway for the year compare as follows:—

Gross earnings	$304,579 83
Working expenses	399,947 79
Difference (deficit)	$ 95,367 96
The gross earnings were	$304,579 83
The earnings from passenger traffic, 1907-8	132,382 76
The earnings from freight traffic, 1907-8	146,280 99
The earnings from mails and sundries, 1907-8	25,916 08
The capital expenditure on the Prince Edward Island Railway for the year ending March 31, 1908, was	$390,461 83
Charlottetown railway shops, new	$299,875 71

Souris wharf, new crib, and facing with concrete	$51,159 90
New machinery at Charlottetown	35,456 00
Rolling stock additions, 4 locomotives and 23 box cars	73,281 00

As to salaries, additions were made during the year beginning April 1, 1907, as follows :

Class of employee.	Aggregate Increase.
To trackmen	$4,768
To freight porters	394
To mechanical department employees	6,160

If these increased payments had not been made, then, as I said in reference to the Intercolonial Railway, the deficit on the Prince Edward Island Railway would have been that much less.

Leaving the operations of the government railways for last year, I wish to make a few comparisons in reference to the management of the railway. If my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) will not find fault with me for encroaching on some of the ground he covered so ably the other night, in order to make my statement clear it is imperative that I should use some of the figures he used recently. How can we make a comparison ? A very prominent writer on the 'Economics of Railways' says :

> The percentage of the gross revenues which are devoted to operating expenses, fixed charges and dividends, are not necessarily an indication of creditable management or the reverse. Causes utterly beyond control of the management, may abnormally increase certain items of expense, while ruinous competition may cut down the gross revenue, so that little or nothing is left for dividends.
>
> A favourable location will sometimes make a road prosperous in spite of bad management. On the other hand, the highest grade of skill will fail to keep some roads out of the hands of a receiver.

If he had been writing about the location of the Intercolonial Railway, he could not have expressed the situation more clearly, and if he had been speaking of that very great competition which he calls ruinous, so far as the water routes are concerned, he could not have made a truer statement if he had had the Intercolonial Railway in his mind. But, I am not going to dwell on that point, I am going to make a comparison with some other lines on a basis which I think is fair, to show that notwithstanding these handicaps as to the location, notwithstanding the handicaps as to the water routes and other handicaps to which I will refer later, that must exist in the management of a government road, the Intercolonial is as well managed as the average railway in Canada, has no greater number of men to the mile and pays no more for the work accomplished. The train mileage expense is a fair basis of comparison, and although different considerations, such as the standard of the railway and the double track enter into the problem, the large amount of business brought by high standard and a double track generally counterbalance these to such a degree that the comparison of train mileage expense is applicable. The average cost per train mile in 1907-8 not including interest, just wages and material, on the leading railways of Canada was as follows :

	1907.	1098.
All Canada	$1.381	1.364
Canadian Pacific Ry.	1.45	1.493
Canadian Northern Ry.	1.551	1.480
Grand Trunk Ry. System	1.267	1.154
Temiskaming & North. Ont. Ry.	1.599	1.592
Intercolonial Ry.	1.193	1.295

The only railway that has a better showing as to the average cost per train mile in Canada than the Intercolonal Railway is the Grand Trunk Railway, and the cost on the Intercolonial Railway is considerably less per train mile than the standard or average of the Canadian railways in Canada.

Another significant comparison is the cost of maintenance of rolling stock per mile run. I will give this table under the three headings of locomotive mile, passenger mile and freight car mile. The figures are as follows :

	Loco. mile. cents.	Pass. mile. cents.	Frt. car. mile. cents.
C. P. R.	.0772	.0176	.0105
C. N. R.	.1235	.0137	.0066
G. T. R.	.0712	.0106	.0078
T. & N. O. Ry.	.0633	.0202	.0117
I. C. R.	.0845	.0191	.0106

It is apparent from this that the Intercolonial Railway is not extravagantly run in this respect, and it keeps up the standard well.

Another test is the maintenance of way and structures on the basis of the train miles run. The figures for the different railways in this respect are :

	cents.
Canadian Pacific Railway	.2997
Canadian Northern Railway	.3307
Grand Trunk Railway	.2007
Temiskaming & Northern Ontario Ry.	.2806
Intercolonial Railway	.2400

Again, the Grand Trunk Railway is the only line in the Dominion that shows less than the Intercolonial Railway under this heading. The Grand Trunk Pacific makes a better showing rather than the Intercolonial Railway.

Take the maintenance of the rolling stock per year. As hon. gentlemen know who have studied this question, there is a standard below which it is not safe to go. If that standard is departed from, the quality of the rolling stock must deteriorate.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Where are those train mile figures, giving the statement of cost, taken from?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have a statement from every railway every year, and you can get them from other authorities as well. We can figure out the cost per mile from the statements they give us, and we have other authorities as well. There can be no question about the authenticity of the figures.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Was the statement the hon. gentleman gave per train mile or what is called per train ton mile?

Mr. GRAHAM. The statement I gave has reference to the rolling stock and the maintenance of way and not to the ton mile at all. I may come to that later. Here are the figures tabulated:

	Per locomotive year.	Per passenger car year.	Per freight car year.
Standard.	$2,000 00	$600 00	$45 00
Canadian Pacific Ry..	2,444 63	985 21	75 19
Canadian Northern Ry..	2,388 69	639 48	37 09
Grand Trunk Ry.. ..	1,833 53	447 54	47 90
Temiskaming and N. O. Ry..	1,580 00	417 80	34 84
Intercolonial Ry.. ..	2,083 29	710 10	53 28

It will be apparent from the above that the Intercolonial Railway spends enough to keep up the standard of requirement; and as this comes out of its revenue, it shows we are not starving the maintenance of its equipment in order to make a good showing at the end of the year.

There is another test which has some bearing on the management of the road, and that is the percentage of loaded and empty freight car mileage. This is not always controllable, it depends upon the movement of trade, but in so far as it is controllable it is an evidence of efficiency; and in so far as it goes I want to give a comparison in that respect between the Intercolonial Railway and other railways. It certainly does not show lack of management on the part of the Intercolonial Railway. Here are the figures:

	Loaded.	Empty.	Empty p.c
Can. Pac. Ry.... ..	319,507,176	110,373,337	23
Grand Trunk Ry...	178,722,657	70,788,415	28
Canadian Nor. Ry.	43,837,190	16,078,648	27
Temiskaming & N. O. Ry.	1,639,951	851,533	34
Intercolonial Ry. ..	60,532,928	20,952,989	25

So that in making a comparison along that line, certainly the Intercolonial Railway does not show to disadvantage.

Then I want to come to another point and that is the number of employees per mile of railway. My hon. friend dealt with that the other night, and I think that my figures correspond approximately with his, but are perhaps of a little later date. It has been said in the press that we have, I do not know how many, hundreds of employees in excess of our requirements on the Intercolonial Railway. I am not going to argue that in other railways there have not been certain decreases, but if we compare the management of the Intercolonial Railway with the management of other railways, if we take the number of employees per mile, we will find nothing to complain of on our road in that respect. Taking the past two years, I find the comparison as follows:

Per mile of railway.	1907.	1908.
Canadian Pacific Railway..	7.39	5.68
Grand Trunk Railway	7.50	5.52
Canadian Northern Railway.. ..	3.94	2.85
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry.	5.92	5.54
Intercolonial Railway..	5.72	5.81

Mr. J. HAGGART. What employees are those?

Mr. GRAHAM. All the employees.

Mr. FOSTER. From the president down?

Mr. GRAHAM. I could hardly consider myself an employee. From the manager down.

Mr. HAGGART. Should you not give the amount of work they do in order to have a fair comparison?

Mr. GRAHAM. The work on the line shows pretty well what they do.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Also the earnings?

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall attend to the earnings before I get through. What I want to point out is that we are not overmanned to the extent some newspapers would lead the public to believe we are. Or if we are overmanned, then every railway on the continent is in the same condition. Let me point out this feature, which will strike members of the House as I read these figures. While the other railways reduced their number of men per mile in 1908, owing to the shrinkage in the traffic, the government owned railways retained about the same staff.

Mr. LENNOX. The other railways had not an election on their hands.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am glad my hon. friend has made that interruption because what I have said about the Intercolonial Railway applies equally to the Temiskaming and Ontario road. So that I submit, in neither the one case nor the other, had the elections anything to do with this question.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the hon. minister dismissed any since the elections?

Mr. GRAHAM. None that would not have been out in any case.

I call attention to the fact that on the two government railways, the number of men remained stationary this year as well as last year. By last year I refer to 1908. While last year the other railways of Canada dismissed no fewer than 17,608 employees, owing no doubt to the falling off in the traffic, the Intercolonial Railway did not follow suit, and the fact that there was an election did not make a bit of difference as I suppose it did not make any difference with the Ontario government railway. I have an idea—perhaps an erroneous one—that in a government railway such as this, where thousands of men are employed, there can be a distinction fairly drawn between the treatment of these men, when hard times arise, and that accorded by the other great railway companies to their men. If we were to take the cold-blooded view of what it would mean to the railway itself, then it would be wise to dismiss every man possible, it would be wise to do, as other roads, and reduce the number of employees to the lowest possible extent. But by doing that we would only add to whatever pannicky condition might exist and intensify the conditions. I may be wrong and possibly railway managers may say so, but I take the ground that during a financial stringency it would be unfair to municipalities and to portions of the country through which the road runs and to the employees themselves, if we were to act as other railways do and turn our employees out on the street to do as best they could while hard times prevailed. I did not think we should do that nor did the Ontario government, and as a consequence, while other railway companies reduced the number of their employees very materially these two governments practically retained the same number as they did before.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Why did not the hon. gentleman impress that line of conduct on his colleagues in the various other departments?

Mr. GRAHAM. They don't run a railway. This is a work that is in motion; it is not a new work, it does not mean not employing certain men, but it means depriving men of employment who have had it for years, and who depend upon it for their means of livelihood.

Now, I come to the question of earning power. I have tried to point out, as briefly as I could, that the management of the Intercolonial is as economical as the management of the other lines. You ask: Then, why does not this railway show a profit? Well, my own opinion is that the railways covering practically the same territory as the Intercolonial Railway have not made a dollar in the last ten years. I think that if hon. gentlemen will look into the facts, they will find that the Intercolonial stands as well financially year after year, for the last seven or eight years at least, as the other lines running through substantially the same section, considering these parts separate from the lines over the rest of the continent. The Intercolonial is a detached line, a line covering part of a territory, a line without feeders from the west, simply a long railway practically feeding itself, though getting what traffic it can from other roads. We have, it is true, an understanding and agreement with the Grand Trunk. But the Grand Trunk has its own connections to Portland, and will shortly have connections further east. And, while it may live up to its agreement with us, it does not give to the Intercolonial a pound of freight that it can get out of giving to that road; it gives as much as it can to its own line, and carries it to Portland. So, if you wish to compare the Intercolonial Railway with any of the other lines running through substantially the same section, we are willing to have that comparison made.

In considering the earning power, I wish first to take the train mile. When we discuss the train mile and the small rate received by the Intercolonial, we mean two things: first, that the Intercolonial does get a small rate on nearly all its commodities, and, second, that the majority of the traffic of the Intercolonial only entitles the road to charge the lower grade rate. If we had a railway into a rich silver district, or running through the richest agricultural section where they pay larger rates, we could have the same average rate as other roads similarly situated. The higher standard of the traffic would allow us to charge a higher average rate per ton per mile. To illustrate this I have only to call attention to the rates realized by the Ontario government road. Not that these rates are very much higher than ours if you consider them merely by the schedule; but their tonnage is of such a high standard, on the average, that they are enabled, as it works out practically, to get 149 per cent higher rate per ton per mile than the Intercolonial. I wish to be clearly understood: I am not saying that they charge too much for the kind of freight they carry, but theirs is a high class freight on which they are able, under the ordinary tariff, to charge a higher average rate than the Intercolonial can charge on its traffic. This accounts, to a certain extent, for the low rates on the Intercolonial. There is another condition to account for it, and that is the competition with the water rate from Sydney to Montreal, Quebec and other points, and also the water transportation from Halifax to Sydney. These must be met, and they are met; but in meeting them the Intercolonial gives

to the people of the eastern provinces and the Dominion generally great benefits in the rates. Now, let me make a comparison of the earnings per train mile of the different roads. The figures are as follows:

Earnings per train mile.

	1907.	1908.
Canadian Pacific Railway..	$2.279	$2.19
Grand Trunk Railway..	1.835	1.664
Canadian Northern Railway.. ..	2.41	2.201
Temiskaming & Northern Ontario Railway..	2.155	1.806
Intercolonial Railway..	1.254	1.238

There is a marked contrast, as hon. gentlemen will see, between the earning power of the other railways and the earning powers of the Intercolonial. Now, in the same way, take the average receipts. The following are the figures:

AVERAGE RECEIPTS.

	Passengers per passenger mile.		Freight per ton mile, terminal charges included.	
	1907.	1908.	1907.	1908.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
C. P. Ry.....	1·844	1·898	0·778	0·742
Can. Nor. Ry...	2·835	2·381	0·873	0·779
G. T. Ry.	1·839	1·771	0·672	0·685
T. & N. O. Ry..	2·585	2·288	1·518	1·443
Intercolonial Ry	1·762	1·845	0·584	0·578
New South Wales	.....	.....	.....	2·4

Then, to carry this comparison a little farther—for I wish to convince the House, if I can, that the Intercolonial rates are low and that receipts will continue to be low so long as we carry the goods of the people at these rates—let us see what would happen to the other companies' earnings on the basis of the Intercolonial's freight rates for 1908. The Canadian Pacific Railway rate was 28·4 per cent more than the Intercolonial. To compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to accept the Intercolonial rate would have meant a loss to the Canadian Pacific Railway on freight alone of $9,587,531. Now, take the Canadian Northern; its rate was 34·8 per cent more than that of the Intercolonial. If forced to accept the Intercolonial rate last year, it would have meant the loss to them of $1,760,628. The Grand Trunk rate was 18·5 per cent higher than the Intercolonial, and the loss to them on the basis of the Intercolonial rate, would have been $2,969,703. The Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway rate was 149·7 per cent higher than the Intercolonial, and the loss to them, had they accepted the Intercolonial rate, would have meant $166,462. So far as the passenger rates are concerned, I think that the Intercolonial rates are fair. The Canadian Pacific Railway, on the average, gets about the same, the Grand Trunk a little less, the Canadian Northern 23 per cent higher and the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario 24 per cent higher.

It has been stated, and has been made a subject of complaint in some quarters, that the government road has injured the provinces through which it runs. I have seen the question raised in the press, and have heard it discussed by gentlemen who have taken quite an interest in the matter and who have said that, in years gone by, the Intercolonial hampered the maritime provinces and the province of Quebec. I am not sure about that, but I am inclined to think that the figures and conditions will not bear out the statement.

Now, take the province of New Brunswick. There are 440 miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway in New Brunswick, 565 miles of other lines, and 503 miles of the Intercolonial, or about one-third. There are a great many company lines of railway, but the government road has only one-third of the total mileage of New Brunswick. So if there be anything wrong, if the railways have not been fair in their treatment of New Brunswick, only one-third of the unfairness ought to be charged to the government railway. Now take Nova Scotia. I want to point out also that the Intercolonial is not the only railway that has a large mileage in Nova Scotia. We have the Mackenzie and Mann, with 435 miles, we find other railways with 395 miles, and the Intercolonial has 485 miles. Again the government railway has only about one-third of the mileage in the province of Nova Scotia. Now I do not admit for a moment that the existence of a government owned and government operated railway has injured any part of Canada. It is true that conditions have changed—and I will deal with that a little later on—conditions have changed, and what would do for a government owned railway or a company owned railway a few years ago, will not do for a government owned railway or a company owned railway at the present time. Companies are waking up to the situation and keeping pace with the increased demand of the times, and the government owned railway will have to follow in their wake, if it is to occupy the place it has occupied, or ought to occupy, in the transportation of the country. Now I want to point out something that my hon. friend pointed out the other night, and that is the expenditure we have made in the Dominion of Canada on railways. We hear a good deal of comment about the money we spend on the government railway. Well, Sir, if we selected the government railway and expended money on it and not on the other railways throughout the Dominion of Canada, I would say that perhaps we were treating one part of the country a little better than the other. But the fact is that there is no part of the Dominion of Canada

that has not had, and is not having to-day millions of the people's money expended in order to obtain for the people of Canada better transportation facilities. Now I will give a few figures, and I will explain to my hon. friend from East Hamilton (Mr. Barker), that I have taken the basis of $5 an acre.

The total sum of money granted by way of aid towards the construction of railways to 30th June, 1908=

From the Dominion of Canada..	=$133,049,376
From the provinces..	= 35,191,415
From municipalities..	= 17,430,945
Making a total of..	$185,671,736

Further aid by way of land grants has been given, aggregating:

From Dominion, acres..	= 31,864,074
From provinces "	= 20,420,109
Total..	= 52,284,183

If we take the average value of the land in question at $5 per acre—a moderate estimate—we get $261,420,915, making in land and cash a sum equivalent to $447,092,651. Of this the Canadian Pacific and its allied lines got:

From Dominion government.. ..	$50,072,980 69
From provincial government....	12,617,536 79
From municipalities..	5,214,267 35
A total of cash .. .. =	$67,904,884 83
Land grants, 26,816,202 acres at $5 per acre.. .. .. =	134,081,010 00
Equivalent value to amount of =	$201,985,894 83

The Canadian Northern and allied companies, including the Quebec, Nova Scotia and Quebec and Ontario lines:

From Dominion government.. ..	$ 7,488,710 86
From provincial government.. ..	9,649,297 59
From municipalities....	174,000 00
Cash total of..	$17,312,008 45
Land grants of 5,047,872 acres at $5 per acre.. .. .. =	25,239,360 00
Equivalent value to amount of=	$42,551,368 45

The Grand Trunk Railway system and allied companies :

From Dominion government.. ..	$17,277,465 33
From provincial government.. ..	3,000,406 59
From municipalities..	5,305,727 37
Municipal subscription to shares.	440,000 00
Cash total of.. .... =	$26,023,599 29

Mr. FOSTER. Do the Grand Trunk figures take in the whole liability of the Grand Trunk Railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine they do, but I am not sure about that. I asked for the way it was distributed among these other companies. These amounts I have given do not total the amount I have mentioned, in the aggregate, but I have only taken the three larger railways. In addition to that, as I say, we have given in guaranteed bonds large amounts of aid to different railways. We are also constructing a large section of the transcontinental line, which amount is not included in these figures. Taking them altogether, we have given very many millions of money for the sole purpose of accommodating the people with railway facilities.

Mr. EMMERSON. We have made loans as well, and propose making others.

Mr. GRAHAM. Now we have been generous in the Dominion of Canada, not generous to the railways because we wanted to help the railways, not because it was thought wise to have great corporations, but we have been generous because it has been thought for years by the people of Canada, as represented in this House, that to give aid to the railways meant to give aid to the people in order that they might get better prices for their products in the markets of the world. That being the case, I do not think we ought to cavil so much when we are asked to make some expenditure on a railway we own ourselves. Now I want to point out one or two other things. It has been stated by somebody, at some place, at some time, that it would be wise to stop the expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial. Now Sir, if that was done it would mean, as the Wall Street 'Journal' said, the stagnation and death of any railway.

Mr. JOHN HGAGART. Who made that statement? I never heard any one make it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have heard people make it. I did not mention my hon. friend as having made it. I have heard it mentioned at some time, at some place by some person.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. I was not there.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not make any personal reference. If there has been any person who had the erroneous opinion——I will put it that way, to meet the views of my hon. friend—I want to point out that other railways have not stopped expenditures on capital account during the past year, although they have taken devious ways of securing that capital. I want to read a few of the ways they have adopted in certain companies. Owing to the financial panic in the United States, these other railways demanded the closest possible curtailment of money demands; yet to meet pressing obligations, short time notes were issued by the following companies for the amounts named:

Boston and Maine..	$ 7,000,000
Erie..	5,500,000
Delaware and Hudson..	6,000,000
Missouri Pacific..	6,000,000
New York, New Haven and Hartford..	8,320,000
Wheeling and Lake Erie..	8,000,000
Chicago Great Western..	3,300,000

*Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific	$ 6,000,000
Baltimore and Ohio..	11,600,000
Pennslyvania system issued 5 per cent 3 years collateral notes for..	60,000,000
The Canadian Pacific Ry. in turn issued in the year 1906-7 common stock at par to the amount of..	15,684,810

The Canadian Pacific Railway have, a few months ago, taken power to issue $50,000,000 more stock.

For the year 1907-8 preferred stock increased..	$4,866,666
Bonds increased for the same period	8,668,498

The Southern Railway Company, about 7,548 miles in length, has increased its expenditure on capital account by the sum of $76,000,000 in the past four years, for improvements in existing line, terminals and increased equipment.

Many other of the great systems of railways have, in like manner, made large investments on capital account, in obedience to the universal law of 'progress or death.'

But no matter by what method the capital is secured, it is necessary in order that a railway may live, that certain amounts be expended year by year in order to increase the facilities for carrying the people's goods, else these facilities will not be afforded and the railway must necessarily die. I want to take up another point that has been discussed in this House at times, and when I refer to it, I want to be distinctly understood as not taking any sectional view.

A comparison has often been made between the expenditure on the canal system and the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway. That view may be sectional, but I want to point out that a great many people understood at the time of confederation, and it will be candidly admitted by any person who will read all the discussions which took place then, that the Intercolonial was to be built in a certain way to balance the canal systems that were built in other parts of the country. While it may be a sectional view, I want to carry out that comparison and point out to my hon. friends that there is not so much difference after all between us as to the contention that the Intercolonial Railway ought to be, for a portion of Canada, just as much the people's highway as the canal system is in another part of Canada. Anything that will tend to make it more efficient ought to be assisted by the people of the Dominion as a whole. With that end in view let me make a few comparisons. These figures are up to the latest date available. The Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways—and I am including them both so as to be quite fair—had an expenditure made upon them on capital account up to the end of last year of $94,825,192.94. The total expenditure on capital account upon the canal system has been $93,457,874.28. Practically the same amount has been expended on the government railways as on the canal system. Now let us take the year ended March 31, 1908. We find that there was an expenditure on the canals of $3,221,984.73, made up as follows:

Capital account..	$1,723,156 07
Income account..	508,010 19
Maintenance staff..	556,902 83
Repairs..	433,915 64

Leaving out the amount of money that we received from hydraulic rentals in connection with these canals the deficit on the operation of the canals would be $1,498,828.66. But I wish to deduct from that amount what was received from hydraulic rentals, namely, $144,882.13, making the cost of the operation of the canals last year to the Dominion of Canada $1,353,946.53. I want to make another calculation in order to bring in the interest. I propose to make a comparison for the last twelve months with respect to the cost of the canals and the government owned and operated railways.

Mr. STRATTON. With respect to the operation of each?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, if we were to take the question of operation alone there would be a showing of about $1,500,000 in favour of the Intercolonial Railway. But I propose to take the interest for one year on the canal expenditure and the interest for one year on the government-owned railway capital expenditure and then the cost to the country of the canals and the cost for the maintenance of the government-owned railways and see where we stood last year. If I take the interest at three per cent on the government railway expenditure I find that it amounted to $2,844,755.78. If I take the interest on the canals I find that it amounted to $2,803,736.22, there being a difference in favour of the canals as against the government-owned railways for last year in interest alone of $41,019.55.

Mr. EMMERSON. You are including the Prince Edward Island Railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, I am including the Prince Edward Island Railway. Then if I take this $41,000 which was against the railway in the item of interest and deduct it from the $1,353,946.53, the net deficit on the canals, I find that it makes $1,312,927. If we were to stop at that point there would be an expenditure in one year, including interest and management of $1,312,927 in favour of the government railways, but that would hardly be fair. During that same year there was a deficit on the government railways of $79,244.69 and, deducting that, if we compare the expenditure on the canals with the expenditure on the Government Railway system we would find that the canals of Canada cost us $1,233,-

683 in excess of what the Governement Railway cost. That is, in a way, a sectional view and I do not want to confine myself to it. I take the position that the Intercolonial Railway is for the benefit of all Canada and that the canals are for the benefit of all Canada. That is the way I wish to regard these two propositions but I went to the trouble to figure out the position as to the cost in one year of the capital expenditure on canals and on the Government Railways to show the people of Canada who do not live along the Intercolonial Railway the point of view from which these two propositions are looked at by people in the maritime provinces and in a portion of the province of Quebec. The people of the maritime provinces contend, and rightly so, that this comparison was made at the time that they entered into confederation.

Now, I come to another point which is of as great interest but not as encouraging. I have been speaking all along with regard to the revenue of the Intercolonial Railway for 1907-8. The figures for the year that will end on March 31, inst., are not in the report but I want to refer to them very briefly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the hon. gentleman leaves that point may I just ask one question because I was waiting for something further to come, that I have not quite gathered yet? Why is it that the statistics are so good and the results so bad?

Mr. GRAHAM. The satistics are so good and so true and the results so bad because the fares are so much lower than on any other railway in Canada that we do not get the income.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is simply a question of tariff.

Mr. GRAHAM. Largely a question of tariff and of conditions. In some correspondence that I saw in the newspapers a writer said: Of course, the Intercolonial rate is lower but it is only about one-fifth of a cent per mile per ton lower. He did not know, or did not seem to grasp the idea, that that small amount per ton per mile meant $2,000,000 annually to the Intercolonial Railway. If you were to increase the rates by one-fifth of a cent per ton per mile on the freightage of the Intercolonial Railway you would have, instead of a deficit this present year, a large and comfortable surplus. While there may be deficiencies and lacks in the management of the government railways, as you will find them on all railways, the real reason why the Intercolonial Railway has not been able to keep even is because it gives to the people of the country lower rates than any other railway on the continent of America. Now, talking of the deficit, it will be within the knowledge of every member of the House who has studied this question at all during the past few months that any falling off in the trade of the country affects railway business more quickly and more decidedly than perhaps any other. All the traffic of the countrv, all the produce of the country, all the goods coming in, all the goods going out, all the product of the factory, all the product of the farm, all the product of the mine, all the product of the fisheries and all the product of the forest must be carried by some railway or by some other means of transportation. Once the business of the country is relaxed the railway and transportation companies are the ones to feel the result most keenly. Every railway on the continent has suffered greatly during the past two years. A year ago, I made a statement in this House. There was, at the end of January, quite a snug surplus on the Intercolonial Railway, but the traffic fell off so rapidly that by the 31st March it had been reduced to the small amount of $16,000.

That traffic has fallen off remarkably month by month and has been getting worse instead of better during the past year. Of course, the traffic has fallen off on other railroads as well but they have been able to keep their expenditure more nearly within their receipts by dismissing a large number of men which the Intercolonial has not done. The expenses of the Intercolonial during the past year owing to increase in wages and cost of material are larger than they were a year ago notwithstanding that the traffic is less. How is it that during the past week or two we have seen that the Canadian Pacific Railway is making a record showing? Sir, the Canadian Pacific Railway is a through line and its record week has been attained on account of the grain trade moving from the west. The Intercolonial has no grain moving trade from the west and I am afraid it never will until it is hooked up with some transcontinental line and is used as an outlet for some railroad system running from one end of Canada to the other. I am inclined to think that the trade of the Intercolonial Railway will not pick up until the traffic coming from imports received in exchange for the crop of this year begins to arrive when part of it will find its way over the Intercolonial Railway from the east to the west.

The statement for the Intercolonial Railway up to December 31, 1908, is as follows:

Passengers	$169,878 97	decrease.
Freight	567,151 39	"
Miscellaneous	199,564 83	increase.
Net decrease in earnings.	537,465 53	
Net deficit..	436,854 24	

Mr. J. HAGGART. What is the expenditure on capital account?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am merely giving a summary to the House of the results of operating the Intercolonial Railway for the past year; I have not the statement as to capital with me.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The minister is furnished with a statement from Moncton every month of the expenditure on capital account as well as on revenue and he ought to be able to tell us.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will give that in Committee of Supply. I am merely giving the net result on the railway for nine months.

Mr. FOSTER. You cannot give the net result unless we have the capital expenditure as well as the revenue.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am giving what I purport to give; I am giving the net results of the receipts and expenditures of the railway.

Mr. FOSTER. If a comparison is to be made the minister should give the expenditure on capital account up to the 31st of December. Surely that is germane to the question.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not in any degree germane to the question I am now dealing with; it will be germane when we are in committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister now refuse to give the information?

Mr. GRAHAM. I don't refuse to give anything of the kind; I simply say I have not the figures.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we have not the whole deficit.

Mr. GRAHAM. What I am doing now has nothing to do with deficits. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has been so accustomed to deficits all his life that he has deficits on the brain.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no necessity for the minister showing his temper. Was it not a fair question that my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) should ask what is the capital expenditure?

Mr. GRAHAM. Perfectly fair.

Mr. FOSTER. Then why did not the minister give it; or if he cannot he need not get cross.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was not cross with the hon. member (Mr. Haggart) because he asked a fair question and I gave him a fair reply and he was satisfied.

Mr. FOSTER. Was my question unfair?

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) did not accuse me of refusing to give information. I am not accustomed to refusing the House any information I can possibly obtain and I do not think it is fair to make such insinuation. Just now I am merely giving the receipts and expenditure for the nine months which have not yet been published, and the capital expenditure has nothing to do with the question I am now discussing. When we are in committee the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) can criticise me all he likes, but he has no right to insinuate that I am endeavouring to refuse information. If he were addressing the House and I should make such an accusation against him he would think I was very rude.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend allow a remark?

Mr. GRAHAM. Decidedly.

Mr. FOSTER. When the Minister of Finance is making his budget speech he gives his statement of revenue and expenditure and he immediately supplements that by stating the capital expenditure. If that were not done we would have no knowledge of the real financial state of the country. I suggested we can have no knowledge of the true position of the Intercolonial unless we have a statement of the capital expenditure and when I ask for that my hon. friend flies off at a tangent.

Mr. GRAHAM. Your hon. friend did not fly off at all; my hon. friend is wrong about that. I am only purporting to give the House the receipts and expenditure of the Intercolonial, and not the capital expenditure, and my case is entirely different from that of the Minister of Finance making a budget speech. I don't like to have the insinuation made that I am refusing to give information, because I think the House will admit that, such is not my habit.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, will the minister give the information?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will get the information for my hon. friend and it can be discussed in committee which is the proper place to discuss it. Now that we understand each other may I be permitted to proceed?

There are certain difficulties in connection with a government-owned railway and I am not going to minimize these difficulties. To those hon. gentlemen who are new to this House and who have not had their minds in any way biased by the discussions on the Intercolonial Railway from a political standpoint, I want to appeal, on one or two business points.

One point is that the method adopted by the House and by parliament—and I am not complaining of that method—in compelling the Intercolonial to publish and send broadcast throughout the country every detailed item of its expenditure, is unfair to the railway. There is not another railway on

the continent of America whose expenditures are so exposed. I have had occasion to get reports from other railways, and I point out that the Intercolonial Railway is handicapped in its buying of materials and supplies by the fact that every dealer in Canada and possibly on the continent is in a position to know just what we bought last year, and what we paid for it. The members of the House ought to have that information in the fullest degree so as to be able to criticise the buying and the expenditures of the government, but I submit that it is a handicap to the government-owned railway that every dealer in every kind of supplies to be sold to that railway has to-day in his hands the number of pounds or yards or tons bought last year, from whom bought, and the amount we paid for them. It is regrettable, but it is true that people in trade have certain understandings all over Canada. John Jones knows to-day what William Smith got for everything he sold to the Intercolonial Railway. He knows what the Intercolonial Railway bought and paid last year. Having that information the two dealers get their heads together, and if the price last year was too low then no matter how many tenders we may advertise for, we cannot get a price lower than they had agreed among themselves to charge. The Grand Trunk can go to a company or a dealer and say: We want all these goods. Then the dealer need not observe the agreement with other dealers so particularly as he would where the details are placed on record and published broadcast. No dealer will sell to the government for less than he has agreed with other dealers to charge for such goods because he knows that the price he gets will come to the eyes of the other dealer the minute the Auditor General's Report is published. That handicap does not exist on any other railway and no other railway would tolerate it.

Here is another handicap with reference to which I appeal to business men. The Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway will go to a large dealer who perhaps during the year has a large amount of freight to carry. The officials of that railway will say to him: We want so many goods of a certain kind, what will you let us have them at? The dealer has to give them at a right price. No tenders are asked for but the goods are bought at a right figure and they are bought with the consideration that this particular concern will give that railway the carriage of their freight. Under the tender system we have to ask for prices publicly and we have to buy from the lowest tenderer. The result is that we often buy large quantites of goods from men who never give us a pound of freight, and as the result of buying from these men, we lose the freight of their competitors, who perhaps tendered at a higher price but who have a large amount of freight on the line. The tender system is all right in theory but in running an institution like a railway you are handicapped, as I said, by the publication of the details of every purchase, and by having to purchase from the lowest tenderer, no matter how much freight the railway may lose from some other competitor who would have given the goods at a fair price.

I now come to another question with which my hon. friend dealt the other night. This situation stares us in the face—and I want to approach it without wincing or shrinking. I may be right or I may be wrong, but I give my opinion for what it is worth. As I said, the Grand Trunk Pacific will soon have its line through the maritime provinces. The Canadian Pacific Railway now has its line there. Unless some arrangement is made by which the Intercolonial Railway will become the outlet for some transcontinental line, the Intercolonial Railway will only be a local road for all time to come, and there is not enough local traffic to keep it going on a paying basis. That is my opinion. Conditions have changed, years have come and gone; there was a time when the Intercolonial Railway had all the trade of the maritime provinces, anything that came to Montreal, Quebec or Levis, had to get into the maritime provinces over the Intercolonial Railway, and we had a portion of all this trade whether it was through trade or maritime provinces' trade. Now, we have the Canadian Pacific Railway, we will soon have the Grand Trunk Pacific, and these being fed by their own two lines and having to feed their own two lines, will not give us any traffic that they can possibly help. That means that they will give us no through traffic at all. I believe that if the Intercolonial Railway is to be made the road it should be, if we are to maintain it as a proposition in the interests of the people and to make it pay its way it will have to be hooked up with a through line from the west, which will feed it with east bound traffic and which it can feed with west bound traffic.

That brings me to the point of branch lines, a question of deep interest to the people of Canada in every part. I repeat that my opinions may be right or wrong, I think they are right. In order that there may be no mistakes as to my position on this point, and that I may not say something that really does not express the full view I hold, I trust the House will bear with me if I read a few lines which I have jotted down.

The question of branch lines is one that must shortly be faced, as it does not need

an authority on transportation and railway traffic to understand that there can be no prosperous main line unless it is fed by branches stretching out into adjacent territory.

The Canadian Pacific Railway is now in the east, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is going there, and if the Intercolonial Railway is to maintain its fair share of trade it will have to see that it gets some of the feeders.

There is no use shrinking from the situation. Either the government must ere long be prepared to acquire some of its feeders and build new ones or it must hand over the management of the Intercolonial to some company that will do so. It will not be fair either to the railway or the section of the country served by it in face of the changed condition, to very much longer continue to occupy the present position.

Companies recognize the necessity of branch lines, and that is why in the west there is almost, at the present time, a struggle to cover the territory with branch lines. If the Grand Trunk Pacific is to be the success it is hoped, it will have to see that it has a sufficient number of feeders to keep its trunk line busy.

I think I am safe in saying that if a company owned the Intercolonial it would immediately proceed to pick out some of the best branch lines and absorb them, as well as build others, and it is possibly not going too far to say that if we were prepared to lease the Intercolonial Railway to a company, any company desiring to get such a lease, as a condition of it, would agree to take over such branches and build others. This is my view of the situation, and while present conditions do not warrant the government in launching out on the acquisition of existing branch lines, and the construction of new ones, the time cannot be far distant when the government will be forced to take one of two positions: either to adopt the policy of expansion itself or in the interests of the road and the country it serves lease the railway to some company that will adopt these business-like measures.

I have dealt at some length with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway problem. I may have expressed views that do not coincide with those of members of the House. The views I have expressed are mine, I am prepared to defend them and I think they are founded on common sense.

What are we going to do with the road? A good deal of discussion has taken place as to what we are going to do in regard to its management. Let me say that among the officials of the Intercolonial Railway are many first-class railway men, men who are giving the country good service. It has struck me that possibly the Intercolonial Railway, having been a government-owned road so many years, having had to combat some of the conditions to which I have referred, may have possibly got into a rut, and that we might get it out of that rut by making some changes. I do not mean by changes the dismissal of officers, but what I have in my mind is this, and I shall state it frankly, and it will be an experiment if carried out. There is no use disguising the fact that such will be the situation, if the plan I have in mind be put into effect. It will be an experiment, but one I think well worth trying, and which should bring good results. My proposition is this: Not to establish a commission. I have studied that a good deal; and if I do not favour that solution, it is not at all because my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) advocates it. I have gone into the question of the management of the Australian railways, and I came to the conclusion that, as a minister of the Crown, with a railway under government supervision and management, two conditions confronted me. In the first place, I was not prepared, as minister of the Crown, to admit that the Crown itself, through proper means, could not manage a government railway. In the second place, I did not think the country would be prepared to say that the government ought to divest itself of the responsibility which the people had entrusted to its hands. Having that view, I made up my mind to make this proposition and give it a fair trial. That proposition is to establish a board, not responsible to parliament—that is, not directly responsible—but responsible to the government of the day, whatever government that may be—responsible to the government through a minister of the Crown, because after all we may say about commissions, this fact remains that the people will hold whatever government is in power responsible for the management of the Intercolonial Railway so long as it is owned by the government. There is no use in our trying to get away from the inevitable. Any government must retain the responsibility, and any minister of railways must accept full responsibility. On that board I propose to retain two of the officials, now on the Intercolonial Railway, in very high places. I propose also to allow Mr. Butler, the Deputy Minister of Railways, to act on that board, and I would call it, not a commission, not an advisory board, but a board of management. I propose as well to appoint on that board a man, whom I have not selected, from one or the other of the great railways—not an over expensive man, but a man with a good practical, level head, who would bring with him the knowledge and experience he had acquired on one of the great lines and add these to the knowledge and experience possessed by the officials on our line of railway. This board would have the management of the road, and be responsible, as a general

manager would be, to the government. My idea was that this board would have to meet my deputy at least every thirty days and give a full and complete report and information of everything done on the line, so that the minister would know at all times what was going on and what was being done. Would this relieve the minister of the responsibility? Not of one iota. The minister must retain all responsibility, but it would relieve him and his deputy of a multitude of details which now come here and which ought never to get beyond the head office at Moncton. We have to-day details coming to the department at Ottawa, which never go to the president of a railway company, which never get by the general manager, and three-fourths of which never get to the general manager. But a condition has grown up on the government owned railway for which nobody is to blame; and little details, instead of being settled on the spot by men detailed and paid for that purpose, keep filtering through by some means to the head office and to the Minister of Railways, until our department is at present flooded by these matters which ought never to reach it. This board would be given power to settle these minor affairs without reference to the department at all. This would be a good thing for the railway, it would be a good thing for the men, and a great relief to the department.

I have kept the House too long. I have expressed my views fully, and I know that they will receive that consideration which this House is always ready to give a statement of this kind. There are many sides to this question which I might discuss and discuss at some length, but the question of transportation is so broad that it is impossible to enter, as far as one would like, into a discussion of its many phases. I assure the House that anything done, will be done with the interests of the Intercolonial Railway at heart, and above all with the object of giving the people, whom this railway was built to serve, the best service at a minimum cost.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). My hon. friend the Minister of Railways, in his opening remarks, dealt with the general question of transportation which is always a very interesting one. He spoke of the immense resources of this country, how they were being developed, and of the public anxiety for better transportation facilities than we have at present. He spoke to us at some length about the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway and the present railway in embryo the Grand Trunk Pacific. He referred also to our different canal enterprises or water transportation. Regarding the later I have particular views which I may as well take this opportunity of stating. Two or three years ago I explained to the House that the solution of the problem of cheap transportation was a better water communication for the west. In that connection I instanced the different countries which had adopted that system—Germany, France, Austria, Belgium and latterly the United States. I drew attention to the speech of ex-president Roosevelt in favour of water communications and its necessity in the United States, and also to the speech of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy in the same direction. Nature has given us on the continent of North America a proper line of communication for transportation purposes from the centre of the continent to the Atlantic ocean, if we will only avail ourselves of it. If we take advantage of what nature has given us, we will not only control the transportation of the products of the great republic but also of a greater fertile area than is to be found in any other part of the globe, namely, the area which is contiguous to the St. Lawrence river and the great lakes down to lake Michigan and Superior. There you have an immense section of fertile country which produces men of the Anglo Saxon race ; and if the people who inhabit that country would avail themselves of the means of transportation afforded by nature, they would control the destinies of this great continent. I have said before that water communication in no way interferes with communication by rail. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy said that this doctrine had been laid down so clearly by President Roosevelt that it was useless for him to dwell on it. According to that doctrine, in order to carry the heavy freight, it is necessary to have a cheap system, and that is to be found in water transportation.

I have shown that, with an expenditure of $100,000,000, we could have water communication, practically sea communication, from the Atlantic to the upper lakes, giving us control of the water transportation of this part of the continent. The deputy Minister of Railways and Canals has proposed another thing : Seeing the advantage of water transport, and being aware of the interest that is taken in this matter throughout the west, he proposes the deepening of the Welland canal. Let me show in a word the fallacy of that. We have expended on Port Colborne already in the neighbourhood of between $3,000,000 and $4,000,000 in order to provide facilities so that vessels from the upper lakes may tranship to smaller vessels for transport eastward. The effect of deepening the Welland canal would be simply to move this point of transhipment from Colborne to Kingston. The expense of carrying the system further would be prohibitory. Does the minister or does his deputy know what it would cost to deepen the St. Lawrence so

as to make a channel of full depth to Montreal? The evidence on that subject was given before the Transportation Commission. The testimony of the best engineer then living in reference to these subjects, Mr. Wisner—I am sorry to say he has since departed this life—was to the effect that the cost of making a channel deep enough for ocean-going vessels from Kingston to Montreal would be in the neighbourhood of $200,000,000, or double the cost of building the Georgian Bay canal, a route which would be about 450 miles shorter than the other. However, that is incidental to the general question of transportation. I would not have dealt with it had not the minister introduced the subject in his opening remarks.

The hon. gentleman next dealt with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. He has built a branch road from Levis to Moncton that will be finished next year. Now, how is he going to utilize it? Is it to be worked by the Grand Trunk Pacific? It has no connection with the main line. Is it to be run by the government in opposition to the Intercolonial? The minister (Mr. Graham) hinted that he was considering a proposition of ferry boats at Levis pending the erection of the bridge. He tells us that the plans for the bridge will not be finished for a year or a year and a half. At that rate, the bridge cannot be completed in less than six or seven years. Are we to depend upon a ferry to connect the Levis-Moncton road with the rest of the system? I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) must now see the folly of constructing a road which will be quite useless as part of the transcontinental system for seven or eight years to come. But, so far as the bridge is concerned, we have in this an instance of the government's paternal care for certain corporations. A corporation was formed to build this bridge. It induced the government to subsidize the work. A catastrophe happened to the bridge—it fell down. One would have supposed that the parties particularly interested in the loss of the bridge would be those who had stock in the corporation that was chartered to construct the work. But these gentlemen did not suffer a single cent; the government took over the whole of their stock at its face value with interest. Now, we come to the construction of the road. We had a statement from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding)—not the celebrated statement backing up that of his leader that the road would only cost the country about $13,000,000—but a statement made in his saner moments to the effect that the road would cost in the neighbourhood of $38,000 per mile. The government now come down with the statement, that after revision of the plans of construction, they find it will cost $63,000 per mile. We have entrusted the construction of that road to a commission, supposed to be composed of gentlemen who were capable of taking charge of this construction, looking after the estimates, specifications and everything else necessary to the direction of the work. But we find now that contracts entered into are re-interpreted by the lawyers and that the Department of the Minister of Justice has given an interpretation to the specifications and schedules which has the effect of altering the classification under these contracts—which contracts, be it remembered, were approved, made on the authority of the engineer in chief, presumably after consultation with the commissioners. The effect of this interpretation is to increase the cost of construction from $38,000 to $63,000 per mile. Why, then, does the engineer in chief, whose opinion as to the classification has thus been over-ruled, still retain his position? Why do the commissioners, who have let these contracts, still remain in charge of the work of construction? But there is worse than that; even after they knew the opinion of the Minister of Justice, they continued to let the rest of the contracts with the same specifications and the same quantities as in the other. What will be the effect in the cost of the road to the country?

You would be astonished if I told you it will cost the country nearly $300,000,000. Let me give the figures as nearly as possible. From Moncton to Winnipeg the distance is 1,803 miles. According to Mr. Lumsden, the engineer in charge of the works, the cost of that section will be $63,427 per mile, or a sum equal to $114,393,765. Now what interest will we have to pay during its construction, which will take seven years? For three years and a half the interest at three per cent will be about $10,000,000. Then we have to pay interest for seven years after construction, which will amount to $14,422,000. The Moncton, Winnipeg, Quebec and other terminals, according to a statement brought down by the Minister of Railways, will cost $5,600,000. We have no information what is likely to be the cost of the mountain section of 800 odd miles. I estimate it, and I think very moderately, at $70,000 to $80,000 per mile. We guarantee 75 per cent of that, or three-fourths of the whole amount is guaranteed by us. The interest which we will have to pay on that alone will be without doubt $7,500,000. The loan is $10,000,000. The amount we guarantee for bonds on the mountain section will be nearly $50,000,000, and on the prairie section, $11,908,000. On the Quebec bridge we have already lost about $7,000,000, and I estimate the probable cost of reconstruction and of terminal facilities at Quebec at $15,000,000. Now the Minister of Railways brought down a return from Mr. Schreiber which ought to give us

the most accurate information in reference to the prairie section, and we have a right to rely upon it in considering the $10,000,000 which we are asked to advance to the company. So far as I can make out from the figures returned by Mr. Schreiber, he estimates that the mountain section commences 916 miles west of Winnipeg, and that it extends 800 odd miles to the coast. Now the cost of the prairie section of the road, if you can take the information which is furnished by Mr. Schreiber, is in the neighbourhood of $30,000 a mile. Add the $10,000,000 which we are giving for the purpose of finishing the road up to the end of the 960 miles, and the cost will be in the neighbourhood of $35,000 per mile at least. So here is a road which the engineers of the government, and which the government themselves, told parliament when they entered into the contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific, would cost the country $16,000 per mile, and we now find that it is going to cost $35,000 per mile. I will not deal here with the advisability of advancing the $10,000,000, as there is a resolution on the Order Paper which will call for a full discusion of that question, and all the details regarding it. The mountain section is the only part of the road where we have accurate information as to the probable cost. I regret that the government have not yet brought down the return moved for by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), in which a comparison is made between the quantities estimated by the engineers on which the contracts were let, and the estimates allowed to the contractors on a good many sections already let. It would be interesting to see how they compare. I have seen information in regard to the quantities which shows that the portions of the road which have been contracted for are going to cost double the amount which was originally estimated, owing to the fact that the government engineer had not been left to follow his own judgment, the resident engineers have not been left to follow their own judgment, in the matter of classifying the work. Now this is a serious matter. Now why do you retain in office men who make an estimate, who prepare your classifications, who draw your contracts, and yet who make such a bungle in the classifications? They ought to be at least qualified to draw up contracts and see that the classifications are right. Why is there such bungling in the administration of the commission? On some of the contracts the work is going to cost double. The engineer himself has increased the estimate from $48,000 to $63,000. The quantities should have been accurate, the information should be correct, and according to the information which I have in reference to that matter, I should judge that the cost of that road will be largely in excess of what is estimated by the engineer, even at the present moment.

What is our position? We have liabilities of nearly $300,000,000 in connection with this road. You may laugh, and say the amount will not be nearly that. I say it will come up to nearly $300,000,000. The liabilities of the people of Canada with regard to that road are enough to stagger any man who looks the matter squarely in the face. What likelihood, or what security, is there that the Grand Trunk will ever work that road from Winnipeg down to Moncton? The promise of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway company is equal to their ability of performance. Can they do it? Look how their loan was floated the other day. See how their securities have been received upon the market. They cannot raise money for the purpose of building or extending the road. They were obliged to come to the government of the country for assistance to the extent of $10,000,000. What security have we that the Grand Trunk Pacific will go on and operate the road? It depends entirely on whether that road is a going concern able to earn the revenue necessary to keep running and pay a certain amount of interest. What security have we? No security at all. The security of the second bondholders ranks before that of the last advance of $10,000,000 which we are making to the company.

Now, let us come to the Intercolonial Railway. We have dealt with that question again and again in this House. There is always some excuse given from time to time why this road does not pay. I remember that at the time when I was Minister of Railways and Canals different corporations approached the government with the view of leasing the road. The minister complains that the rates are so low that they cannot possibly pay. The parties who were willing to lease that road undertook to guarantee the same rates which were then in force on the Intercolonial, not as high as those at present, because Mr. Blair, when he was Minister of Railways raised the rates beyond what they were in my time. There were corporations at that time willing to take over the road, maintain the rates then in existence and pay a handsome sum per annum to the government of the country. What is the financial position of the road? Let me take this statement as it is set down by the Minister of Railways and Canals himself in his own report: The expenditure on construction account on the Intercolonial Railway up to the 1st December last was $77,673,000. The deficit between revenue and working expenses on the Intercolonial Railway since it started has increased to $8,250,000. Add $8,250,000 to the $77,673,000 and you have nearly $86,000,000. To this is to be added the Cape Breton Railway, the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, the Eastern Extension Railway, and other railways amounting to $9,750,727; or, on construction account, $87,127,000. Then,

add the amount of cash which was paid out of the consolidated fund of the country for the purpose of making up the difference between the revenue and working expenses of $8,250,000 and you have $95,000,000. Ninety-five million dollars added to the amount which the minister says the railway at the present time is behind and the possibilities of another capital expenditure will leave ,independently of the Prince Edward Island altogether, an amount of $100,000,000 expended on the Intercolonial Railway since it was undertaken by the people of this country. We have heard statements as to the beautiful prospects of the future —equip the road, give us large locomotives, increase the strength of the bridges, put heavier ties upon the road, let us use modern methods in operating the road and we will show you results; then the Intercolonial Railway will come out of the woods, it will no longer be a back number, it will no longer do business on the back street, if it is improved the result will redound to the benefit of Canada! Every year the promise has been made that the result will be better next year but still we find this state of affairs on the Intercolonial. Times are bad, they say, upon the railways in the different sections of the country at the present time. Two or three years ago they were not bad. Every railway on the continent of America was prosperous and paying dividends except the Intercolonial, under the management of the hon. gentleman who sits opposite me here, and it is getting worse and worse. What is the result at the present time?—the result that was dreaded by the people of the maritime provinces, the result that was foretold by the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that they would be obliged to part with the road, that no longer would the people of the country submit to the enormous expenditure above receipts for the purpose of continuing its operation. But the minister says: Oh, I would make things all right if they would allow me to fix the tariff on the road. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), made the statement that the tariff for local purposes was one quarter lower than upon other roads. Notwithstanding that statement, the people of the maritime provinces pay, for everything except a few articles which I shall mention, as high rates for the carriage of their goods as are paid by people in any other part of the country. The minister made some comparisons with reference to haulage per ton per mile in connection with which he presented some of the most alarming figures that I have ever heard. I understand the question of haulage per ton per mile. Where you haul for 25 miles your rate per ton per mile is larger than where you are hauling for fifty miles, and the same thing applies to where you are hauling for a hundred miles. Where you have a full carload it is less per ton per mile comparatively than where you have part of a carload only. The only thing that the minister's figures prove is that he is using too much haulage power, that he is running trains without carrying freight upon them or without carrying passengers; in short, that he is running trains in excess of the requirements of the traffic. He sends out a train with half the load that it ought to carry and then he makes a comparison with other roads.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. To keep the men employed.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Too many men. When I came into the management of the Intercolonial Railway I found a state of affairs something like that which at present exists on the road. The idea of making comparisons as to the number of men per mile employed on that road with another road without comparing the amount of business done is the most absurd thing I ever heard of. What is the use of saying that the Intercolonial has only the same number of men as a certain other road if you do not tell us the amount of business that is done by each road? The Intercolonial Railway only earns altogether a little over $9,000,000 per year. Another road, with the same mileage and performing the same service, may be earning four times that amount, or $36,000,000 per year. What is the use of making a comparison as to the number of men employed on the road? What I was going to say was this. When I took charge of the Intercolonial I found a state of affairs existing similar to that which exists to-day, and that a number of people were employed in connection with the road more for political purposes than for anything else. They got so that the officials of the road dare not discharge them or interfere with them, and the power was not with the heads of the road, but with a political agent as is the case now. I found that at Moncton there were 1,200 men more than were requisite for running the shops, and they were dismissed.

Mr. EMMERSON. By you?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, by me; nearly 1,200 men.

Mr. EMMERSON. In what year?

Mr. HAGGART. About 1894, if I remember rightly.

Mr. EMMERSON. 1,200 dismissed?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, there were over 1,200 dismissed from the road. I had to endure all kinds of trials in connection with it. The Minister of Justice of the day, I remember, if he only knew who recommended the dismissal of these people he would decapitate them. But, there is no doubt you have to exercise a firm hand. Every railway man laughs at the excess of

men employed by the Intercolonial. Look at the grand description of the shops of which the people of the country are asked to be proud, greater shops than the Canadian Pacific Railway have, and built for the accommodation of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Mind you, eight or nine years before that road reaches its destination. I venture to say that the locomotives required for the Intercolonial can be purchased for less than they can be manufactured for in these shops. Now, a few words in reference to the capital account.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock

PRIVATE BILLS—ROYAL CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY OF CANADA.

Mr. LENNOX. I would suggest the advisability of leaving this Bill and the next one, to incorporate the Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Company, in the committee until we have before us the other Bill of which I spoke the other day, owing to the danger of confusion in names.

Mr. FIELDING. I understand the Bill referred to has not yet been introduced. Besides I think there may be shades of difference and an argument that might apply in reference to one might not apply in reference to another. If there is any objection to the names perhaps the better course would be to refer the Bills back to the committee for further consideration. There seems to be no question but the title and I have no views on the matter myself.

Mr. LENNOX. I would not want to do that, because there is no special difficulty with regard to these two. I think if we had the Royal Life Insurance Company and the Royal Insurance Company these two would infringe on the rule. When we come to consider these two I would not like to be hampered by the fact that we had passed these two Bills.

Mr. PERLEY. As I understand the feeling in the Committee on Banking and Commerce is that no company shall have the exclusive right to any particular name providing the difference is such that an ordinary person can understand it. As to the suggestion to change the name of Royal Victoria Life Company to the Royal Life, there is now a Royal Insurance Company doing a fire and life business. That would not appear to me to be a reasonable change. There is as much difference between the names of the companies now under consideration as there has been between names of similar character which have come up from time to time in the committee. If the the committee is to pursue any different policy, and the House directs them to do so, we will be glad to follow instructions.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I objected to the name last night because I had a communication from one of the agents of the Royal Insurance Company objecting to the use of the name 'Royal.' He said representations had been made to him by the general agent of the Royal in Montreal. I wrote last night to the general agents in Montreal. Apparently they were not aware of the fact that they could appear before the committee of this House and object to the Bill. I think the minister's suggestions to refer the Bill back is an excellent one. I shall write the general agents of the Royal Fire Insurance Company in Montreal and if they wish to come before the committee and make objection they should be heard. Many Bills affecting outside companies come before the committee and the parties vitally interested are not notified. Many foreign fire companies carrying on fire business here are not allowed to carry on casualty business and so they procure a charter for casualty business in Canada and call it, for instance, the Royal Casualty Company of Canada; but it is generally understood among people doing casualty business that in the case of a Canadian company with a name similar to that of an old country company the risks are underwritten by the old country company. If a company with the name 'The Royal Casualty Company of Canada,' was permitted to carry on business here, every one having a casualty risk would immediately arrive at the conclusion that the Royal Insurance Company of England was behind that company and therefore we should know definitely if the Royal Company is promoting any of these Bills. If it is we should give them a charter and let them carry on business, but if it is some one else seeking a charter with the name of the Royal I think it would be very wrong to give them the use of the name. If the Bill is referred back and the parties do not appear before the committee, they have themselves to blame if we give the name to some one else.

Mr. MILLER. This matter was threshed out in the committee. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley). There is undoubtedly a great difference in the names of these two companies. As the hon. member (Mr. Perley) has said, we should be careful when a company comes before the Banking and Commerce Committee seeking to change its name from the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company to the Royal, so that if we granted the charter we would have the Royal Insurance Company doing a fire and life business and the Royal Life Insurance Company doing a life business. I would object to that as misleading the

people, but there is a great difference between the name of the Royal Casualty and Surety Company of Canada and that of the Royal Canadian Accident Company. So far as the Royal Insurance Company of Liverpool is concerned, Mr McCarthy appeared in its behalf before the Banking and Commerce Committee when these two Bills were considered and made his objections. The committee fully considered the whole matter and decided that as the Royal Insurance Company of Liverpool is not doing an accident business and cannot possibly be permitted to do it, there was no reason why these two Bills should not pass. It would be unwise therefore to refer them back to that committee and cause unnecessary delay. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has mentioned the Bill of the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company, which will probably come before us, and says he would have the strongest objection to the word 'Victoria,' being struck out. I quite agree with him, but it is not necessary, in order to avoid that, that we should hold up these two Bills.

Mr. FIELDING. I would rather gather that there are some parties who wish to be heard before the committee. The hon. member for Simcoe seemed to be under the impression that the Royal Insurance Company of Liverpool had no opportunity of being heard. That is a mistake. The agent in Montreal called on me, and he was told that the matter was coming up before the committee. A legal gentleman appeared there on behalf of the company. Of course if any one had not been heard, who has a particular interest in the matter, I would be glad to have him appear before the committee, but unless somebody has something further to present, I cannot see anything to be gained by sending the Bill back.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. We are all aware of the fact that these casualty companies have been going to the wall pretty rapidly the last two or three years and there have been some pretty bad failures. We ought to be very careful therefore in giving names which might lead to people being misled. Of course if Mr. McKay, the agent of the Royal Insurance Company of Liverpool, was present——

Mr. FIELDING. He was not present but was represented.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. That cuts away the ground of my objection. If that be the case, there is no use in objecting any further to the name. Still I think that the Minister of Finance should consider very carefully whether a casualty company should be permitted to take the name of a large company such as the Royal Insurance Company, especially in view of the fact that the large English companies have been building up subsidiary companies in this country, carrying their own names, to engage in the business of casualty insurance, and everybody knows that when an English company underwrites another, there is no possible risk on the part of the insured. The presumption would be that this company we are now chartering would be underwritten by the Royal Insurance Company of Liverpool.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not.

Mr. J. A. CURRIIE. As a matter of precaution it would be better not to give it a name so closely similar.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. member has said that a number of casualty companies have recently failed in Canada and that some of them have been bad failures. That is news to me; and for my own satisfaction and the credit of Canadian companies, I would like him to inform us what failures there have been recently among Canadian casualty companies?

Mr. MONK. I understand that the position taken by the Royal Insurance Company of Liverpool is this. It is authorized to go into the casualty business but does not do so, and therefore has no special objection to the incorporation of this company under the name 'Royal,' although that name comes pretty close to its own. But what it objects to is that a company doing a life insurance business should take the name, as for instance, the Royal Victoria Insurance Company.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE— THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Company—Mr. Ames.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 93) respecting patents of Ammonal Explosives, 1908, Limited—Mr. Macdonell.

SUPPLY—THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

House resumed debate on the motion for Supply.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was about to deal with the manner in which the books of the Intercolonial Railway are kept. I have argued again and again in this House in favour of the closing of the capital account of that railway. What I meant by that I fully explained, and I thought the House could have no misunderstanding of my meaning. Last session, in a debate in this House on the subject, Mr. Logan, the then member for

Cumberland, took the same view as the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), that I meant that there was to be no expenditure on capital account. An item might be necessarily an expenditure on capital account; but my contention was that a road that has been finished and in operation by the government for twenty-five or thirty years has no reason for a capital account. The reason is that it would induce the minister to be lax in his administration, in reference to expenditures, the purchase of land for stations, and various additions to the railway, which, if he had no capital account, he would be chary about incurring. If there were no capital account the Finance Minister would not allow him the funds for an expenditure if it were to appear in the Public Accounts as ordinary expenditure, as he would want to make a good showing. The Minister of Railways cannot resist the importunities of his friends and he has no objection to making an expenditure if he can have it charged to capital account, and it does not appear in the current expenditure. The man who first made the suggestion in this House, supported by the whole of his party, was the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. He drew the attention of the House to the iniquities that might be perpetrated with an open capital account, to which the minister could charge a great many expenditures, while the Finance Minister would not care two-pence about them so long as they did not appear in ordinary expenditure. With those sentiments I entirely agree. If we have to have an Intercolonial Railway controlled by the government, the only possible way to make a fair comparison with the past is to close the capital account altogether. I think I have made myself perfectly plain to the hon. member for Guysborough. I mean to say that an amount which might be fairly charged to capital account on other railroads, in a worse condition as to locomotives and other things, could not be fairly charged to capital account on a road like this. We should have no open account, the whole charges should be against revenue and expenditure. When I was controlling the Intercolonial I endeavoured to do so. In a couple of instances, I must admit, I went astray. There was a large expenditure for additions to the freight and passenger establishments at St. John, and that was entered in the books to capital expenditure. I discouraged as much as possible any charge of that kind. I told the officials of the road that although improvements, additions to locomotives, new stations, new rails and so forth, might be charged to capital account on other roads, it was a vicious system on a government road.

Now we find that the expenditure has increased from 1896 up to the present day from $50,000,000 up to over $100,000,000 on capital account. The minister stated that the capital account on the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island road amounted to $94,000,000. It is over $97,000,000 on the Intercolonial alone. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) who sits opposite smiling at me, perhaps does not credit it. For his benefit I will give the figures, and if he can show where I am wrong in any particular, I will be glad to hear from him. For construction account on the Intercolonial there is $77,673,576 to the end of the current year. The difference between working expenses including the Windsor branch, and the revenue received including the Windsor branch, is as the difference between $122,000,000 and $130,000,000, or $8,000,000. To this is to be added the expenditure on the Cape Breton Railway, the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, the Eastern Extension Railway, the Montreal, European and Short Line Railway, the Drummond County Railway and the Canada Eastern Railway, making on the whole $9,750,727, or an amount equal to about $95,000,000 plus the amount we owe during the current year. That will bring it up as nearly as possible to $100,000,000, and that is not taking the Prince Edward Island Railway into account. But that is a small amount to the people of this country, we are perfectly indifferent about it. The people would rather have this enormous expenditure on the Intercolonial than to be without it. What does it amount to? Two postage stamps per year for each man in the country. Two postage stamps was the argument I heard, perhaps outside this House, and I am not permitted to refer to debates in the House. Let the people of the Dominion support the burden. We have no objection to the Intercolonial, we like to see it a prosperous and flourishing concern, but we insist that the road shall be well managed, the same as any other public institution.

The minister says that the reason he can not make it pay, the reason that the Intercolonial Railway is not in the position of other railroads, is that we do not charge as high freight and tariffs as they do on other roads. I have heard that remark before, and I have heard it supported by the schedule of rates charged on the different railroads, which was filed by a minister in making his address to the House showing that the people using the Intercolonial only paid about one-fourth of the freight that the people pay on other railways. In ordinary rates, people pay as much on the Intercolonial as the people pay in ordinary rates on any other road in the Dominion of Canada. People pay just as high rates for freight and passengers on the Intercolonial. It is true there are some things we carry on the Intercolonial at a lesser rate. For instance, for the purpose of developing the coal trade in Cape Breton,

we carry coal on the Intercolonial for less than we can afford to. We do so for the purpose of encouraging the coal trade, and other collateral trades, and for the purpose of developing a larger trade for Halifax. We have built elevators there for grain, and we carry grain to Halifax for less than we could possibly haul it and pay expenses. Parties exporting lumber on the Intercolonial pay less rates perhaps than are paid on other roads. But for ordinary freight and passenger rates on the Intercolonial, as fair a price is charged as on any other road in the Dominion. Let a party make inquiries, any party who is an expert in reference to tariffs, and he will find that what I say is the fact. But what is the remedy? The suggestion was made the other evening in a debate on this question, that people who use this road do not wish to use it in forma pauperis. If we do not pay rates sufficient in the carriage of freight and passengers, the hon. gentleman stated, we are perfectly willing to pay higher rates. What a commentary all this is on government-owned railroads. Look at the tendency of the present day. In every civilized country in the world, France, Holland, Belgium, the German Empire, the Austrian Empire, what is the tendency?

The tendency is towards state-owned railways. We have the lamentable spectacle here of a Minister of Railways admitting that he cannot make both ends meet on the Intercolonial Railway, that he is going to give it up, that he is going to try another system. It is a commentary upon our government. What is the form of management proposed? If you are going to do away with the present system there are two or three plans that perhaps might suggest themselves to ordinary persons. First, there is the plan of leasing the road to some other railway company that will manage it better than the government do. Or, you might govern it, as my hon. friend suggests, by a commission. There is a new idea proposed by the Minister of Railways and Canals. He speaks of a board of which his deputy is one of the members. Two of the parties who now manage the Intercolonial Railway are to be members of that board and they are to add another man to it. The country will have no confidence in a board of that kind. If the minister cannot govern the road and cannot make both ends meet under the present system no board that he appoints, governs and rules will have the confidence of the country. You might appoint a commission for the purpose of doing it. I doubt very much if a commission will be much better. The people of the maritime provinces, no matter how badly the road has been managed in the past, no matter how far short of meeting the expenditure the revenue has fallen,

are fond of the Intercolonial Railway, and they will support no government, as I found out when I was in power, that will part with the Intercolonial Railway. It is a parting with the undertaking if you lease it to a railway company. There is another way suggested, and that is to grant to the different railways that connect with the Intercolonial running powers over the road. But, it is impossible to work that out. The granting of powers amounts to nothing. The three railway companies that will connect with the Intercolonial Railway are the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway. In order to have joint running rights upon the road each of them would have to appoint agents for the purpose of picking up business and operating their trains upon the road. That would involve a three-fold expenditure which is unnecessary for the purpose of running the institution. There is still another way in which you could do it; you could create a company of which these three companies would be members. The Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railways could form a joint stock company for the purpose of operating that railway in connection with their own roads, or for the purpose of pooling the earnings in the interest of the three. That possibly might be done, but in order to put the Intercolonial Railway in a position to compete or to make money there would have to be a considerable expenditure upon it, not in acquiring branch roads, not in building branch roads, but in affording modern facilities for what is perhaps the best paying traffic of any in connection with a railway, that is the tourist traffic. You want to build hotels in every part of the country traversed by the road, you want to offer the best possible facilities to the tourist to come into the country. All of that requires money. Of the three parties that might join in the undertaking two could not afford to pay anything. Is the other company going to pay the whole amount for the joint benefit of the two which can pay nothing? It is an impossible arrangement, yet that is the only way in which it could be undertaken. Then the minister is forced to the alternative of appointing a board. I think he was a little jealous of the idea suggested by the hon, leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) of appointing a commission for the purpose of managing the road. I must say that I differ from both of them. I have no faith in commissions. I believe that a proper man at the head of the Railway Department, free from political influence, big enough to stamp his foot and put it down on any interference and who would govern it on correct and modern principles, would make the Intercolonial a paying concern. It is our only

hope if we are to have a government railway system in Canada that there should be a spirit encouraged amongst the people of the country which would result in making it possible to have good management, free from political influences. When I was running the Intercolonial Railway, of course, approaches were made for the purpose of securing that road. We could have rented the road for what would have been a valuable addition every year to the revenue of the country on conditions such as would have preserved to the people the rates that they at that time enjoyed. I hope that the minister's board may be a success. I wish, from the bottom of my heart, as I know every member on this side of the House and from this section of the country wishes, prosperity to the Intercolonial Railway. May it fulfil to the utmost extent the wishes and desires of the people of the country in building up trade and commerce and developing what may possibly be the cheapest railway transportation in the country. We believe that with proper management it can be done. No matter what the deficits are, I am with the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) when he says: Do not part with the road; try it again and again, and the day will come in this country when there will be a management of the road which will redound to its credit, and which will show that in this country we possess a form of government equal to that in any of the older countries. Those having their reputations as business men at stake, will agree with me, I am sure, that such a management of the road would be a credit both to the country financially and in every other respect. I have nothing more to say. I am not going to discuss the details of this question which has been so fully dealt with by the minister. The opportunity will be afforded me if necessary in the committee. I have only to add that I hope that whatever the minister or the government may do, they will not part with the principle of government ownership of the Intercolonial Railway. I hope that their followers sitting at the back of them will also voice that opinion. Let it be a heritage for the people of the maritime provinces, and if the government adhere to that principle they will receive the support of the people in other sections of the country as well as those of the maritime provinces.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say just one word. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), this afternoon, certainly did give to us statistics regarding the operation of the Intercolonial Railway that seemed to be of a very excellent character indeed. I was very much struck by them, but I do not know whether in the statistics he embodied all the essential tests of the good management and effective operation of a railway. I am not sufficiently familiar with the practical operation of a railway to judge of that. However, the statistics as far as they went seemed to be exceedingly good but the results disclosed at the end of his very eloquent speech are not such as we might have expected from hearing these statistics for the first time. The hon. gentleman disclosed to us a deficit of about half a million dollars, and when I asked him why the statistics were so good and the results so bad he told me it was entirely due to the fact that the passenger and freight tolls on the Intercolonial are lower than upon the other great railways. I cannot of my own knowledge controvert that statement, but during the past two or three years those who know something about it have informed me that with the exception of the commodity of coal — and perhaps one or two other articles—the tolls of the Intercolonial Railway are just as high both for freight and passengers as upon any other great Canadian railway. We have therefore a responsible minister of the Crown assuring us on his responsibility as a minister that the reason for the extraordinary discrepancy between the good statistics and the bad results of the Intercolonial are because the Intercolonial Railway tolls are lower than they should be. But on the other hand I have the statement of men familiar with the practical operation of railways in this country who say it cannot be assigned to any such cause. When we come to discuss this question more particularly in committee, the House will be entitled to some comparative statement from the minister which will prove beyond doubt in what respect the tolls paid by the people of the maritime provinces upon the Intercolonial are lower than those paid by the patrons of the other great railways.

The Minister of Railways used a remarkable argument in the course of his able address when he said that in the near future the Intercolonial would be face to face with a critical condition because of the approaching completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I endeavoured to follow the remarks of the hon. gentleman with a good deal of attention and I think I am right in understanding that this was one of his arguments for advocating some necessary change in respect to the management and operation of that railway. His point was that upon the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific, that road would necessarily be in competition with the Intercolonial Railway; that the revenues of the Intercolonial Railway would decrease because of the business diverted to the Grand Trunk Pacific, and that hence there might

be demanded a very thorough change of policy on the part of the government with respect to its road. I would remind the Minister of Railways that before he was a member of this House, such was not the position taken by those who spoke for the government in the transcontinental debates of 1903 and 1904. I could quote from the debates of that session a great many arguments from the government benches exactly the contrary of the argument he has used this afternoon. However, I will merely give one citation from the speech of the then Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) who in my opinion made the most effective argument of all from the government benches in support of their policy. Speaking of the Intercolonial Railway, he said

We are told by our late colleague (Mr. Blair) that the facilities are not sufficient as yet, and that some millions more will be required to enable that road to cope with the business which it has to meet under present conditions. Well, I do not know whether that be correct or not; I do not know enough about the Intercolonial to say, but I think perhaps we may all agree over that which we do know, which is a matter of common knowledge, that the Intercolonial had all the business within the last year or two that it could do, and its facilities are not more than sufficient to enable it to do the business which it has at the present time.

The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) had argued that the Intercolonial ought to be permitted to carry the traffic brought by the National Transcontinental Railway from the west to Montreal, on to the maritime provinces; and the government, through the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) met that argument in this way:

Now, what is the proposition of the member for Hamilton. It is that the Intercolonial, with its barely sufficient equipment to do the business which it has now, shall take three or four times as great business as the Grand Trunk, that it shall take the business of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that the business of these railways shall be suddenly precipitated upon the Intercolonial Railway, and that that railway shall be expected with its insufficient facilities to do the business of the whole three, and my hon. friend says that is a consummation to be desired.

And he goes on to draw a harrowing picture of the conditions if the Intercolonial Railway should be called upon to assume the burden of that transportation. It will therefore be seen that the argument from the government benches at that time was that the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific through the province of New Brunswick would not injure the Intercolonial Railway or take away any business from it, but, on the contrary the increase of business would be such that both of these lines would be necessary through the province of New Brunswick to handle the traffic. I desire to point this out to the Minister of Railways so that he may know that the argument presented by him for the government this afternoon was the very antithesis of the argument which the government set up in 1903.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Graham) referred to the efforts of the Grand Trunk to carry this traffic to Portland. Well, the hon. gentleman knows that that phase of the question was thoroughly debated in 1903 and 1904. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Graham) seems rather to despair of the Grand Trunk doing anything else. Why it is five years ago since we despaired of its doing anything else, and we then pointed out that all the clauses and all the agreements and all the contracts that were placed before parliament would not and could not be sufficient to prevent the Grand Trunk from carrying its traffic to Portland in the future as it had in the past. The Prime Minister in discussing the matter at that time said he had no expectations whatever that the Grand Trunk would divert from Portland the traffic it then had and carry it to the maritime ports of this country. He said very frankly that he did not expect that but he did expect that owing to the provisions of the agreement then placed before this House, all the traffic which the Grand Trunk Pacific would gather up in the west, all the new traffic as he expressed it, would be carried not to Portland but to the maritime ports of Canada. There was a good deal of scope for criticism of that statement. Hon. gentlemen on this side at least could not very well understand how there should or could be any such sharp distinction as that. They did not see and do not yet see how it can be expected that the Grand Trunk will make some curious division of traffic and that which might be assumed to have been created in the past shall go to Portland but all that which might be assumed to be created in the future shall go to St. John and Halifax. No one sees that yet, so far as I am aware, and I am convinced by the remarks of the Minister of Railways to-day that he least of all sees how any such arrangement as that could be carried out.

The minister has by his further remarks given us the best possible illustration of the absolute futility of any such contract as that entered into by this government in 1903 and 1904. What were the remarks of my hon. friend this afternoon? He said that the Intercolonial Railway could not very well be successful, could not very well be remunerative, could not very well command the western traffic which it ought to command unless it could get 'hooked' up to some great railway corporation. I rather think that the great difficulty with regard to the Intercolonial Railway in the past has

been that it has been hooked up too much to political pull and patronage and not sufficiently hooked up to ordinary business-like and efficient methods. That is the difficulty with the Intercolonial Railway, but I shall come to that later on. The minister desires that it shall be hooked up to some great Canadian railway system. Let us go back for a moment to ten and eleven years ago, let us go back to the proposals of the government in 1897 and 1898. I very well remember the discussion of those years because I was a new member in this House, and was naturally attracted by a very important debate such as that, especially as it had reference to the Intercolonial Railway in which the members from the maritime provinces feel an absorbing interest. What was the proposal of the government at that time? It had entered into a contract with the Drummond County Railway and another with the Grand Trunk Railway, and I would point out to the Minister of Railways the glowing predictions uttered at that time. A very able gentleman then occupied the position of Minister of Railways and Canals, the late Hon. Mr. Blair. At page 4264 of the 'Hansard' of that year Mr. Blair, speaking for the government, to the parliament of Canada and to the people of Canada, said:

The idea has gone abroad and has sunk deeply in people's minds, that because the Intercolonial Railway has not been a paying property—or, in other words, has scarcely in all its history been able to show a balance on the right side of its accounts—there was something inherently vicious in the government ownership of railways, and that the less a government had to do with them the better. That was an idea which I think I am justified in saying strongly impressed itself upon the people's minds. But I think I shall be able to show this committee that if there has been one thing more than another which has led to this state of affairs, it is that the Intercolonial Railway has been cribbed, cabined and confined. I will give this committee, before I get through, good reasons for believing that after this extension shall be concluded, and after it shall have an opportunity of getting into successful competition, the days of deficits will be over, and we shall be able—I do not say to pay interest on the capital invested—I do not think the country looks for that—but by the business arrangements which we shall be in a position to make, and by the facilities which will be secured to us in Montreal, to show a balance on the right side of the account and to reverse the record which has been exhibited in the running operations of this railway in times past.

Further on:

I do say, as far as I have been able to exercise any little judgment I may have, that the extension of this railway to the city of Montreal will reverse the position it has had in the past by creating business which cannot fail to produce vastly important results.

Then at page 4269:

But the fact, as I say, that we have carried only a small proportion of through passengers and through freight in times past, shows under what disadvantages the road has been operated. We look for an entire change in this respect.

Further on:

And, as I was saying a moment ago, if you examine the details of the contract which has been entered into between the government on one hand and these companies on the other, you will perceive very clearly that we have been solicitous and careful, that every term and every condition should be introduced which would ensure us an opportunity to gain our share of the western trade. As you will see, we have engaged with the Grand Trunk to carry the freights for us from the west to Montreal and to deliver these freights to us when they get them there, not to take them around by the Richmond line or by Lévis—not to carry them off on the Grand Trunk, but to deliver them to us. So, when we send our canvassing agents through the west, as all railway companies do, and ought to do, and those agents pick up traffic and make contracts, we may be sure that the business will fall into our hands when it reaches Montreal.

From this you will observe the position taken by the government at that time. Mr. Sifton expressed it during the debate of 1903 in a still more striking way. He said that the Intercolonial Railway had had its terminus in a ploughed field and they had brought that terminus to the city of Montreal and had placed that railroad in a position to compete for and obtain its fair share of the great traffic of the west. The government in 1903 had made a contract with the Grand Trunk, the terms of which are embodied in 'Hansard' at page 4088 et seq. The government claimed that this contract with the Grand Trunk Railway would enable the government of this country, by the agreement thus constituted, to obtain its fair share of western traffic and through traffic and that it would necessarily result in placing the Intercolonial Railway on an entirely different basis from that which it had occupied in days gone by. There were to be no more deficits, the Intercolonial Railway was to obtain its fair share of western traffic and the agreement thus consummated by the government was to result in an absolute revolution in the returns which the people of this country were to expect from the Intercolonial Railway. We have had 10 years' experience with that contract. What is the answer of the Minister of Railways to-day? His answer to the people of this country, his answer to the parliament of this country, is practically that the agreement of 1897 and 1898 between the government of Canada and the Grand Trunk has resulted absolutely in no change or benefit to the Intercolonial Railway or the people of Canada, that the agreement has been practically evaded, that it has not resulted

in the Intercolonial Railway obtaining any fair or proportionate share of western traffic. I ask hon. gentlemen of this House and the people of this country, in the light of that, how much we are to expect from the agreements which this government in 1903 and again in 1904 made with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, which is only another name, after all, for the Grand Trunk Railway?

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Minister of Railways and Canals in the address which he delivered this afternoon, has unwittingly passed about as severe a criticism upon the agreements of 1903 and 1904 as have ever been addressed to the parliament or the people of this country. He has shown the absolute futility of any such agreement whether contained in the Act of 1897 or the Act of 1903, so far as the purpose may have been to divert traffic over the Grand Trunk Railway from Portland in the United States, to the Canadian ports in the maritime provinces. Under these circumstances, how does my hon. friend propose to get the Intercolonial Railway hooked up to any great railway system in Canada to a greater extent than it was hooked up to the Grand Trunk Railway by the agreement of 1897. How is it possible to devise an agreement which, on the face of it, would be stronger or apparently more effective for that purpose ? My hon. friend would not, I think, be prepared to suggest how that agreement, in its terms, could be made stronger. Yet we see the result. Every prediction of the government in 1897 has been falsified, not only in the spirit but the letter. The deficits, instead of disappearing, have increased, and we are faced to-day with a deficit of half a million dollars. The only reply which the minister can give is one that cannot very well be confirmed, and that is the people of the maritime provinces are getting lower freight rates than the people of any other province.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was speaking about the lower rates without any particular reference to this year. The deficit this year is largely attributable to the vast falling off in traffic which has taken place on all railways. The falling off up to December 31, was over half a million dollars.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not desire that my remarks as to the results of the operations of the Intercolonial Railway shall be confined by any means to the year we are now considering, because it is well known that when every other railway worthy of the name on this continent was earning dividends on the capital invested in it, the Intercolonial Railway was considered to have made an excellent showing if it came out without a deficit or with a surplus of a few thousand dollars. There must be some explanation of this. The opposition took a certain position in this regard in 1903, when the government brought down its proposal. I am not going to argue the case over again but will simply invite attention to what we then proposed. I moved a resolution in that session declaring, among other things, the following :

That this House is of the opinion that the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway should continue to be owned and operated by the government of Canada.

That the government system of railways should be developed and improved in the province of Quebec and the maritime provinces, and should also be extended from Montreal westward to such point or points as will enable it to transport to eastern Canada and to our national ports on the St. Lawrence and on the Atlantic the rapidly increasing products of our great western country.

That the management of government railways and of all railways, under the control or direction of the government, should be free from party political control, influence and interference.

In the same session, or the session following, there were questions put and answers brought down which indicated that the Intercolonial Railway, if it had been operated from Parry Sound to Halifax, could have carried grain at a rate which would have shown a profit and which would also have ensured to it a fair share of the western traffic. However, I shall not go over that portion of my argument more than to recall to hon. members the fact that we did take that position at that time.

My hon. friend the Minister of Railways has spoken of bettering the condition by leasing the Intercolonial Railway to some great railway corporation. If that policy, he said, is not adopted and carried out, then it will be necessary for the government to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) and acquire certain branch lines in the maritime provinces, especially the province of New Brunswick. I fail to understand how the acquisition of these branch lines in New Brunswick will bring us to our share of that western traffic which, according to every minister of railways, whom I have heard discuss the subject, is absolutely necessary to the future success and operation of the government road. The acquisition of branch lines in New Brunswick will not give us any special advantage in securing our fair share of the great western traffic to which we are looking in the future. Nor do I see how the acquisition of these branch lines is going to offset the disadvantage relied upon by the Minister of Railways—if it be a disadvantage—of the low rates which he says the people of the maritime provinces enjoy at present as compared with the people of the rest of Canada. Yet my hon. friend puts the two as alternatives. He

says there are only two things to do. One is to lease the Intercolonial Railway to some great railway corporation; the other is to acquire these branch lines. Take the latter alternative, will any man tell me how the acquisition of these branch lines in the province of New Brunswick will remedy the disadvantages of which the minister has spoken? I may be singularly obtuse, but I cannot understand how that will get the Intercolonial Railway out of the difficulties into which, according to the minister, it is now plunged.

I do not know whether or not the Minister of Railways is considering the other alternative. The question was put across the floor in the early part of the session, and the answer of the government was that there had been certain proposals made to it in that regard, but that these proposals were not even considered. But now we come to another important, and a very important part, of the minister's argument this afternoon. He said that some change might be necessary. I think he went so far as to say that in his opinion some change was necessary in the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and he spoke of the appointment of a board. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has referred to my proposal of some years ago that the Intercolonial Railway ought to be placed under the management of a committee. Mr. Speaker, I have not the slightest confidence in, nor do I place the slightest reliance on the word 'board' or the word 'commission,' but I do place some reliance on the management of the Intercolonial Railway by business methods and the absolute elimination of party political control. I do not say, mark you, the elimination of political control or interference. By political interference I mean political in the highest sense of the word. It may be absolutely right and proper that the government and parliament should on occasion exercise what you might call political control in connection with the management of the Intercolonial Railway. But what I am referring to is party political interference, that political patronage, that party pull, which tends to make the Intercolonial Railway, whether the one party or the other be in power, a great political machine. I know, from my own experience in the maritime provinces, that there are certain party hacks there who regard the Intercolonial Railway as belonging to the Liberal party, while that party is in power, and not as belonging to the people of Canada, but to be used for the ends of the party so long as it remains in office. And I am not party man enough to deny that if the Conservatives were in power, there might be men calling themselves Conservatives who would have as fantastic and as absurd a view regarding the ownership and management of that road.

The essential thing that requires to be done is to put the management of the Intercolonial Railway under such conditions that the party hack should have no right to interfere. My hon. friend says that the management of the Intercolonial Railway is to-day all that it should be. I know something about the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and I do not believe that it is to-day what it should be. I believe that there are men by the score, by the hundred, on the Intercolonial who are not bound by the ordinary ties of discipline, because forsooth they were put where they are by political pull and interference; and that same political pull and interference prevents them from submitting to that discipline which is absolutely essential to the proper and efficient management of any railway. I know whereof I am speaking, and if it were necessary or desirable I could give some illustrations of that fact. The name amounts to nothing; the principle amounts to a great deal; and when my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals tells us that government responsibility would be to some extent interfered with, I venture to think that he speaks, if I may say so without offence, a little without the book. What have we been doing in Canada in recent years? Did we not appoint a commission to superintend and carry on the construction of the Transcontinental Railway? I suppose that was an endeavour to take that work out of party politics, if it were possible to do so by appointing men to carry it on separately from any department of the government. Have we not appointed a Civil Service Commission, and is not government responsibility, in the sense in which my hon. friend spoke, interfered with somewhat by the appointment of that commission? And did we not three or four years ago appoint a Railway Commission for Canada, which has to-day imposed upon it some of the duties, and which under the statutes of this country has assumed some of the functions which were formerly discharged by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, consisting of members of the government?

I venture to think—and I am speaking to business men who will I am sure weigh my words—that when the government of any country undertakes to engage in a business such as that of transportation, some of the old ideas about governmental responsibility will have to be modified a little. The business of transportation in Great Britain, in the United States, and in this country has been committed almost entirely to private enterprise. As my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart)

has well remarked, it is not so in other countries; because if you eliminate Great Britain and the United States, you will find that at least two-thirds of the railways of the world are owned and for the most part operated by the state. But in Great Britain and the United States, it is not so. Therefore when we in Canada engage in a business which in the great English speaking countries of the world has been committed to private enterprise—when we engage in that business in competition with private enterprise, it seems to me that we ought not to be bound too much by the fetters of that governmental responsibility to which my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals attaches so much importance. Suppose the parliament of Canada put the Intercolonial Railway under a commission or a board, or under the management of one man—these are details as to which I care nothing—and give to that man a status which would enable him to manage the road free from party patronage, free from political pull, free from political interference, the parliament of Canada could take back what it had given, and, if it found that that system was not a successful system, it could revert to the earlier methods or seek some new method of dealing with the railway. You do not take away any of the responsibility of parliament or of the government except for the time being, and you take it away only in respect of the operation of the road and in order that it may be carried on as an efficient business enterprise and by efficient business methods. Therefore, I venture to think that the suggestion which has been made in this regard ought not to be put aside too lightly by the Minister of Railways and Canals. He speaks of a board of four men, but he is absolutely nebulous as to what their duties and responsibilities shall be. You have a general manager of the Intercolonial Railway now. What would it advantage the Intercolonial Railway or the people of this country if you appoint four men and leave the methods of operation exactly as they are at present? You might as well appoint Ministers of Railways and Canals and expect good results as to do that. What we must arrive at by any satisfactory solution of this question, which has been under discussion for the past twenty-five years, is some means of applying to the management of the Intercolonial Railway just ordinary, plain, honest business methods. Three or four years ago we advocated making the Intercolonial Railway subject to the Railway Commission just like any ordinary railway in this country. I see no reason why that should not be done. Whether the Minister of Railways and Canals appoints a board, a commission or one man, I think that he will arrive at good results, he will accomplish more than any of his predecessors have accomplished, if he will so frame his statute and his regulations that the road will be carried on by the same methods that private enterprise has applied to the transportation business. If he does that, I venture to think that good results will follow.

I see no reason why the Intercolonial Railway should not be operated successfully There seems to be an impression in the minds of some of the hon. members of this House that the Intercolonial Railway runs through a wilderness. Why, it runs through some of the finest districts in Canada, in the province of Nova Scotia, the province of New Brunswick and the province of Quebec. Is the country between Quebec and Montreal not one of the finest districts in Canada? Does not the Intercolonial Railway in the province of New Brunswick run through a splendid fertile region, with great timber and other resources of many kinds? Does not the Intercolonial in the province of Nova Scotia run through a thickly populated country, and is it not carrying the freight of great enterprises such as the Dominion Iron & Steel corporation and the Nova Scotia Steel Company? And can you imagine a finer district anywhere in the Dominion than that portion of the province of Nova Scotia through which it runs? I do not put out of sight the consideration that the minister has placed before the House in respect of the competition of water carriers; but let no one imagine that the Intercolonial is running through a wilderness. It is running through just as good a country as there is on the face of the earth to-day, and there is no reason why it should not be carried on by honest, straight business methods; and there is no reason that I can understand why it should not be operated successfully and bring a fair return, or some return at least on the very large amount of capital which the people of this country have put into it.

With regard to the question of branch lines, that has been very fully debated, and I do not intend to touch upon it to-night. I would be in sympathy with any reasonable movement for providing feeders for the Intercolonial Railway in the maritime provinces or the province of Quebec. My view of the Intercolonial is that it cannot stand still; it must develop or we must give it up, one or the other. You will not find any live railway in Canada today that is in a condition of stagnation. The people of Canada and the government of Canada must both make up their minds to either one thing or the other, to give up the Intercolonial altogether, as my hon. friend the Minister of Railways partly suggested this afternoon, that is, pass it over to some private corporation, or to develop that railway, to apply the same enterprise

and efficient business methods, not only to the operation of the road, but to its development, which we might expect if the road was absolutely transferred in title to a corporation. There can be no half way measure about it, it must either be efficiently developed or it must be handed over to some corporation. I rose, however, in the main, for the purpose of pointing out to the Minister of Railways that the glowing predictions of his predecessor of the results of the extension to Montreal, have not been fulfilled, and to point out the extreme difficulty of accomplishing such results as were predicted in that case, by the mere terms of a contract. That has not been possible in the case of the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal, and it will not be possible, I think, under the contract which this government, in 1903-4, entered into with the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). I am sure that any one who has been at all familiar with the part which I have taken in discussions with respect to the Intercolonial, will not condemn me for prolonging somewhat this debate. My voice has been heard at this session already, and on former occasions I have felt impelled to give an expression of my views. I have listened with the closest attention to that which has fallen from the lips of the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me this afternoon and evening, and I am bound to say that I have not been able to elicit very much comfort from anything that has been said either on one side or the other. You, Sir, will agree with me that it is a lonesome task to plough a lone furrow; and when I listened to the remarks of the Minister of Railways and to the subsequent remarks of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) with respect to the Intercolonial and its branch lines, and when I listened with close attention to the remarks of the leader of the opposition, it will be understood that I could not get much comfort from any of them. It is a somewhat unpleasant position to stand half way between, and to find none who agree with the views which I hold with respect to so great a question as the Intercolonial Railway. Let my attitude not be mistaken. I have now been in public life upwards of twenty-five years, and I have never yet, and never will be, charged with being an opportunist, or with concealing my convictions on public questions, whether they are adverse to one party or the other. It may be said that I hold extreme views with respect to the Intercolonial; that may be true, but they are honestly held, and are the result of a life study of the conditions which prevail on that road, are the result of a familiarity with it that could only be obtained by the association which I have been permitted to have with the employees who are engaged on that road, and by the knowledge I have of the people of the maritime provinces and of the conditions which that railway is designed to meet.

Now, Sir, I can congratulate the Minister of Railways and Canals on the very able speech which he made this afternoon. I think that if ever there was a speech delivered that was confirmatory of the attitude I have taken in this House, it was the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways. It will be borne in mind perhaps that the views which I hold are, in the first place, that we should continue to own and operate the Intercolonial as a government road, and that its operation should be expanded, that it should be developed in every respect. I am sure that in the very clear, and concise, and eloquent speech delivered by the Minister of Railways, every point that I have taken with respect to that railway has been established, has been demonstrated beyond question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why was not the minister's speech a comfort to the hon. gentleman ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend need not anticipate. He has established my premises, he has supported every assertion I have ever made; he has demonstrated by comparison with other railways that the Intercolonial has been one of the best managed railways in Canada, that it has been efficiently managed, that its rates are low, that its earnings are as a consequence small, that its expenses are not great in comparison with those of other railways; he has demonstrated all these, and he has shown that the Intercolonial has served a great purpose. He started out with saying that, as a first condition, we must remember that the Intercolonial was a set-off of the canals, that they were both to be viewed in the same light at the time of confederation, that they were designed to come down through the decades of our life as a confederation in that same relative position, the one off-setting the other.

My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals clearly agreed with that condition. Then he brings out the point that it is the duty of this parliament, as it is the duty of the people of the country, to recognize the Intercolonial and the canals as twin systems, each to be treated in precisely and practically the same way, the one serving as a highway for central Canada and the other as a highway for eastern Canada as well as for central Canada with respect to its traffic. He proved that beyond all question, and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition only took exception to one point in the argument of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals. He joined issue upon the question as to the tariff

rates of the Intercolonial Railway, My hon. friend the leader of the opposition states that he wants it demonstrated to him that the rates prevailing on the Intercolonial are lower. I did, on a former occasion, I think, two years ago, place on the table of this House the tariff rates prevailing on the Grand Trunk, the tariff rates prevailing on the Canadian Pacific Railway, the passenger rates and traffic rates prevailing on these respective railways, and I, at the same moment, placed before this House the passenger and freight rates prevailing on the Intercolonial. I need only remind the House of that which demonstrated clearly and beyond question on that occasion, that the freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway with respect to every classification of freight were lower than on either of the other railways. I showed then what increase per cent of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific rates over the Intercolonial rates was. on certain classes of freight. I gave the rate with respect to different distances, commencing with five and over ten miles and ranging up to 700 miles, I pointed out the difference both as to export tariff rates and as to the ordinary tariff rates and I also pointed out that the increases over the Intercolonial rates ranged all the way from fifty to one hundred per cent with respect to certain classifications. I called the attention of parliament at that time to the local comparative rates on coal in carloads, and I showed then, in comparison with other railways, that the Intercolonial rates were from 25 to 10 per cent lower dependent upon distance. I also showed that with respect to lumber, to give one illustration, the rates on a 650 to 700 mile haul on the Intercolonial are 57 per cent lower than the export rates on either of the other railways, and with respect to the ordinary haul 76 per cent lower than they are on either the Canadian Pacific Railway or Grand Trunk Railway. The passenger rates were found to be lower dependent upon the mileage. Hon. members need only turn to the 'Hansard' of 1907, page 5338 and following pages, to find confirmation of the statements which I am now making. If my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is anxious to know he can there learn because these are the actual freight tariff rates prevailing on these railways. The originals, as they came from the railways, were presented to parliament and the facts and statements were there made. Only in that respect was there any difference between my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals with respect to the Itercolonial Railway. I have said that I do not get very much comfort even if my position with respect to the Intercolonial Railway as to its operation has been established by the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals because of his conclusions. He has, after saying that the railway had been efficiently managed, that there was nothing wrong with it, that its administration could not be better in comparison with that of other railways, asked the question: What shall we do with the road? Why is it necessary to do anything with the road? He has clearly shown that during the past year, in common with the other railways on this continent, that railway had a decrease in its earning power that has been very marked particularly in the maritime provinces because of the depression in the lumber traffic. It will be borne in mind that the lumber traffic of the Intercolonial represents 26 per cent of its whole traffic, and I am sure that I am within the facts when I state that there has been a practical stagnation in the matter of the transportation of lumber along the Intercolonial during the past twelve months in consequence of the condition of the lumber trade in Great Britain. In that particular alone there has been an immense falling off in the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway and the falling off in that regard has been followed by a lessening of its earning power in other respects, to the extent, as the Minister of Railways and Canals has shown, of $500,000. He has shown that, despite that falling off and despite an increase in the wages paid to the employees, there is only an anticipated deficit of half a million dollars this year. Have we not had a surplus on the Intercolonial Railway for the past five years? Then, what is there to complain of? What is there to be done? If the management of the Intercolonial has been good, in comparison with that of other railways in Canada, if there is nothing to complain of with respect to it in that regard, why should it be condemned simply because there have been deficits? Surely, Mr. Speaker, that will not be contended in this House. We had a report laid on the table of the House the other day showing that the deficit of the Welland canal alone, during the past five years had averaged nearly $180,000 per year. Some hon. member has computed the figures with respect to the deficits on the Intercolonial from 1867 down to the present and has shown that the average deficits on the Intercolonial, commencing with its inception, when it was a railway running from Rivière du Loup to Halifax, Moncton and St. John, have only been about $245,000. On that one little canal alone there is an annual loss of $170,000. Is there talk of doing anything about that? The minister has told us that the canals of Canada are a balance of the Intercolonial Railway, but if you add but one other canal you will have a greater annual deficit on these two canals than you have all told on the Intercolonial Railway. Of course, if you take the canals of Canada as a whole

there will be, according to the statement of the minister himself, a deficit of upwards of one and a quarter million dollars. How is it we never hear the question asked. What shall we do with the canals, or, shall we put them under a commission, or, shall we transfer them to a private corporation in the interests of the country? If these questions are asked about the Intercolonial, surely they could with equal reason be asked about the canals which also have deficits.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER. Of course the hon. gentleman is aware that the traffic on the canals is free to the whole country. There is no analogy between them and the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am thankful to my hon. friend for the information, but I think there is a great analogy for there is an investment of $90,000,000 of the people's money in the canals and an investment of $80,000,000 of the peoples' money in the Intercolonial both investments being to develop the trade of the country. But there is this additional point in favour of the Intercolonial, that its construction was undertaken as well to bring about the confederation of the then scattered provinces into one Dominion.

My disappointment at the speech of the Minister of Railways is to be found in the fact that his conclusions do not seem to agree with his argument. He argued that the excellent management of the Intercolonial under government operation showed up well in comparison with the private operation of privately owned railways, and that while the results of the book-keeping were not so favourable to the Intercolonial yet that was brought about by peculiar conditions. I agree with the Minister of Railways up to that point. However, he concludes that although the government administration of the railway is good and although the Minister of Railways through his department can manage it in excellent fashion, and although the conditions justify low rates, yet he says we must go back to company operation before the Intercolonial Railway can be made a success. A success in what way? The hon. gentleman proposes to make it a success by trying an experiment. He proposes to form a board of management, a sort of advisory board he says. But let me ask: What is the necessity for an advisory board or a managing board if the management is as excellent as he said it was under the present administration.

Mr. LENNOX. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. Why the necessity for any change? If the minister brushes aside the question of placing this railway under an independent commissioner or commissioners, independent of this government or of any future government and only answerable to parliament; if he declines to place that railway under the direction of a servant of this parliament, then, what is the necessity for turning aside from the excellent management of the railway during the past few years,—and I agree with him that the management has been excellent. If it is desirable to have a board of management then I would invite the attention of the minister to the character of the board. I understand from him that three of the gentlemen who are to comprise that board are now connected with the Department of Railways. One of them is the deputy minister, and a very able deputy minister he is as I have had opportunity of knowing. The other two are to be men who have been for years in the employ of the Intercolonial and who have had the management and control of it under the Department of Railways. If this is to be an advisory board we have had for many years the advantage of the advice of these two gentlemen, and we have had for four or five years past the advantage of the great experience and knowledge of the deputy Minister of Railways. I do not know to whom the minister refers when he speaks of two other gentlemen who have been for years in the employment of the Intercolonial Railway, but I suppose I can assume that they are gentlemen who have controlled and managed the Intercolonial Railway in the past. Is that management going to be any better because they are clustered together in a board? Assuming that one of them is the present manager of the Intercolonial Railway, are you going to have him any more efficient or any more alive by attaching him to others and making it a hydraheaded management ? I do not think so. I ask the minister, and I ask hon. gentlemen to consider how it can be expected that any better results will be obtained in the management of the road from these very same men. Well, sir, I do not look for any great success, nor do I look for any great improvement in that direction.

I should be glad indeed to see the hopes of the minister realized but I cannot now see anything but failure written all around the proposition and in that I think many hon. members who have a knowledge of the conditions will agree with me. But that is neither here nor there, I simply call the minister's attention to it. I asked myself what my hon. friend meant when he said that if this experiment failed these other questions would be considered. What other questions ? Is it the transference of the Intercolonial Railway to a company-operated road? I would hope that that question had been settled in the mind of the minister. He has convinced me and I believe he has convinced the country that he can manage the Intercolonial Railway efficiently. He has

demonstrated to this House this afternoon that it is possible to so manage the Intercolonial that it will be in the interests of the people and that it will become what it was designed to be a government-operated road in the interests of the country. The very moment you discuss the question whether the government of this country shall part with the Intercolonial Railway, you are face to face with one great issue, whether you will have a government-operated railway or whether the people will tolerate a railway-operated government, surely the time has not come when we cannot operate that railway, when we cannot as a people manage the railway in the interests of the people. If it should be shown to me that the Intercolonial Railway could be managed under some system with greater advantage to the people of Canada, that it would develop the east to a greater extent under a private corporation, I would be willing to accept that alternative, but the prevailing opinion to-day is in favour of that measure of government-operation which we have. That feeling is not confined to eastern Canada, you will find it in Ontario and in the west. That opinion should be recognized by this parliament. I quite admit that the corporations are anxious to secure the road. The minister has pointed out that the Canadian Pacific Railway already have access to the Atlantic coast and that in a very few years the Grand Trunk Pacific will find an outlet there. He says then that there must be an outlet for another railway and that the Intercolonial Railway offers an excellent outlet for some trans-continental line of railway. There are only three railroads that have aspirations towards becoming transcontinental; the Canadian Pacific Railway is now a transcontinental line, the Grand Trunk Pacific is seeking to become one and we intend that it shall be, the Canadian Northern hope to become one. The possession of the Intercolonial Railway by the Canadian Northern Railway would be of immense advantage to the Canadian Northern. Their system is now 50 miles west of Edmonton and they hope to reach the Pacific coast. They connect Edmonton and Port Arthur. I read in the newspaper press that there are now proposals to supply the link between Port Arthur and Sudbury. Soon they will have a through line from Sudbury to Montreal. There will still be a missing link between Montreal and the sea-board and it would be of immense advantage to them to reach Halifax or Cape Breton. They would then be in contact with their Nova Scotia system. They have a line of railway from Halifax westward around the south coast of Nova Scotia, known as the Halifax and South Western. If they could connect their western system with their eastern system it would be a great advantage to them, and I do not say they are not justified in having hopes and aspirations in that direction. The question is, is it in the interests of the people of Canada to have them secure that road? I can well understand that it would establish them in their credit, that they would be placed in an entirely different position before the financial world from that which they are in to-day. It would be of immense advantage to them but would it be of advantage to the people of Canada? If the experiment which the minister is to undertake with respect to the management of the road during the next year be a failure, if it bring about no better results than he is now obtaining, I would like to know whether there is an idea that we should discontinue our operations of that road in favour of the Canadian Northern? If that were the proposal before this House I would unquestionably take my stand against it. I would be recreant to what I deem to be my duty to my constituents, I would be falsifying the record of a life time, if I were to support any such idea. I cannot agree with the Minister of Railways that the Intercolonial Railway must of necessity be the outlet for a transcontinental railway in order to achieve the success which he would like to see it achieve. It must be borne in mind that the Intercolonial was not built for the wheat traffic. It must be borne in mind that in 1903, when we had under consideration the bringing of the produce of the west to the Atlantic seaboard, it was the opinion of the people of this country, it was the opinion of the members of this House, that the Intercolonial Railway should not be that channel of communication, and that by reason of its conditions by reason of its grades, it would be impossible for it to carry that traffic, and if it is true as the minister states, that the Intercolonial Railway must be an outlet for a transcontinental line, why did we not make it an outlet in 1903?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friends think they get some comfort from that idea. I hold and every man on the other side must recognize, that the Intercolonial was not designed for the purpose of carrying the wheat from the west, it was extended to Montreal to secure the traffic of central Canada, uniting Ontario and Quebec and the maritime provinces. It was intended to unite the provinces of Ontario and Quebec to the maritime provinces. It was never built as a transcontinental line and it was never expected that it would become such a line. If the Intercolonial is given the advantage of management and the advantage of the traffic of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, if its facilities are enlarged, if its branch lines are extended into the remote sections of the maritime provinces, it will accomplish the object

which led to its construction—not the carrying of traffic from the wheat fields of the west, but the traffic from industrial centres of Ontario. These industrial centres are pouring out each year an increasing quantity of products for which they are seeking a market, and in order to secure that market they require the best possible transportation facilities. They require to reach the remote sections of the maritime provinces at the lowest cost and with the greatest advantage. But under the conditions prevailing with respect to ing Intercolonial Railway and its connecting lines, these advantages are not given the manufacturers of Ontario, and these manufacturers consequently cannot reach those remote markets. The Intercolonial Railway will be a great success if it could but assemble that traffic and distribute it within the zone of its influence. That zone can be widened and extended by the acquisition of these branch lines. And if it is extended and if rates fair and reasonable to the consumer as well as to the manufacturer are afforded, I venture the assertion that the Intercolonial Railway would be an immense success, not merely in bringing together the people of the different provinces, but in earning a surplus which would increase each year. I remember on one occasion I had a computation made as to what the financial returns of the Intercolonial Railway would have been had we charged on our traffic for one year the rates charged on the Canadian Pacific Railway in eastern Canada, and I found that we would have had a surplus on that year's operations of two and a half million dollars. Surely with these opportunities within our reach, it is the duty of this government and parliament to place the Intercolonial Railway in such a position that these results will be brought about. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways realizes that. His own argument demonstrated that it could be done, and I am sure that there is no man who would dispute the conclusion, that if it can be done it should be done.

I do not wish to say anything further with respect to any management or any proposed management or method of management. Opportunities for criticism will naturally be offered, but it seems to me that the minister should take into consideration the additional expense involved. I am not one of those who had very great faith with respect to the Civil Service Commission. I venture to declare myself from my place in this House on that subject. We find to-day that we have established a commission at Ottawa for the purpose of doing—what? For the purpose of selecting employees for the civil service in Ottawa. and $30,000 were voted the other day simply to run that commission. But formerly the work entrusted to that commission was done, and well done, by the heads of the departments. But if this board in connection with the Intercolonial Railway is created, there must of necessity be additional expenses; and while I am not in accord with the Minister of Railways regarding this proposition, because I do not think it is in the interests of the Intercolonial Railway or the proper administration of his department, yet I think that he should be given full latitude to manage that railway in the way he considers the most efficient. I am criticising his proposition, as others no doubt will, but yet it is not a matter of vital concern. The question which is vital, boiled down, is this, that the Intercolonial Railway shall be continued as a government-operated railway, that it shall be extended, that its influence shall be made wider, and that it shall be made better able to do, not the transcontinental business, not the assembling of traffic from the fields of the west, but the gathering up of the products of Ontario and Quebec and distributing them to the markets of the east and to the point of departure to markets beyond the sea. If we should aim to do that, in my judgment we will be fulfilling the expectations of those who have the interests of this country at heart, and assist in developing our industries.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, New Brunswick). I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a few words on the very important question before the House. The matter of the construction and operation of the Intercolonial carries us back to the days of confederation when that road was made a link in the chain which binds the maritime provinces to the rest of Canada. As my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) pointed out a few days ago, there is a clause in the British North America Act providing that the construction of the Intercolonial Railway shall commence within six months of the passing of the Act, and we have during the last forty years operated that road as a government railway. In 1896, when the present government came into power, the earning power of that railway was in round numbers about $3,000,000. During the last twelve years by adding the mileage between Ste. Rosalie and the Chaudiere, namely, 112 miles, and between Fredericton and Loggieville, 125 miles, we have increased the earning power of that road by $6,000,000. We have increased its earning power 300 per cent, whereas we have not, except by a very small percentage, increased its mileage.

We have therefore to take this position that we can do the transportation from the east to the west and from the west to the east—I do not mean as a portion of a great through line from the prairie provinces; but in the great industrial centres of

Canada, mainly in the commercial metropolis of the Dominion, the city of Montreal, we can gather up a very large proportion of our traffic; and we are handed a portion by the Grand Trunk Railway, according to an arrangement between the government and the company. But I want you, Mr. Speaker, not to forget when we are talking about traffic from the west, which we are not in a position to gather up as perhaps we would be if the railway extended to the prairie provinces, that at the present moment we have a practical monopoly of gathering up the traffic in the east. We are told by the department in reply to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that the Intercolonial Railway traffic from the east to the west is fifty-six per cent. As far as that fifty-six per cent of the traffic is concerned, what does it matter how many railways there are carrying the traffic from the west to the east? They will not affect it. We have a traffic arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company by which we take their traffic at Montreal in exchange for our traffic to them. When they take that traffic from us, it is surely reasonable that we should have something that we can offer to other roads, if the Grand Trunk Pacific should say that it wanted all the traffic to Moncton. We must not get the blues over this project. It is a matter that has engaged the attention of this country for the last forty years, and there has been adverse criticism by both parties. When the Conservative party was in power, there was adverse criticism by the opposition. I am very glad, however, on this occasion to hear my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. John Haggart) say: Do not part with the Intercolonial Railway; the time will come when it will be a heritage to the maritime provinces. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that these are my sentiments —to stand by the tie that binds the provinces by the sea with the provinces of central Canada. The very word Intercolonial means an interchange of traffic. You have this steel road taking Ontario flour from the west to the east, and fifty-six per cent of the traffic of the Intercolonial is from the east to the west; and if it be true that our rates are lower than those of any ordinary railroad, will any gentleman tell me that the people in the west are not receiving a share of the benefits arising from those low rates? It does seem to me that if there are low rates on the Intercolonial Railway, the advantage is mutual. There was 44 per cent of the traffic going east carried over the road during the past year. I venture to say that a very large proportion of that arises in the city of Montreal and is not handed over by the Grand Trunk Railway at all. If we look on the bright side of this matter, we shall be able to realize the picture of

the ex-Minister of Railways on the Conservative side of the House (Mr. Haggart) who said to-night that we must not part with the Intercolonial Railway, and I echo in the strongest terms that sentiment. I realize that it is the heritage of the maritime provinces and the link uniting those provinces to the other portions of the Dominion. If you leased the railway for ninety-nine years, you would to all intents and purposes be selling it, and the effect might be to break that tie. I shall not forget very quickly what the hon. Minister of Railways said to-day about linking the Intercolonial Railway to one of the great transcontinental lines. In the Act relating to the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, there is a clause providing that the Intercolonial Railway should be linked to the Grand Trunk Pacific from Moncton to Halifax and from Moncton to St. John. That clause reads like this:

> Securing to the company running powers and haulage rights over the Intercolonial Railway or any portion thereof, upon such terms as may be agreed upon between the government and the company.

I am sure that is good doctrine. That is using the rails of the people's railway from Moncton to the sea-board, and it does seem to me that it would not be unreasonable to apply the same principle to another great transcontinental railway that will very soon reach the city of Quebec. That is, use the rails of the Intercolonial railway from Quebec to Moncton—retain the management of the people's railway and give haulage rights over it. I know that there is objection to that. I know that it will be said that it is a long haul, and that local traffic would not be gathered up. I quite admit that. It seems to me all the same that some favourable arrangement might be made along these lines. I have another alternative. This is a project of mine, and you will pardon me, Mr. Speaker, if I make it known. The Act relating to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway gives the government this power:

> Reserving power to the government to grant running powers and haulage rights sufficient to enable any railway company desiring to use the said eastern division, or any part thereof, to do so upon such terms as may be agreed upon between the companies, or, in the case of their failure to agree, then upon such terms as may be deemed reasonable and just by the government, having regard to the rights and obligations of the lessees.

Now my proposition is this: We will have one of the best pieces of railroad in the world between Quebec and Grand Falls. We have power to allow the Canadian Northern to run over the rails down as far as Grand Falls. Then the country requires in the very worst way a railroad constructed

between Grand Falls and St. John down the St. John valley. Therefore, we have a through road for the Canadian Northern from the Pacific to the Atlantic by using a certain number of miles of the Transcontinental Railway, namely the distance between Quebec city and Grand Falls, and there you will have a road filling a gap which very much needs to be filled, because every hon. gentleman in this House knows that the necessity of a road down the St. John River valley is one of the most urgent needs in New Brunswick to-day. When this gap is filled, a line will be afforded from one ocean to the other ocean. So far as I am personally concerned, that project would satisfy me very well. I would never think of saying to the Canadian Northern, you take over the management of what we have managed for forty years, and administer it. The government have done so that its earnings have increased from $3,000,000 twelve years ago to $9,000,000 this year. Now, Mr. Speaker, so far as the management of the railway is concerned, I am willing to listen to any suggestion that hon. members may have to make. They can eliminate the partisan feature from it. The road intersects my county from one end to the other, and I can tell hon. gentlemen that I do not know anything wrong in the management of the road. I do not know that the partisan feature which is dwelt upon so much, affects the revenue in the least, I do not know that there is a man on that railway who is not earning the dollar a day that he receives. So far as I know the railway is well managed, and it is a pleasure for me to compliment the Minister of Railways on the statement he has given us to-day, both as to its management during the year past and also so far as the present year has gone. Now I cannot help but say this, Mr. Speaker, that the great corporations base their expenditures on their revenues and have to pay interest on capital. Their management endeavour to manipulate profits so that the interest for dividends is provided for. If, however, there comes a bad year and earnings do not reach nearly what was anticipated, the inevitable must happen, namely, no dividend is declared, but as a rule, there is no noise about it. Now, what is the case with the Intercolonial in this regard; it is this: The expenditure and revenue are based on practically an equilibrum, and when a panic year happens, and earnings fall off, then the only result can be a deficit, because provision was not made for any great surplus over expenditure. So far as I am concerned I would favour, if necessary, raising the rates 5 per cent all round, 10 per cent if necessary, 15 per cent if necessary. I am satisfied that as a party and as a people we owe it to ourselves to make that railway self sustaining, knowing that it is the chain that was forged many years ago to bind the maritime provinces to upper Canada, and that chain is clearly provided for in the British North America Act. Therefore I say that for my part I am opposed to the Intercolonial passing into the hands of any corporation to manage it, but I would allow another corporation to use the rails on terms that are reasonable and fair. I am willing to give the Transcontinental most favourable terms from the starting point to the seaboard, I would give them less rates than they could possibly afford, to pay interest on the capital invested, if it used its own rails. Now, Mr. Speaker, any proposition to part with the management of the Intercolonial seems to me like breaking faith with the maritime provinces. I see no reason for pessimism. The prospects are bright. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) said that the road could be made self supporting. I do not think there is much danger if the Grand Trunk Railway should say they are going to hand over to the Grand Trunk Pacific what was our share of the freight going east. They cannot give it for Campbellton, they cannot give it for Newcastle, they cannot give it for other points between Lévis and Moncton, it is true they can give it for Moncton. Let me tell you that they receive more from us than they give us and in a fair exchange we can take care of ourselves.

Mr. LLOYD HARRIS (Brantford). I do not think this discussion should close without the House hearing from one of the private members from the province of Ontario. We have heard from the Minister of Railways to-night, a statement on the Intercolonial and I must admit that after listening carefully to the statements he made, I came to the conclusion that perhaps after all the opinion I have had in the past was wrong. He made out such a case for the good management of that property that once or twice I began to think that perhaps the Intercolonial was managed better than any other road. I have consulted the report of the Minister of Railways, and studied the figures which are given as regard capital expenditure, and revenue, operating and working expenses. According to my calculations I find that during the 41 years the road has been in operatian, the Intercolonial has produced a surplus in 18 years, and in 23 years it has produced a deficit. Then I analysed it a little bit closer. I wondered whether the bad management was all since the present government came into power. I took the number of years in which there were surpluses from 1878 to 1895, and I found that they numbered six and that the number of years in which there were deficits was twelve. The percentage of surplus years was not as great as we would like them to

have been. From 1896 to 1908 I found that the good or bad management, as shown by surpluses and deficits, was a little to the advantage of the present government, as the number of years in which they had surpluses was seven and the number of years in which they had deficits was six.

However, I have got back to the point I started from. I have had my own opinion as to the management of the Intercolonial Railway, I have discussed that question with members of this House, I have discussed it with business men outside of the House, in the maritime provinces, in the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario and in these private discussions every man with whom I have talked has been of the opinion that the Intercolonial can never be properly and successfully managed under a government department as it is at the present time. If we feel that, if we believe it, I cannot see why we should not have the courage to stand up and say so. My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) stated that he had cold comfort in the speeches which he had listened to, and I am very much afraid that he will find less comfort perhaps in my few remarks than he had from the others. We are discussing at the present time the theory of government ownership. We have had an opportunity of experimenting with government ownership in this country for forty-two years and over. If we were running a business and we found that one department of it was being carried on at a loss, what would happen? We would change our methods of management or get rid of that particular department of the business. Are we running a business when we are representing the people in this House? Is not this simply a great big business undertaking and should it not be run on strictly business lines? I was very much struck with the statement which was made by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals and also with another statement which was made by my hon. friend the hon. leader of the opposition. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals made the statement in his remarks that the views of the political parties on the Intercolonial Railway depend on whether they are in or out. The hon. leader of the opposition made the statement that the Intercolonial has been too much hooked up to political influences. You have these two statements made by prominent members on both sides of this House, and I think that ninety-nine, perhaps one-hundred per cent, of the members of this House believe that these statements disclose the cause of the whole trouble, and account for our failure to properly manage the Intercolonial. If that is the case I think we should face the situation and endeavour to seek a solution which will be in the interest of the country at large, because any solution which can be arrived at with regard to the management of this property will necessarily and decidedly be to the interest of the country at large. The first principle of government ownership is to give the people the special utility to be owned and managed by the government at cost. When I say cost I do not figure as my hon. friend from Northumberland, New Brunswick, (Mr. Loggie) does. He says that the revenue and expenditure of the Intercolonial Railway are on an equilibrium. That is very good. If we ran our own private business with the revenue and expenditure on the same kind of equilibrium we would all be in the poorhouse in short order. I am of the opinion that the Intercolonial should be managed in such a manner that it will not only pay its operating or running expenses, but that it will earn a fair and and decent amount of interest on the capital employed in the construction of the property. That is a principle that every hon. gentleman, I am sure, will agree with. The ouly management I will be satisfied with and I believe the only management that other members of this House will be satisfied with is the one that will produce results of that kind. I was very much surprised to hear the hon. member for Westmoreland make the statement on the floor of this House that local rates in the maritime provinces are lower than they are in any other part of the country. Is that not right?

Mr. EMMERSON. They are lower than any where in the world.

Mr. HARRIS. In that case then the other provinces are having a very decided and great wrong done to them because the people in the maritime provinces have no right to have local rates lower than we have in Ontario or than the people in Manitoba and the western provinces have.

Mr. EMMERSON. You get your canals free of tolls.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not propose to take up this canal question because I think it is a very dangerous thing to get into any sectional discussion. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) tells us that the deficits on the Welland canal are so and so. The only thing I will say about that is that if we have deficits on the Welland canal we have a perfect right to have them for the simple reason that the good old province of Ontario which stands as a buffer state between the east and the west has to pay the deficits; so, why should we not have them if we want them ? Now, we evidently cannot agree as to the best means of managing this property. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is

not apparently willing to agree that any of the methods which have been mentioned here to-night would be satisfactory. Others have agreed that a commission would be satisfactory. I personally do not believe that a commission would assist us very much. I do not think that we would get any better results by management under a commission than we get at the present time for the simple reason that I do not believe that we could get a commission which could be completely separated from political influences, and therefore management by commission would have the same drawbacks that we have at the present time. I am not going to make any suggestion as to how the property should be managed but I am glad the question has come up and that we have had an opportunity of expressing our views and opinions upon it. I hope, before anything definite is done, that we will have a further opportunity of seriously considering the question with the view of getting together in a fair, proper and reasonable discussion and endeavour to arrive at a solution which will help us out of a position which is not a good one for the country generally and especially for that portion of the country through which the road runs.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Capital—Intercolonial Railway towards double tracking part of the line, $69,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is merely to carry on the work between Moncton and Painsec junction, which has been going on for some years.

Mr. RHODES. Will this vote complete the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is considered it will complete the section between Moncton and Painsec junction.

Mr. RHODES. What will be the total cost of double tracking that section?

Mr. GRAHAM. The total expenditure to the present time has been $783,973,

Improvements at Loggieville, $25,500.

Mr. RHODES. What is this money being spent for?

Mr. GRAHAM. Three-stall engine house, concrete engine pits, remodelling and enlarging the station building, loading platform, freight house, tracks and grading. There is a revote of $14,450.

Mr. RHODES. Is this a divisional point?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is really the end of the Canadian Eastern section from the junction down to Loggieville.

Increased accommodation—Truro, $52,000.

Mr. STANFIELD. I do not rise to find fault with this vote, which I may say is a very necessary one. I would like, however, to call the attention of the minister to the very unsanitary condition of the present Truro station, and I shall not delay the House more than a minute or two because I feel sure it will be unnecessary to dwell on the matter at any great length. I have in my hand a clipping from a Truro paper which contains a statement signed by Dr. S. L. Walker, health officer of the town of Truro. It is stated in this newspaper that the report of the medical officer is to be forwarded to the Minister of Railways and myself but my copy has not reached me.

Mr. GRAHAM. Nor mine.

Mr. STANFIELD. I will direct the attention of the minister to what Dr. Walker says in conclusion, and then I shall send him over the report so that he may read it. Dr. Walker says:

Taken as a whole the Truro railway station is a positive menace to the health of all who enter it for any purpose, and were it under the town's jurisdiction it could be condemned by the board of health.

I would like the minister to look into this matter and have a remedy applied with as little delay as possible.

Mr. GRAHAM. I certainly agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Stanfield) that there appears to be a very undesirable condition of affairs at Truro station. The report to which my hon. friend refers was brought to my attention by himself but I have not yet received my copy. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I will give it attention. Of course we will get rid of all these things when we build the new station but in the meantime we will look into that report.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. What business will be taken to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We shall go into supply on the Public Works estimates. At the first convenient opportunity in committee I would like to have the supplementary estimates for the current year considered.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 17, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

WESTVILLE POST OFFICE.

Mr. CROSBY—by Mr. Rhodes—asked:

1. What is the contract price of the Westville post office, Pictou county, Nova Scotia?
2. Who is the contractor?
3. Is the work completed? If not, when will it be completed?
4. What is the date under contract when it was to be completed?
5. What is the total amount paid to the contractor, and what further sums will be payable to him?
6. What amount of extras, and for what, is paid and to be paid to the contractor?
7. What will be the total cost of building when completed?
8. Who is the inspector, and between what dates has he been employed?
9. Has he stopped work, and when was he discharged? If not discharged, when will his work be finished?
10. How much per day is he paid, for how many days, and what is the total amount paid to him to date?

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

1. $12,997.
2. E. F. Munro.
3. No. Contract will be completed in about a week.
4. October 15, 1908.
5 and 6.

	Paid.	Due.
Contract	$11,510 00	$1,487 00
Heating	1,011 65	
Electric wiring and fixtures	350 00	351 00
Sidewalks, curbing and gravel walks	1,455 13	
Varnishing and plastering	42 50	
Road to station		478 80
Drain		29 60
Ladder and peg rails		13 75
Totals	$14,369 28	$2,360 15

7. The original estimated cost was $22,000 which did not include the road to station.
8. W. R. McKeen. From October 5, 1907, to present time.
9. (a) No; (b) in about 6 weeks.
10. (a) $3.50 per day; (b) 482 days; (c) $1,687.

I may add that the arrangement with the present inspector was made before the new rule was adopted by the department that inspectors are not to be paid for Sundays. Previously, pay for Sundays was included in what was regarded as monthly employment.

HOLSTEIN CATTLE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What reason does the government give for not having Holstein cattle at the experimental farm?
2. Is it true that the Minister of Agriculture has stated in public that he did not wish to encourage the breeding of Holstein cattle in Canada? If so, what reasons are given for making such a statement?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. Any more breeds than are there at present could not be satisfactorily dealt with.
2. No.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, EXPENDITURE AND EMPLOYEES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What is the total number of employees in the Agriculture Department, inside and outside service, who devote their time to agriculture alone, and the total amount paid in salaries?
2. What was the total amount of money expended in the year 1908 on purely agricultural purposes, and the names of each branch and the amount expended?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. Number of employees.. 450
   Amount paid in salaries .. $253,560 00
2. $762,589.89.

Experimental farms	161,125 91
Printing and distribution of bulletins, farm	8,000 00
Fumigation stations	4,499 71
Dairying and fruit industries, &c	133,669 28
Seed	63,229 57
Live stock	44,656 22
Health of animals	320,538 10
Civil government	26,871 10

ASSISTED COLD STORAGE PLANTS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. How many companies have taken advantage of the clause in the government Cold Storage Bill which grants 30 per cent bonus to builders of cold storage plants as provided for in the Bill?
2. Where are said plants situated, what is the amount paid to each company, and the amount still to be paid by the government?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. Seven.

2.

Name.	Where situated.	Amount paid.	Amount to be paid.
		$ cts.	$ cts.
The New Brunswick Cold Storage Co., Ltd.	St. John, N.B.	36,740 00	13,360 00
The Halifax Cold Storage Co.	Port Hawkesbury, N.S.	6,685 06	2,430 85
Scott & Hogg	Peterborough, Ont	2,175 00	2,175 00
Cold Storage Ltd	Woodstock, N.B.	3,836 55	3,836 55
Scott, Ashton & Co	Morrisburg, Ont.	Nil.	18,986 70
The Trenton and Atlantic Storages Ltd	Trenton, Ont.	"	13,569 91
The J. D. Moore Co., Ltd	St. Mary's, Ont.	"	5,100 00

N.B.—In addition to the foregoing the following have made applications which are pending:—

Edmonton Produce Company, Edmonton, Alberta.

The B. Wilson Company, Limited, Victoria, British Columbia.

Canadian Fish & Cold Storage Company, Limited, Prince Rupert, British Columbia.

R. T. Treen, Prince Albert, Saskatchewan.

The Nova Scotia Cold Storage Company, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

The Acadia Cold Storage Company, Limited, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

The London Cold Storage Company, Limited, London, Ontario.

These contracts have not yet been awarded.

ISLAND OF SOULANGES.

Mr. LORTIE asked: (Translation.)

1. Has the Bureau of Canadian Geographers changed the name of the island of Soulanges, in the St. Lawrence?
2. If so, what name has been substituted for it?
3. What are the reasons for this change of name?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries.) (Translation). The attention of the Bureau of Canadian Geographers has been called recently to an island upon the St. Lawrence indicated upon the charts under the name of 'L'Ile Soulanges' and 'L'Ile Dondaine'. The Bureau has decided for the adoption of the last name which seemed to have priority over the other, as it will, at the same time, avoid the repetition of the name Soulanges' already given to several localities, in the vicinity.

THE BOOK 'FARM WEEDS.'

Mr. GOODEVE asked:

1. How many copies of the work entitled 'Farm Weeds' were published, and what was the total cost?
2. How many copies have been distributed, to whom, what are the names of the parties receiving them, and how many copies to each?
3. How many copies are on hand at present?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. 25,000 copies at total cost of	$26,770 49
2. 18,500 copies, on application from:—	
Senators and Members of House of Commons, 3 copies each	525 00
Public Libraries, one copy each	925 00
Educational institutions, including rural schools in which libraries are maintained, or on behalf of which some assurance is given by inspectors of schools that the book will be maintained as the property of the school section	14,874 00
Agricultural Colleges, up to 30 copies each	412 00
Agricultural Organizations, one copy each	1,000 00
Farmers' Institute lecturers and Agricultural Educators, one copy each, and on personal application to others shewing a special interest in the subject	764 00
	$18,500 00

3. 6,500 copies.

INSPECTION OF DRESSED HOGS IN KENT AND ESSEX.

Mr. McCOIG—by Hon. R. F. Sutherland—asked:

1. How many dressed hogs have been inspected in the counties of Kent and Essex from October 1, 1908, to March, 1909, under the Meat Inspection Act?
2. How many hog carcasses were rejected by the government inspectors in Kent and Essex from October 1, 1908, to March, 1909.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. 12,330.
2. 10 entire carcasses, and portions of 954.

PAYMENTS TO ERNEST BOIVIN AND A. DESBIEN.

Mr. MONK—asked :

1. Has Mr. Ernest Boivin, of Bagotville, province of Quebec, been employed by the government on any of its works during the years 1906, 1907 and 1908? If so, during what space of time, in what capacity and at what salary?

2. How much has the said Ernest Boivin been paid by the government during the said three years?

3. Did the government during the first six months of 1908 issue a cheque of $14 in favour of one Auguste Desbien for work performed at or near Bagotville?

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

1 and 2. Ernest Boivin has not been employed by this department at any time; but on the 28th of June, 1904, he and one Onésime Coté entered into a contract with the department for the construction of a wharf at Sacré Coeur, which was duly completed on 1st July, 1905. The department has no knowledge what Mr. Boivin's share of the contract earnings may have been.

3. Yes.

INDEBTEDNESS OF GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY TO DOMINION GOVERNMENT.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR—asked :

1. In what amount, if any, is the Grand Trunk Railway Company indebted to the Dominion of Canada?

2. How much is owing for principal and interest, respectively, upon the said indebtedness?

3. How many years' interest is due?

4. On what date was interest last paid?

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

This deals with a very old and complicated account. It might be more convenient to put it as a motion for return, but as I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. George Taylor) might regard it as having a bearing on proposals of this session I have brought down the answer :

1, 2, 3 and 4. In the year 1862, five years prior to confederation, a reorganization of the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada was effected under chapter 56 of the Statutes of Canada of that year.

Provincial debentures of the provinces of Canada to the amount of $15,142,633.34 had been issued, prior to the passing of this Act, in aid of the company. These debentures carried interest at the rate of six per cent per annum.

By section 19, of the chapter referred to, the province of Canada consented to allow its claim for interest due and accruing in respect of these debentures to be postponed to the payment of certain charges which were made prior by the Statute. The section provided that after the payment of the working expenses of the Railway the balance of earnings was to be appropriated and applied in payment:—(a) of interest on equipment mortgage bonds; (b) of interest on first preferential bonds and the dividend due on first preference stock; (c) of interest due on second preferential bonds and the dividend due on second preference stock; (d) of dividend due on third preference stock; (e) of dividend due on fourth preference stock; (f) of dividend of 3 per cent per annum for ten years on the ordinary stock of the company and thereafter at the rate of 5 per cent per annum; (g) of further dividend on one per cent per annum on the third preference stock; (h) of further dividend of one per cent per annum on the fourth preference stock; (all the above were given priority over the government claim for interest); and then; (i) in payment of the interest for the time being due and accruing, subsequent to the 1st January, 1862, on the provincial debentures issued in aid of the company, before the passing of the Act, at the rate of 6 per cent per annum.

The interest on the provincial debentures referred to amounted, at the time of confederation, to $10,457,458.01. Amounts, represented by these province of Canada debentures, $15,142,633.34, and this interest of $10,457,458.01, were, at confederation, taken over by the Dominion from the province of Canada, and have since been carried in the balance sheet without change under the heading 'Railway Accounts,' but these amounts have not been included in the statement of assets of the Dominion.

As the net earnings of the company never met all the prior charges, as provided by the Act, no part of this interest has ever been payable.

There was also carried in the province of Canada accounts and taken over at confederation a special interest claim of $7,302.18, which has been continued in the balance sheet. This special interest claim arose from an adjusted balance of various accounts made between the province of Canada and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which balance was confirmed by an order in council of the 18th October, 1866.

Besides the above, the province of Canada was, at the time of confederation, the holder of fourth preference stock of the company, (converted, by section 11, chapter 18, Act of 1873, into third preference stock), of the par value of $121,739.65. Dividends have been paid to the Dominion on this stock on several occasions as follows :

During year	1881	$ 608 70
"	1883	1,643 48
"	1884	1,978 26
"	1902	1,217 40
"	1903	2,434 80
"	1905	2,434 80
"	1906	3,652 20
"	1907	3,652 20

This fourth preference stock was accepted by the province of Canada in payment of a certain part of the accounts adjusted by the order in council referred to.

DISRAELI WHARF.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. Referring to the statement of the Minister of Public Works as recorded in unrevised 'Hansard' of 10th March instant, as follows: page 2425, Mr. Pugsley,—It happens in that case that vessels land and deliver their cargo on the lower side of the bridge, and at the wharf, which is at the lower side of the bridge, and page 2429: With regard to the wharf at Disraeli, I am surprised at my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) should allow himself to be misled as to the facts of the case. When he went there on the occasion to which he has referred, he must have studiously avoided the side of the wharf which is frequented by vessels navigating the lake. The same rather unjustifiable and inconsiderate statement was made at the last session of parliament. A report had been made by the resident engineer to the effect that vessels do go to that wharf and that it is a very useful structure for the purpose of navigation. It is true, the wharf having been built, the municipal authorities used an end of it for supporting a bridge, and their doing so does not interfere with the purposes for which it was built. I hope my hon. friend will get more reliable information before he again speaks on that subject in this House,—(a) how many vessels carrying passengers or merchandise regularly called or landed at Disraeli wharf during the navigation season of 1908, and (b) called or landed at all during the season, (c) what were the names of these vessels, and of what tonnage were they?

2. What vessels, boats or craft of any kind called or landed at or used the said wharf during said season, and to what extent was it used?

3. What is the area of the lake called Lake Aylmer into which the stream passing under Disraeli wharf empties?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not sure that that question is regular as it referred to what happened in Committee of the Whole in a previous debate. The latter part of the question, I think, might be put.

Mr. LENNOX. I would prefer to withdraw altogether, Mr. Speaker, if you do not think it in order. It seems to me all right.

Mr. SPEAKER. Bourinot says that it is not regular to refer to what has been said or done in a previous debate, and this refers directly to what was said in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LENNOX. It is a mere question for purposes of certainty, it seems to me. But I will withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the latter part of the question is quite regular, but not the first part quoting the words of the minister.

Mr. LENNOX. I suppose the latter part covers the matter.

Mr. FIELDING. Stand, to be amended.

FRENCH TRANSLATION IN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. PAQUET asked:

1. Has the hon. Minister of Agriculture established in his department an office of French translation?

2. If so, when was it established, and what are the names of the translators?

3. Is the volume entitled in French La Statistique Annuaire, translated in the Department of Agriculture?

4. Are all the documents and reports respecting the office of agriculture translated in that department?

5. In what departments have offices of French translation been established?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. Yes.

2. 1907. C. E. Mortureux and L. Noailles, a temporary assistant. From 1892 to 1906 Mr. Louis D'Auray translated the Statistical Year Book, and from 1892 to 1908 Mr. Guignard translated the Experimental Farms Report.

3. Yes.

4. Yes, with the exception of such as are translated by the House of Commons translation staff.

5. All departments have officers or clerks who understand both of the official languages, and who translate documents from one language to the other for their departments.

MARCONI STATIONS BETWEEN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC.

Mr. ECREMENT asked:

1. Has the department of Marine and Fisheries received from certain navigation companies petitions asking for the installation between Montreal and Quebec of telegraph stations of the wireless Marconi?

2. If so, is it the intention to grant what is asked for in these petitions?

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

1. Yes. The Montreal Shipping Federation has sent such a petition.

2. Under consideration.

DUTY ON REPAIRS TO CANADIAN SHIPS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE asked:

1. Have any representations been made to the government to reduce or abolish the tariff or duty now payable on repairs done to Canadian ships in foreign countries?

2. If so, who were the individuals making these representations, and who did they assume to represent?

3. Is it the intention of the government to deal with the matter this session?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1 and 2. Definite representations have not been made to the Customs Department to reduce or abolish the duty now payable on repairs done to Canadian ships in foreign countries since the Act came into force July 20, 1908, except representations by the Dominion Marine Association not to impose the duty in any case where it is impossible to enter a Canadian dock on account of its previous engagement or occupancy.

3. The government is not prepared to make any statement on this point at present.

BONUSES OR SUBSIDIES—NONE PAYABLE.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Are any bonuses or subsidies payable under any legislation passed by this House overdue?

2. If so, what are the items and amounts, and why have such amounts not been paid?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). So far as I am aware there are none, but if the hon. gentleman will indicate more fully the purpose of his inquiry the matter will be more closely looked into.

DREDGING AT INDIAN POINT.

Mr. CROCKET—by Mr. Daniel—asked:

1. Were tenders called for the dredging which was done by the Maritime Dredging Company at Indian Point, N.B., last summer and fall?

2. If so, what tenders were received, what are the names of the tenderers and the amounts?

3. To what depth was the dredging done, and what was the depth of water before dredging?

4. How much in all was the contractor paid for rock and boulders exceeding two cubic yards, and how much for other materials?

5. From what appropriation was the money paid?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (for the Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.

2. Maritime Dredging and Construction Company:

Price per cubic yard, scow measurement.

Towed to dumping ground—

Rock or boulders exceeding 2 cubic yards	$17 00
Other materials	0 50

Cast over—

Rock or boulders exceeding 2 cubic yards	19 00
Other materials	0 50

3. Dredging at Indian Point last season was done to seven feet, low water summer level; average depth of water before dredging was three feet and eight-tenths below summer level, one third of track having but six-tenths depth at low water.

4. (a) Rock and boulders: $0.00

(b) All other materials: $48,247.68.

5. From appropriation 'dredging, maritime provinces.'

CARRIAGE OF GOODS BETWEEN CANADA AND GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

In view of the representations made by the Home and Foreign Produce Exchange, London, regarding the urgent need of a law to regulate water-carriage of goods between Canada and Great Britain, is it the intention of the government to introduce a measure for that purpose at the present session?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance.) A Bill dealing with that subject is now before the House.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE TARIFFS.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. When was the proclamation of the Governor in Council bringing into force part 1 of 7-8 Edward VII, chapter 61D, respecting telegraph and telephones issued?

2. What was the cause of the delay?

3. Has the railway board issued regulations as to the form, size and style of tariffs to be filed, and the information they are to contain and will the minister lay a copy upon the table of the House?

4. Will the companies be at liberty to charge at the rate of their old tariffs of tolls for four months after the date of the proclamation?

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

1. The proclamation referred to was published in the 'Canada Gazette,' February 6, 1909, bringing part 1 into force from and after Monday, the 8th February, 1909.

2. When the minister's attention was called to the fact that proclamation was necessary he immediately recommended that an order in council be passed authorizing it.

3. The board has not yet issued regulations as to the form, size and style of tariffs to be filed and the information they are to contain.

4. Yes, unless such tolls are in the meantime disallowed by the board.

INSPECTION PERMANENT CORPS AT ESQUIMALT.

Mr. BARNARD—by Mr. Cowan—asked:

1. When was the permanent corps at Esquimalt last inspected, and by whom was such inspection made?

2. Where does the inspecting officer reside?

3. What allowances for travelling or other expenses were made to the inspecting officer?

4. What was the total cost of such inspection?

5. Was any remuneration over and above his regular salary allowed to such officer for such inspection?

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

1. On June 21 and 22, 1908, the whole of the permanent corps at Esquimalt were inspected by the inspector-general.

2. The inspector-general has his headquarters at and resides at Ottawa.

3. The usual allowance and expenses made to an officer of his rank when travelling; i.e., actual cost of transport and $5 per diem to cover hotel expenses and subsistence en route.

4. Esquimalt was inspected by the inspector-general during his tour of inspection of all the corps west of the great lakes, and, as the expenses incurred on that tour were paid in a lump sum, it would be a difficult matter to arrive at the cost of any one particular inspection.

5. No.

TENDERS FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Is the government aware that in the Appropriation Act, 1908, 7-8 Edward VII, money was voted for the following purposes:—

(a) To provide for the construction and completion of a survey steamer for the Pacific coast and furnishing.

(b) For the purchase or construction of a steamer for the hydrographic survey of the gulf and river St. Lawrence, to replace 'La-Canadienne.'

(c) For the construction of an ice-breaking steamer for the Northumberland straits.

(d) For the construction and completion of a dredging plant for the river St. Lawrence from Father Point to Montreal.

(e) For the purchase or construction of a steamer to replace the fisheries protection cruiser 'Georgia.'

(f) For the purchase or construction of a vessel to replace the condemned fisheries schooner 'Osprey.'

(g) To provide a fisheries protection cruiser for the Pacific coast.

(h) To provide for the construction or purchase of a lighthouse tender and buoy steamer for the Great Lakes.

(i) To provide a boat for lighthouse and buoy service in the Bay of Fundy to replace the 'Lansdowne.'

(j) To establish and maintain a lightship at Pointe Pelee, Lake Erie?

2. Were tenders called for these various items and services? If so, which ones, and what are the dates?

3. Were tenders awarded for any of the above items? If so, to whom awarded, and what were the amounts respectively?

4. If tenders were called and contracts not awarded, why not, and in what cases?

5. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the construction or purchase of the items above referred to? If so, when and what items?

6. Is it the intention of the government to confine the purchase and construction of government steamers, vessels and dredges, to Canada, that the fair wage clause can be enforced as against contractors and shipbuilders?

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

a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j: Yes.

2. (a) Tenders were invited for the construction of a survey steamer for the Pacific coast in March, 1906.

(b) Tenders were invited for the construction of a hydrographic survey steamer for the Atlantic coast in October, 1908.

(c) Tenders were invited for the construction of an ice-breaking steamer for the Northumberland straits in February, 1908.

(d) No tenders were invited for the construction of a dredging plant for the River St. Lawrence as this work is being performed at the government shipyard at Sorel.

(e) Prices were obtained for the suitable vessels available in British Columbia to replace the 'Georgia,' and the most advantageous offer was accepted.

(f) No. The steamer 'Christine' was purchase and exchanged for the steamer 'Constance,' formerly owned by the customs Department.

(g) Tenders were invited for the construction of a fisheries protection cruiser for the Pacific coast in November, 1908.

(h) Tenders were invited for the construction of a lighthouse tender and buoy steamer for the great lakes in March, 1908.

(i) Tenders have not yet been invited for a boat for the lighthouse and buoy service in the Bay of Fundy.

(j) Tenders have not yet been invited for a lightship for Point Pelee, Lake Erie.

3. Yes. Contracts were awarded for the following:

(a) A survey steamer for the Pacific coast to the British Columbia Marine Railway Company, Limited, Victoria, B.C., at $143,000.

(c) The construction of an ice-breaking steamer for the Northumberland straits to Messrs. Vickers Sons and Maxim, of Barrow-in-Furness, at £103,000.

(h) A lighthouse tender and buoy steamer for the great lakes to Messrs. Swan, Hunter and Wigham Richardson, of Wallsend-on-Tyne, at £33,000.

4. The tenders for the construction of a steamer for the hydrographic survey of the Gulf and River St. Lawrence and a fisheries protection cruiser for the Pacific coast are now under consideration.

5. Answered in Nos. 2, 3 and 4.

6. The government is desirous of encouraging the building of vessels in Canada and will always give the preference to Canadian yards over foreign yards when same can be done with due regard to economy and efficiency.

RETURNING OFFICER FOR ST. JOHNS-IBERVILLE.

Mr. MONK asked.

Was J. A. Lussier, a notary of St. Johns, P.Q., the returning officer for the electoral

division of St. Johns-Iberville at the last federal elections? If not, under what authority was it announced for those having claims in connection with said election to call on him for payment?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). The returning officer for St. Johns and Iberville in the election of October, 1908, was Charles Arcand, farmer. His election clerk was M. J. Aimé Lussier, notary, of St. Johns, Quebec.

There is nothing of record in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of any action having been taken by Mr. Lussier in the election held in St. Johns and Iberville. Everything that was reported to the office mentioned was signed by Returning Officer Arcand.

SUPPLIES TO ROYAL CANADIAN DRAGOONS, ST. JOHNS.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. (a) Have the contracts for supplies to the Royal Canadian Dragoons, at St. Johns, P.Q., been awarded for the coming fiscal year? (b) If so, what is the name of each contractor and article, and the price of said articles, and (c) was the contract in each particular case awarded to the lowest tenderer?

2. If tenders were called, in what newspapers were said tenders advertised?

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

1. (a) Yes. (b) Contracts were awarded as follow:

For meat to L. Papineau, beef, 7½c per. lb.; mutton 7½c. per lb.

For bread, to Arthur Labelle, 2¾c. per lb.

For groceries and vegetables, to R. Gould—

		Cents.
Bacon, breakfast	per lb.	16
Bacon, green	"	12
Potatoes	"	1
Beans	"	3½
Jams	"	8¾
Butter (in 1 lb. lots)	"	25
Butter (in 25 lb. lots)	"	24
Cheese	"	14
Split pease	"	2½
Sugar, white	"	4½
Salt	"	½
Coffee	"	18
Tea	"	25
Pepper	"	15
Fresh vegetables	"	1
Lard	"	14
Yeast, Royal	per doz.	10

For forage, to George O'Cain—
Hay, $14 per ton of 2,000 lbs.
Straw, $7 per ton of 2,000 lbs.
Oats, 55c per bushel of 34 lbs.

For emptying refuse pits and cleaning chimneys, to Henri Masse.
Emptying refuse pits, $20 per month.
Cleaning chimneys, $1.75 per flue.

For scavenging to Ernest Camaraire.
Emptying latrines, 75cts. per flour barrel.

For removing manure, to T. C. McGinnis, at $8.50 per month.

For washing bedding, &c. to J. B. Thuot:

	Cents.
Blankets	each 5
Cases	" 4
Cases, bolster	" 1
Rugs	" 5
Sheets	per pair 5
Cases, pillow	each 1
White haversacks	" 2
Nose bags	" 1
Hospital clothing, per suit of 3 pieces	15
Hospital clothing, per suit of 2 pieces	6
Towels	each 1
Night shirts	" 2
Table cloths	" 6
Tuques	" 1
Aprons	" 2
Blinds	" 3
Bandages	" 1
Covers, mattresses	" 6

(c) Yes.

2. The St. John 'News,' 3 insertions, and 'Le Canada Francais,' 3 insertions.

Tenders were also called for by 50 posters, 25 in English and 25 in French, posted in or about St. Johns.

ST. JOHNS WHARF, P.Q.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What amount was expended last year in connection with the repairs to wharf at St. Johns, P.Q.?

2. What amount has been spent upon said wharf since the end of the fiscal year?

3. Was said wharf changed from wood to concrete? If so, why?

4. Who executed such repairs, and were they by contract?

5. Were tenders called for publicly through the newspapers? If so, in what newspapers?

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

1. $157.96 was expended for engineering expenses.

2. The sum of $5,500 was voted for 1908-09, under the head of 'Income,' for rebuilding the old wharf at the upper entrance; out of this amount $5,469.82 was expended as follows:

Labour	$2,451 05
Cement, stone, sand, lumber, &c.	3,018 77

3. The top of the old wharf repaired as stated above at a cost of $5,469.82, was changed from wood to concrete, so as to make it permanent.

4. The work of repairs to the old wharf was done by the canal repair staff, and the materials required, purchased under accepted tenders.

5. Since the work was done by the regular repair staff, by day labour, it was not necessary to call for tenders.

NEW WESTMINSTER PENITENTIARY.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked:

1. Who was the chief warden of the New Westminster penitentiary from 1876 to 1888?
2. How many prisoners escaped during that period?
3. Was Oliver Adair one of the escaped criminals? If so, what was his sentence and crime?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (for the Minister of Justice):

1. Arthur Hill McBride from the opening of the penitentiary in 1878, until, and for several years after, 1888.
2. Fourteen. Of these, nine were recaptured, leaving five escaped convicts at large December 31, 1888.
3. Francis Oliver Adair escaped with another prisoner on September 6, 1888. He was sentenced at Nanaimo, B.C., December 1, 1885, to serve a term of 15 years for the crime of robbery with violence.

GOVERNMENT FISHERY CRUISERS.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked:

1. How many fishery cruisers does the government own and operate for fisheries protection throughout the whole of Canada?
2. What are their names and where are they separately placed?
3. Has the government definitely decided to build cruisers for the British Columbia fisheries protection?
4. As the House of Commons appropriated a sum for this purpose two years ago, why has the work been delayed?
5. Have the claims for such protection been presented to the department? If so, by whom?

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

1. Nine.
2. 'Canada.' Southeast coast of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton.
'Constance.' Cape Breton coast.
'Petrel.' Prince Edward Island coast.
'Curlew.' Bay of Fundy.
'Princess.' Magdalen Islands and Lower Gulf Division.
'Vigilant.' Lake Erie.
'Kestrel.' British Columbia coast.
'Falcon.' British Columbia coast.
3. Yes, the government has decided to build a cruiser for the British Columbia fisheries protection service.
4. Tenders were called a year ago for the construction of the cruiser. The tenders received were not considered owing to representations made by some Canadian ship building firms, who suggested some changes in the plans and specifications. The plans and specifications were revised and new tenders called for. These tenders are now under consideration.
5. Yes. Mr. Ralph Smith, M.P., Vancouver Board of Trade, and Hon. Hewitt Bostock.

ST. JOHNS HARBOUR, PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Has a contract been awarded for works this coming spring and summer in the harbour of St. Johns, province of Quebec, and the extension of wharfs, construction of breakwater, and changing the intake pipe of the waterworks from its present location to one above the barracks?
2. If so, to whom was the contract awarded, was it awarded by tender, and what was the amount of the contract?
3. In what newspapers were tenders for the above works called for?

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

1. Yes; a contract was awarded for improving the harbour of St. Johns, province of Quebec, consisting principally of clearing the site of proposed wharf and dredging to the required depth, building a new wharf and breakwater. The contractor might also be required to build in, intake pipes for St. Johns' waterworks, and to take up those now in use.
2. Messrs. John G. Poupore & Company, awarded by tender, schedule rates. Contract to be completed by April 1, 1909, which when moneyed out on approximate quantities amounts to $35,282.
3. Montreal: The 'Jewish Times,' the 'Herald,' the 'Witness,' the 'Trade Review,' the 'Shareholder,' 'La Patrie,' 'La Presse,' 'Le Canada.'
St. Johns, Quebec: 'Le Canada Francais,' 'Le Progres,' the 'News.'
Valleyfield: The 'Progress.'
Lachute: The 'News.'
Richmond: The 'Times.'
St. Hyacinthe: 'L'Union.'
Brockville: The 'Recorder.'
Toronto: The 'Globe,' the 'Star.'
Ottawa: The 'Free Press,' 'Le Temps,' the 'Danebrog.'

MAIL CONTRACT, CHATEAUGUAY.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Who has now the contract for carrying the mail from the post office at Ste. Philomène, in the county of Chateauguay, to Ste. Philomène station, on the Grand Trunk Railway?
2. What is the yearly cost of this contract and when does it expire?
3. What distance has the present contractor to traverse.
4. Have tenders been asked to carry out a new contract for the same service? If so, what are the names of the parties tendering and their prices?
5. Has a contract been awarded for this same service? If so, at what price and for what length of time?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. François Labrie.
2. $93.50 per annum. Contract expires March 31, 1909.

3. 2½ miles each way daily.

4. Yes. Godfroi Labrie, $79; J. B. Damour, jr., $69.

5. A contract has been entered into covering the usual period of four years dating from April 1, 1909, price $69 per annum.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC LOAN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to have certain information prepared when the government's proposal respecting the loans to the Grand Trunk Pacific is brought down for discussion. I think the House should have all correspondence, reports and other documents relating to the matter. That goes as a matter of course. We ought to have a statement of the amounts actually expended up to date on the prairie and mountain sections respectively; also of the respective sources whence these sums have been derived; also an estimate of the cost when completed of the mountain and prairie sections respectively; also a statement of the amount required to complete each of these sections; also of the outstanding indebtedness of the corporation in respect of each of these sections and of the rolling stock; also a statement of the available assets of the company in respect to each of these sections. We should have full particulars of the location of these roads in relation to other existing roads now in operation; also a statement of the amount which has been expended on rolling stock and the dates when expended; also information as to the uses to which the rolling stock has been applied; and under what arrangement and for what consideration it has been so used; also a statement of the stock issues of the company and the proceeds thereof, and for what consideration and under what conditions or arrangements the stock has been disposed of and by whom it is now held; also information as to how the branch lines have been financed, and how they are to be financed; also information as to what these bonds would realize now if placed on the market, according to the opinion of the government; also information as to the prior mortgages now outstanding, of which I understand there are three; also a summary of these and copies to be laid on the table in so far as they have not already been laid on the table; also information as to the total anticipated capitalization of the eastern and western divisions respectively of the National Transcontinental; also all the information within the possession of the government as to what will be the amount of the total fixed charges upon each division and the total line when completed; also information as to the actual amount invested in the enterprise by the promoters of the undertaking. If there be any contract under which the indebtedness mentioned by the Minister of Finance this afternoon, the indebtedness of the Grand Trunk Railway to this country has arisen, I would like a copy of that contract laid on the table.

Mr. FIELDING. That refers to before confederation. I do not know whether there would be such a contract but we will look it up.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know either.

Mr. FIELDING. It was back in 1862.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am asking purely for information because that is a subject I know absolutely nothing of, and I would like to get some information about it.

I would like also a statement of all the indirect liabilities of Canada by way of guarantee or otherwise at the present time.

I would be glad also to have a statement of the results of any examination of the books of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company by the government or any officer of the government made in connection with the proposal which the government contemplates submitting to the House.

I would like also information as to the number of miles actually completed; the number of miles under operation during construction, if that is the proper term; and generally, information as to how far the work has progressed upon both the prairie section and the mountain section in all aspects of the work.

I have observed question No. 1 upon the Order Paper standing in the name of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). As this question has been upon the Order Paper since the 26th day of January I presume the answer to it has been prepared, and if it be convenient to the government I would be glad if they could give us that information at the same time.

Mr. FIELDING. So far as the information the hon. gentleman has asked for is within the possession of the government or accessible to the government we shall do our best to get it down. The order is a pretty large one and it deals somewhat in futures and I am not sure whether we can cope with it all. We will see that the hon. gentleman's request is put in the hands of officials with instructions to get as much of the information as is possible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Very well.

Mr. FIELDING. Would my hon. friend mind sending me his memorandum?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman is welcome to it but I am afraid he cannot read it.

Mr. FIELDING. I think I will make it out.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has two questions on

the Order Paper, one of them with reference to the original quantities that were estimated to be on the national Transcontinental Railway and the quantities as found by actual work upon the road. I would like to have that information before the discussion.

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. friend refers to the order of the House for the production of papers which has not yet been complied with. There is another motion on the Order Paper bearing on a somewhat similar question.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will ask the commissioners to give me that matter with all possible speed. I will look up the motion on the list and see what it calls for.

WATERS OF LAKE SIMCOE.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I would ask the Minister of Public Works when we may expect the return ordered by the House on the 8th of February respecting the measures taken by the government to lower the waters of Lake Simcoe and Lake Couchiching?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought that had to do with the Trent Valley canal and so was in the Railway Department, but I will make inquiries.

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE SEIZURES.

Mr. BARR. When will the return be brought down asked for on the 8th of February, concerning the seizures of the Department of Inland Revenue?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I was not aware a return had been ordered, but I will give instructions to have it brought down.

Mr. PATERSON. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the customs seizures?

Mr. BARR. I also asked for customs.

Mr. PATERSON. The return has been brought down with regard to both.

PAY OF MILITIA AT HALIFAX.

Mr. CROSBY. I am credibly informed that the men of the permanent force in Halifax have not yet received the last pay due them. If that be the case when will they be paid?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am informed that the fund for paying the permanent force was exhausted on the 7th or 8th of this month, but fortunately there was plenty of money voted during the last session of parliament for the whole militia. A slight readjustment will be necessary and the supplementary estimates which were laid on the table of the House a few days ago will provide for that readjustment. So soon as these estimates pass which I hope will be in a short time—perhaps within a few hours if the House consents—the pay will be available. I have heard no complaint from any source, and I wish to take this opportunity of reassuring the junior member for Halifax and the permanent force that the pay will be forthcoming in due season.

SUPPLY—RURAL FREE MAIL DELIVERY.

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

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I wish to direct the attention of the House to some matters pertaining to the department of the Postmaster General. It has been my privilege to have had a seat in the House for the past six years and I must say I have appreciated the ability shown by the Postmaster General both as Solicitor General and in his present office. And while I appreciate the efforts he has been putting forth on behalf of the people in general, I cannot fail to appreciate also the ability or the agility he has shown in taking a right about face on the important question of furnishing better mail facilities to the rural districts. I need not remind the House of the statements made by the Postmaster General for some years past on the important measure introduced on a number of occasions with regard to the establishment of rural free mail delivery in Canada. As we are all aware the hon. gentleman has distinctly stated many a time that we could not expect to have such a system until we had a population 20,000,000, and that it was a luxury that could only be thought of as ideal. Last session a resolution was moved urging upon the government the necessity of dealing with this matter in an energetic manner Every member on the government side of the House voted in direct opposition to that resolution, and it was generally understood that they would not take any other position on that important question. However, just on the eve of the general election the hon. Postmaster General, in a speech which he delivered at Niagara Falls, showed plainly the position he took in regard to it. He showed that it was his desire to make a political football of the question, by announcing to the people of the Dominion that he was going to give them free rural mail delivery. Not only did he humbug the people by his announcement on that occasion, but a number of Liberal candidates, in their political campaigns, announced repeatedly in their constituencies the wonderful advantages which the people would receive from the boon granted to them by the present government. I have

here papers showing that several Liberal members of parliament told their constituencies that they were not only going to get their mails delivered at their doors if they returned this government to power, but the boxes would be furnished to them free, that all they would have to do would be to bore a post-hole and put up a post, and the box would be delivered to them.

Let me go a little further. On the 17th of September, 1908, the Post Office Department issued a pamphlet which was quite different from the one which was issued only a few weeks ago. In the first pamphlet you will not find any reference to the price of the mail boxes or any suggestion that the people will have to pay for them, while in the later pamphlet the Postmaster General distinctly states that the cost of these boxes, with the necessary fittings, will be $3 each, and they can only be obtained from the Post Office Department. I cannot understand why the minister found it necessary to issue these two different pamphlets, were it not that he felt that the position which he had taken in the first place was not likely to meet with the general approval of the people.

However, let us look into this matter of the boxes for a few moments. The Postmaster General stated in reply to a number of questions I asked on the subject that he had purchased these boxes in the city of New York from the International Mail Equipment Company of New York. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain to this House who are the members of that company or tell us something about it; because I have here, from the latest report of the United States Post Office Department, a list of the firms which have supplied the boxes for the rural districts of the United States, not only during the last year, but during the past five years, and among the names of 300 firms I do not find any such name as the one mentioned by the hon. Postmaster General. How the hon. minister came to purchase 6,000 boxes from a firm which apparently has not been in the habit of manufacturing boxes for the rural districts of the United States I cannot quite understand. Further, in examining into the cost of the boxes used in the United States and comparing it with the price paid by the Postmaster General, I find a very great difference. For instance, out of over 300 boxes that are supplied to the Post Office Department of the United States there are two boxes that cost $2.75 each one at $3, one at $3.25, one at $3.50, and one at $4. The balance of the boxes cost only $2.50 or less. The average would not exceed $1.50. Yet the hon. Postmaster General goes to New York and purchases 6,000 boxes, costing in New York $3 each, and, according to his own statement, he pays the freight from New York to Ottawa and the customs duties on them, and delivers them to the different districts in Canada, and then they are not lock boxes. They are to be supplied with locks from the department at cost. So that the people of Canada will find, after the freight and customs duties are added to the amount paid for the boxes in the city of New York, and the amount they will have to pay for locks, that these boxes will cost them over $5 apiece. For 6,000 boxes that will amount to over $30,000. Let us compare that with the amount paid by the people of the United States for their boxes. The boxes are delivered to the farmers in the different districts, and the department at Washington pays for them only from 42 cents to $2.50 each. I hope the minister will be good enough to explain to us his position in that regard.

Then, I might ask why it is that in the proposition the hon. Postmaster General has made to this House, there is no provision for any reduction in the number of post offices; while the Post Office Department of the United States has been able to dispense with over 100,000 post offices as a result of the splendid system they have inaugurated in that country. I might ask the Postmaster General still further why it is that in the splendid system he has been granting to the people of the Dominion, he is not delivering registered letters and issuing money orders? He is aware that in the United States registered letters are delivered and money orders issued to the people living along the main and side roads, if they live within one mile of their box. and they are also able to purchase post cards and stamped envelopes, and have many other advantages. I might go on to speak of the parcel post. When a parcel that is too large for the box or a money order or a registered letter comes to a man who is living on a mail route or stage route at the present time, it would be necessary for him to go to the distributing post office, perhaps five miles away, to receive his mail or else he would have to depend entirely on the carrier. Further than that the minister knows that the system which he has inaugurated in Canada, although it may be called a step in the direction of rural mail delivery, can have no other result than to create contention and strife in the rural districts of Canada. I cannot understand why a man who happens to live on a mail or stage route—and I am sure the department will have difficulty in defining just which are the existing mail and stage routes—should have his farm increased in value owing to the advantages conferred on him by that delivery, by having his daily papers, having market quotations and many other advantages denied to others whose farms do not happen to be on mail routes. I am sure that when the

farmers thoroughly understand this question they will urge upon the Postmaster General the necessity of enlarging this scheme and giving this service to the thickly settled portions of the Dominion of Canada. The minister knows that the United States system is carried on under certain definite regulations, and while he may contend and try to becloud the issue by saying that our country is sparsely settled, that we cannot possibly grant to the people of Canada rural free mail delivery, yet he knows that in the United States the sparsely settled districts are not being served by rural free mail delivery, and the United States government have no intention of serving these rural districts until they become sufficiently populated to come under the existing regulations. The United States regulations provide that the standard route must be 24 miles long, that there must be 100 families on it, and that 84 of these must be willing to pay for a box and put it up before any route can be established; and if the route should be shorter than 24 miles the rural mail carrier's wages are proportionately reduced, although even if the route is shorter than the standard it must contain a proportionate number of families. Hence I claim that it is nonsense for members of the government to contend that the Americans have free delivery in the sparsely settled districts.

I would ask the minister what he intends to do with his present surplus. He may say that he is going to leave it as part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, but I would ask him if he thinks it is wise to make the Post Office Department a taxing department, that the postal service should be utilized to gather taxes from the people of Canada so that that money may be put into the different departments and, to a large extent, squandered as in the past few years it has been squandered. Does the minister propose to establish an all-red route, an all-red cable, and extend, as he seems to be willing to extend, the carrying of mails into foreign countries at a nominal charge? There is no talk of these propositions not paying, nothing is said with reference to the subsidies and steamship subventions which amounted to over $1,250,000 last year, for the carriage of mails into foreign countries. We hear nothing of these services not paying, and it is our duty to see that the men living in the rural districts, the men who pay two-thirds of the taxes that enable the government to carry on the public service, receive better facilities for the delivery of mail so that they may enjoy some of the advantages which are granted to the cities in Canada.

I know that the Postmaster General will say that we have been improving the postal service, that we have been increasing the number of postoffices in the scattered districts of Canada and to some extent in the thickly settled portions. That may all be true, but the minister knows full well that if we examine into this question more thoroughly he will find in Ontario some 40,000 square miles of thickly settled country in the rural districts of Ontario in which he could satisfactorily establish rural free mail delivery. He might also find in Quebec some 30,000 square miles of similar territory and then he might go to the maritime provinces or to the western provinces. When the minister thinks this is not a live question in the western provinces, he is sadly mistaken, because he must remember that large numbers of people are coming into those provinces from the United States who have been accustomed to these advantages in the United States and who feel the need of like advantages in Canada. It is only fair and reasonable that the people of the rural districts, who contribute so much of the money which permits the free delivery in cities, should enjoy similar advantages to those enjoyed by residents of cities. We cannot but appreciate that the men living in the rural districts are justified in urging on the government the necessity of the extension of this system.

Let us glance at the progress that they are making in the United States. Some 900 counties are to-day entirely covered by rural free mail delivery, and where necessary the postoffices have been dispensed with, saving a large amount of money. The star-route system which the minister claims to be established in Canada is not employed in the United States except in the most sparsely settled portions which enjoy free delivery. According to the statement of the minister, 44 routes have already been established in Canada and the actual cost to the department has been only $663 per annum. $663 per annum is the estimate given by the Postmaster General for the establishment of 44 routes, which amounts to an average of ouly $15.06 per route. Does the minister think that this is an extravagant proposition? Does he think it would involve a tremendous drain on the revenue of his department if he did likewise in the thickly settled districts of this country? I am satisfied that when he investigates this question, and I hope he will, he will see that we are not asking anything out of reason in regard to the establishment of this system in Canada.

Now, let us look a little further. The minister tells us that the system in the United States is a very expensive system. I would like to refer to a previous debate in this House in which the minister tried to becloud the issue and to lead the people of Canada to believe that this system was so expensive that we could not possibly think of undertaking it in the Dominion at this session of parliament. I am

satisfied that when he examines the reports of the United States he will no longer compare the Dominion of Canada, with its six millions of people, with the United States with its eighty-five millions, and he will not hold up before our people the expenditure of $35,000,000 in the United States for the purpose of frightening us and telling us that it would bankrupt Canada if we were to expend any such amount of money. Does the hon. gentleman not realize the fact that 18,000,000 of people in the United States are being served by rural free mail delivery, and that the $35,000,000 that are being spent on the system amounts to only $2 for each family that is being served? But that does not take into account the income received by the Post Office Department for the sale of stamps to people in those rural districts, and the amount of money that is spent on stamps in outside districts for sending mail matter to those people who are living in the delivery districts. Let the minister appreciate this fact that last year when there were 40,000 routes in operation supplying 18,000,000 of people the system covered 1,000,000 miles of road; the carriers covered an aggregate of 200,000,000 miles and 2,000,000,000 pieces of mail were handled by the rural free mail delivery carriers on those 40,000 routes. Does the minister not realize that in handling this enormous amount of mail matter there is an enormous revenue coming into the department from the stamps that are sold, both to the people who send the mail and the people who reside in those rural districts? Now, the amount of revenue that comes into the Post Office Department from those 2,000,000,000 pieces of mail matter only represents a cost to the people of $2 per head. It is evident when you take into consideration the enormous revenue that is gathered under this system that the people of the United States do not look upon rural districts as being producers of deficits, but the reverse. Only a year or two ago the Postmaster General of the United States stated that instead of the rural free mail delivery system being a deficit producer, it is a revenue producer. I would remind the hon. gentleman that the President of the United States distinctly urged upon Congress the necessity of extending this system, and giving a better service and a more expensive service even than they have at the present time.

But the minister will say they had a deficit of $16,000,000 last year. That is true. The increase in the post office revenue for the last number of years has exceeded over 9 per cent, while last year the increase did not exceed 4·24 per cent. But if he will take into consideration the fact that over $9,000,000 were paid in increased wages to employees in the Post Office Department and that there was a falling off in the revenue owing to the financial depression in that country, he cannot but conclude that, had it been a normal year and under normal circumstances, there would have been a surplus instead of a deficit. Now, let us look at the matter in another light. In 1896 when the United States government undertook the establishment of rural free mail delivery the deficit in the Post Office Department was over $11,000,000, at a time when they had only expended on the system $14,000. Last year when they were expending $35,000,000, the deficit only amounted to a little over $6,000,000, nearly one-half of what it was when they were expending only $14,000 on the system. I wish to quote from the annual report of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General made in 1903:

> The average number of routes in 50 states and territories was 315. The average number of houses on each route was 137. The average population on each route was 585; the average number of boxes, 70; the average number of patrons, 381; and the average cost of each route, $597.80.

Those people who oppose the introduction of the system into Canada should take into consideration these figures, which go to show that the United States has not established rural free mail delivery at all in the sparsely settled districts, nor do we on this side of the House urge on the minister to establish rural free mail delivery in any districts but those where the system can be carried on successfully, and that are thickly populated. Now I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that it is necessary for him to make a further investigation into this subject. He has been able to go part way, by granting rural free mail delivery to a portion of the country. But there is no doubt in my mind that, before many years pass, he will be compelled by public opinion and by the position the people are taking in many districts to grant this advantage to the thickly-settled portions of Canada generally. The increase in the value of the farms in the United States has been very great where rural free mail delivery has been established. Take a farm worth $5,000; if it increases only five per cent—and prominent men in the United States say that the increase in farm values has been a great deal more than five per cent—there is an increase of $250. If the minister were called upon to spend an average of that amount in delivering mail to the people on these farms it would mean that the farmers could afford to pay $5 a year for fifty years for this great boon. But it is not necessary for them to pay any such amount. I have here the statements published by Mr. Hamilton, of the Toronto 'News,' who gathered a great mass of facts in regard to the establishment of rural mail

delivery in the county of Lincoln. I need not tell the minister that many counties in the eastern provinces of the Dominion have what are called militia maps. These maps show exactly the number of homes on the different roads. By the aid of such maps, you could lay out routes for free mail delivery that would cover the county completely. The minister, of course, is aware of this fact. I wish I had time to place on record the splendid material which has been gathered concerning the county of Lincoln by Mr. Hamilton. But I may say that he has shown that sixteen routes would cover the county, and that the cost to the people of that county would not exceed fifty cents per head over the cost of the present system. Lincoln is not thickly populated, for if the minister will investigate the figures, he will find that there are only thirty-four families to the mile. After studying these facts, as I have done, I cannot come to any other conclusion than that we have in the Dominion of Canada at least 1,700,000 living in the rural districts who could be successfully served by a rural free mail delivery system. If we take the minister's system of delivery in the county of Lincoln, even if it were thoroughly carried out there would be only 600 people who would be reached, while 2,500 people, who have as good a right to mail deliveries as the others, would be compelled to do without it. I only call these matters to the attention of the minister, that he may investigate the matter more fully. If he will do so, I am satisfied that he can only come to one conclusion, the conclusion that I reached many years ago—that it is time for us not only to investigate this matter but to make the system part of the Post Office Department for the benefit of our people generally.

There is another matter of which I wish to speak. I would urge upon the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) the necessity of investigating the mail matter that is coming into this country under the British preference. I wish I could bring the minister to see the necessity of appointing a board whose duties would be to cause to be examined practically every bit of literature coming into this Dominion. There is no doubt in my mind that masses of literature are coming into this country whose only tendency is to degrade and demoralize the people. The Postmaster General can go to the bookstores of this very city and find stacked up there the cheap novels coming from Great Britain, and also the cheap weekly periodicals, whose influence upon the people is so injurious. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) said, a few days ago, that the amount of material coming through his department in the shape of books and novels was $350,000 worth, and that the cheap periodicals and papers came in free. While the Postmaster General may try to saddle the Minister of Customs with some responsibility in this regard, I cannot but feel that we should have a board of censors. For, though you put your best and ablest men to teach in your colleges, to preach in your pulpits, to lead in your sabbath schools, yet you may depend upon it that, if you allow the literature that is now coming into this country to continue to come in, much of the good that our best institutions would bring to the people will be neutralized.

Another suggestion I would make to the Postmaster General is this: We need inspectors in the Post Office Department. The Postmaster General may say that he already has inspectors in the different districts of the Dominion. That is true. But their duties are so heavy that they are not able to go into the rural districts and examine the post offices. What we need is a body of inspectors whose powers are as wide as the Post Office Department can possibly grant, and whose duties will be to go into the different post offices, examine the systems in use, look into the finances, consider the different postal routes and in every way seek to improve the carrying and distribution of the mail.

But that which I wish particularly to impress upon the minister is what I have said in regard to the establishment of rural free mail delivery. I sincerely trust the Postmaster General will receive these remarks in the spirit in which they are made, and will investigate this system which is in vogue in the United States. For. I am satisfied, that had the hon. gentleman investigated the systems now in operation in Great Britain, New Zealand, Germany, France, and other countries, he would have found that the best system in vogue for our purposes is that of the United States. The people of that country have had the advantage of the system for the last eleven or twelve years, and it is time that we began to investigate it, to say the least. Surely we will be able to improve upon the position they have been taking because we will be able to benefit by the mistakes made in the past. I would urge on the minister the necessity of investigating this question without further delay.

Mr. C. J. THORNTON (Durham). As a young member, representing a rural constituency, I would like to say a word or two on this question of rural free mail delivery. I feel particularly interested in it because I represent a county which is almost entirely agricultural. I have been impressed with the conviction that there should be something done in the way of giving our agriculturalists better mail facilities. I was therefore glad when the government proposed to institute such a system, and I have been pleased with the

spirit which the hon. Postmaster General has shown towards those members who have seen fit to interview him in connection with postal matters. I must say, without any desire to flatter, that I think the Postmaster General is anxious to serve the people and the rural constituencies in the best manner possible. But in looking over the matter, I must say that it does not appear to me that a comprehensive plan of rural free mail delivery has been inaugurated by the minister such as we should have had. Looking at the conditions in my own county, it appears to me that the plan devised by the minister is one which benefits an already favoured class. Take my own county as an example, and what applies to my county will apply to nearly all the rural constituencies in Canada. In my county there are about 140 miles of mail routes, and the people on those routes are the most favoured so far as mail facilities are concerned. They have nearly all of them, and have had for years, a system of rural mail delivery of their own. They pay the mail carrier a yearly sum of from $1 to $2 each, in return for which he drops their mail in boxes placed at their gates. In my county the residents along the mail route pay the carrier $1.50 per year for that service. But outside of those mail routes, the great majority of the people have no mail facilities of that kind. Taking my county again, I find that there are about 1,500 miles of travelled roads along which farmers reside, but there are only 140 miles that would be served with free mail delivery, according to the plan laid down in this little pamphlet. These are particularly favoured, while the people on the other 1,350 miles enjoy no such mail facilities. I would like to see the minister bring down a broad, comprehensive plan of rural free mail delivery which would serve the great majority of the agricultural class. I do not say that he could serve all the people, but I do believe that a plan could have been devised which would have given free rural mail delivery to a much larger portion of the agricultural class.

But there is another matter of more importance, and that is that there are large communities of wealthy, tax-paying people who are without any postal facilities whatever. What I mean by that is that they live long distances from the post office. There are communities in which there are large thickly settled districts of comparatively wealthy people, who contribute largely, directly and indirectly, to the revenues of the country, and who have not anything like efficient postal service. In my opinion it should be the first duty of the Postmaster General to see that these communities are served before any system of rural free mail delivery is instituted.

There is another question of importance to my mind, and that is the inadequate compensation paid our rural postmasters. I know that there was a re-adjustment of the scale of remuneration paid to postmasters a few years ago and that the postmasters get more now than they did previously. But I want to point out that while the revenues from many of our country post offices have not increased, the work has increased three-fold. I need but mention but one office in my own county, which is a fair sample of many of them. The work in connection with that office has been increased three-fold inside of twenty-five years, while the revenue has not increased. Twenty-five years ago we had only one daily paper and to-day we have twenty-five. Twenty-five years ago there were twenty-five weekly papers taken at that post office and there are a hundred and twenty to-day. And then we have to-day catalogues and circulars by the hundreds and thousands delivered at that office. Twenty-five years ago we had none of these. I know, as a matter of fact, that it takes in that office one person, seven to eight hours a day delivering postal matter, and for this he is paid some $35 a year or about 11 cents a day, and there has always to be some person in attendance. That is one of the things which should engage the attention of the Department of the Postmaster General.

There is another matter of importance, and that is the re-arranging of the postal route. In my own county there is a mail delivery at a certain point on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the mail from that point, which is a distributing office leaves that office at 11 a.m. by horse and buggy, and delivers mail at a certain office on the route at 4 o'clock, p.m. Now, at that very point there is a mail train passing within a stone's throw of that office at 11.40 in the forenoon and there could be a mail delievered at that office at that hour, instead of waiting until a horse travels 11 or 12 miles to reach the office at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. We are away behind the times when we allow such a state of things to exist. Unfortunately this is not an isolated case for there are very many others all over the country. Now, first of all I would like to see a good comprehensive system of free mail delivery, but before that I would like to see postal facilities given to many communities who have no adequate postal facilities to-day and who need them badly. In the second place I would like to see better remuneration paid the country postmasters, and in the third place I would urge a re-arrangement of the postal routes so as to give the people the very best facilities for the delivery of mail matter. I hope the Postmaster General will give these matters his best attention.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I have listened with great attention to the remarks of the hon. mem-

ber for Durham (Mr. Thornton), and even though I do not share his views I must congratulate him on the manner in which they were expressed by him. I am sure the hon. gentleman will be quite an addition to the House and especially to His Majesty's loyal opposition. I have taken note of his suggestions for improvements in our postal system, and will give them attention. As regards the number of post offices in the country districts I may tell the hon. gentleman that since I have been Postmaster General it has been my aim and my pleasure to increase as much as possible the postal facilities by adding to the number of post-offices and thereby reducing the distance between those previously existing. In the olden times when the population of this country was sparser the distances between the post-offices ranged from 10 miles to 20 miles, but of course that system got out of date and in view of our buoyant revenues I decided some years ago that we should reduce the distances between post offices to from 3 miles to 6 miles which is about the present average. As regards better remuneration for Postmasters I would remind the hon. gentleman that under the regime of the Conservative government postmasters were paid $12 a year, and that when Sir William Mulock took office he increased that to $25 a year and when I became Postmaster General three years ago I came to the conclusion that the surplus we had in the department entitled us to increase the remuneration of our rural postmasters so as to give them $35 a year. I also increased the percentage on rental, fuel, and light and to-day, generally speaking, our postmasters derive quite a nice revenue from their offices and there are no complaints. As to rearranging our postal routes I may inform the hon. gentleman that that rearrangement is going on quietly throughout the country. As new settlers go into New Ontario and New Quebec, and the west, we are naturally forced to rearrange the postal facilities and to give to outside settlements the facilities which the travelled routes enjoyed for many years. The inspectors in these new districts have received special instructions in that regard and I can assure the hon. gentleman that the good work will be continued in the future. I now come to the question of rural mail delivery and I hope my remarks will be brief. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) referred to my right about face on that question but I can assure him that I made no right about face at all. I acted in perfect consistency with the views expressed by me on previous occasions in this House. I said that in view of our area, of our scattered population. and of our revenue, I could not favor for Canada the same system of rural free delivery which had been adopted in the United States. But at the same time I said I was in favour of the system known in the United States as the star route system, and that I would be glad to be able to adopt it as an experiment in Canada.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister say when he first made that statement?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have not 'Hansard' at hand, but I shall later on give my hon. friend the citation. The hon. gentleman will remember that I pointed out that in the United States they have a dense population and a large revenue, which justified free rural mail delivery, but that we in Canada having the same area but less revenue and less population could not so advantageously adopt it. I stated at the same time I would be in favour of the star route system and that is the system which we inaugurated in Canada a few months ago. When in the month of September last I was in Ontario with the Prime Minister, the question of the star route system had been discussed not only by the officers of my department but by the cabinet several months before, and I never dreamed that I would be accused of trying to corrupt the electors of this country, because on the 15th day of September at the opening of the electoral campaign I announced to the people of Canada that we had decided to establish a system of rural mail delivery. I do not see anything smacking of corruption in that announcement It is a matter of public policy ; and if the government could take credit for the establishment of that policy, I do not know what power would prevent me from announcing the policy and giving due credit to the government for it.

Why, Mr. Speaker, if the announcement I made at Niagara Falls was an act of corruption, I only followed in the path of the hon. leader of the opposition, who two years ago in the Halifax platform stated that if he were supported by the people and became Prime Minister, he would give to the people of this country free rural mail delivery, and recently, at a banquet given by his friends under the roof of this very building, he stated again that if he were placed at the head of affairs of this country, he would give the people of Canada free rural mail delivery. I do not intend to give the people of Canada free rural mail delivery, as they have it in the United States, but I will give to the people of Canada the measure of free rural mail delivery which I established in September last, and which is now working fairly well. I did not say in my speech at Niagara Falls that I would give every farmer a box where collection and delivery of the mails could be made every day. I have the manucript of the speech which I delivered

on that occasion, and which was published verbatim on the 16th September, in the Toronto 'Globe'; and here are the words I used:

As I have often stated in parliament, it is a splendid system which I admire greatly, and which can be introduced step by step in Canada. For some two or three years, acting under my instructions, the officers of the department have been studying the main features of rural delivery as operated in the United States with a view to the possible introduction of a scheme in accordance with our revenue, population, and physical conditions.

Towards that end, the Post Office Department has evolved a scheme of rural delivery and collection from the present system of stage routes whereby the rural population of the country may be able to receive and post all ordinary mail matter at their doors instead of having to drive from two or three miles to the nearest post office for that purpose.

I have, therefore, determined, with the consent of my colleagues to equip all existing mail routes in Canada with rural delivery boxes, under regulations to be published and enforced shortly. At the junction of every concession line with the main road the people will also be given the privilege of having boxes located for the receipt and collection of their mail, as desired.

The department has made all arrangements for the carrying out of this scheme, and will at once proceed to inaugurate it. This system of rural mail delivery can be introduced at a cost which the country can afford to pay. It will evolve and expand gradually with the growth and development of Canada and at a ratio of cost that will not prove burdensome. It is, on the whole, a great postal reform which will be hailed with delight by the farmers of Canada.

That is the declaration I made, and it was not made with a view of corrupting the electorate—far from it. I do not believe the farmers could be induced to vote for the government simply because the government does its duty in placing postal boxes on the road for the collection and delivery of letters. Mr. Speaker, there are two systems of rural mail delivery: there is free rural mail delivery, and there is the star-route system. The free rural mail delivery as differentiated from the star-route system, consists in the delivery and collection of letters, papers, parcels, registered letters and registered parcels. In fact, free rural mail delivery, as they have it in the United States, serving, as my hon. friend has stated, eighteen millions of people, is simply a post office on wheels, equipped with postal facilities, postal notes and money orders. That system is a most expensive system, which we in Canada are not in a position to adopt. The other system, the star-route system, is described in this blue-book, which was distributed to all members of the House a few days ago, in these words:

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Any person living on or contiguous to a rural mail route and not within one-quarter mile of the corporate limits of any city, town or village, who desires his mail deposited in a box authorized by the department at a given point on the line of the route by the rural mail courier, may take advantage of the opportunity offered.

That is to say, the ordinary mail courier starts on his route with the mails, and if the patrons on each side of the route have these boxes, he delivers to or collects from the boxes, but he does not sell postage stamps and does not deliver registered letters unless an order is given to him by the patron to do so. That system is also in vogue in the United States; but before I proceed to explain it more fully, let us see what are the cold facts and the cold figures of the cost of free rural mail delivery in the United States, how the system has evolved in that country and how it has come to attain the proportions which it has to-day. Now, I will answer the questions put by my hon. friend as they arose in the course of his remarks. Rural free delivery has been in operation in the United States for over twelve years. Starting as an experiment in 1897, with 83 rural routes, the number has increased in the following gradation: in 1898, there were 148 routes, in 1899, 391; in 1900, 1,276; and since that time the number has increased by leaps and bounds until at the close of the fiscal year 1908 there were 39,277 routes in operation. What about the expenditure for these routes? Remember always that we have practically the same area as the United States. The expenditure for rural mail delivery in 1897, when the experiment was started, was $14,884, a very humble figure; but in 1898 it was $50,241; in 1899, $150,000; in 1900, $420,433; and in the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1908, the expenditure for free rural mail delivery in the United States, which my hon. friend from Lambton would be so happy to see established in Ontario, Quebec, and the other provinces, had reached the stupendous figure of $34,361,463. It began in 1897. Then every politician in the United States, every congressman was anxious to have his little free rural mail delivery in each county and each state and to-day the Postmaster General of the United States throws up his hands and says, raising his arms to heaven: 'It is startling, I do not know when it will stop.' What about salaries to rural mail carriers, because you cannot expect them to perform that duty without pay. As they are always on the route they are quite friendly with the powers that be, they are pretty good politicians themselves and try to get from the United States treasury the best salaries they can. The average salaries paid to rural carriers in the United States by biennial periods since 1897, have been as follows:

1897	$178
1899	383
1901	406
1903	532
1905	650
1907	711

For 1908, the year of the presidential election, the average was $877.68. These are the salaries paid to each mail carrier for the beautiful but expensive system of free rural mail delivery in the United States. The United States, of course, can afford to have that luxury. As I stated on another occasion, my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) may be in a position to travel in an automobile. His revenue may justify him in making that expenditure, but a poor man like myself will always be satisfied to travel in the tramway. However, my hon. friend may say: 'Why do you not travel in an automobile? You will get a breath of fresh air and besides it is more luxurious.' Of course it is, but it depends on the revenue. My hon. friend can travel in an automobile and I can only afford to travel in a tramway. Well so far as the mails are concerned the United States can travel in automobiles and we must be satisfied with the ordinary vehicles.

The receipts of the United States postal department from all sources during the last fiscal year were $191,478,864.41. The expenditures amounted to $208,351,886.15, showing a deficit of $16,872,222.74. The expenditure of the Post Office Department in the United States on account of rural free delivery forms the second largest item in the total expenditure for the year. It is exceeded only by the expenditure for railway transportation. Of the total amount of the deficit for the last fiscal year, which is the largest in the history of the United States Post Office Department, $9,891,321.92 is due to increased rate of pay to post office clerks, letter carriers, railway mail clerks and rural carriers. The increased pay of the rural carriers accounts for $6,594,837.18, of this deficit. That is to say 66-⅔ per cent of the whole deficit is eaten up by the free rural mail delivery. It is estimated that the rural delivery routes will cost $35,500,000 for the fiscal year 1909 and considerably over $36,000,000 for the next fiscal year, 1910. These figures are all taken from official returns. I wish to quote the words of the Postmaster General of the United States who says in his last report of the rural free delivery system:

> The expenditure for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, was $14,840, while for 1908 it was $34,361,463. What the expenditure will be ten years from now is startling to consider.

If that is not a doleful expression from the Postmaster General of the United States I do not know what it is.

The whole question in a nutshell is: Can Canada afford the luxury of free rural mail delivery as they have it in the United States or can she not? I claim and the figures are there, that we are not in a position to operate a similar system in Canada, but that we can evolve from our present system a scheme of rural mail delivery which our population and revenue will justify.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister admits that 18,000,000 people in the United States receive their mail delivered at their doors in the rural districts. Has he any estimate as to the number of people in Canada living in thickly settled districts who would likely be served? There cannot be two million.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is very easy to learn from the census returns which are the thickly-settled and which the sparsely-settled portions of Canada. I do not need to send my officers to prepare a statement showing these conditions. Any one who is at all conversant with the different sections of Canada knows that this section of Ontario in which my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) resides is a thickly-settled section, while many of those in the west are sparsely-settled. I do not mean to be at all demagogic, but I claim that what the thickly-settled portions of Canada receive, the sparsely-settled portions should receive also; I do not want to discriminate in this matter; what the people of Ontario and Quebec receive, the people of the west must also receive.

Now, in the United States also they have the star route system. The department inaugurated the policy of delivering mail into and collecting it from boxes along the lines of star routes, and an obligation requiring such service was incorporated in the new contracts as they were made from year to year covering the four contract sections. The service is incidental to the transportation of the mail over star routes, and involves no specific increase in expense. These facilities supply a valuable convenience to rural residents, and are appreciated. The Postmaster General of the United States says in his report:

> The contracts for star-route service in all parts of the United States now provide for delivering mail into and collecting it from boxes along the lines of the routes. This feature of the service has proved highly satisfactory to the large number of patrons so served, and is recognized as a valuable public convenience.

Now, our system, which is the star route system, must have regard to the vast area to be served, and also to our population and our revenue. What is our postal revenue as compared with that of the United States? The revenue of our Post Office Department for the year ending March 31,

1908, was $9,483,166.13. There is quite a difference between this and the revenue of the Post Office Department of the United States. And, although we have about the same area as the United States, bear in mind that the population of that country is fourteen times as large as ours, while their postal revenue is twenty-one times as large as ours. The postal revenue of Canada represents $1.50 per capita, while the postal revenue of the United States represents $2.50 per capita of their large population. As I have just stated, the two conditions most essential for rural free mail delivery, as they have it in the United States, England, France, Germany or Belgium, are, first, large revenues and, second, large population and thickly-settled country. My hon. friend praised the United States, and I do not begrudge our American cousins the praise the hon. gentleman gives them. But my hon. friend must remember that in the United States they adopted rural free mail delivery, not when they had a population of seven or eight millions, the population that we shall show at the next census according to the recent prediction—I hope, a sound prediction—of the Minister of Agriculture. My hon. friend must remember that when the United States had a population of only seven or eight million, the system of rural free mail delivery existed in Europe. It is not by any means a new thing; it existed in Europe at the beginning of the last century; it had been successfully carried on in England, France and Germany for nearly a hundred years before the United States adopted it. The United States waited until they had reached a population of seventy million and a postal revenue of $80.000.000—a practical acknowledgment and illustration of what I have just said that, in order to give rural free mail delivery there must be a population and there must be revenue. This is an expensive system, though a beneficial one.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask the Postmaster General a question? Is it his intention, so far as he is concerned, to establish free rural mail deliveries only when we have a population of twenty millions?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Post Office Department is giving the country a good service, an up-to-date service, and it intends to follow the development of the country and to expand with the expansion of the country. I would not like to make from my place in parliament any vain promises to the people of Canada. I will act cautiously—I was going to say that I would act conservatively. I have been asked to act cautiously by the farmers of Canada. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) says it is a sham; he has even used a very unparliamentary term and has spoken of 'humbug.' He did not mean it, I am sure; he does not know what the word means, for he himself has never humbugged anybody. The farmers can speak for themselves. I do not believe there is a better representative body of the farmers in Canada than the Grange, which has its seat of influence in the province of Ontario. Probably there are many grangers in my hon. friend's constituency. Let me quote from an account of the proceedings of the Grange:

> The report of the Resolution Committee covered a number of propositions but it is stated that the clause in the report which drew forth the most animated discussion was the one dealing with rural mail delivery. The clause as drafted contained the following:—
>
> We desire to commend the Dominion government for inaugurating free rural mail delivery. At the same time we would urge the necessity of going cautiously and profiting by the experience of other peoples who have adopted this system.

My hon. friend knows that the Grange is an outcome of the farming community of the United States, and the institution, as we have it in Canada, came to us from that country. The Grange informs the Canadian Postmaster General that it commends his action but urges him to be cautious and to profit by the experience of the country where the Grange itself was established.

> We would also urge that regulations be laid down to enable all rural communities to avail themselves of the advantage of free mail delivery.

The 'Weekly Sun,' in which Dr. Goldwin Smith—'A Bystander'—writes, says, with reference to the debate on this resolution:

> The general expression of opinion on the part of the members was that, while they appreciated what the Dominion government has done, it would be a dangerous thing to proceed too rapidly along this line. The general feeling was that the service should be extended only as the revenue derived in return warrants.
>
> There was a decided indisposition to ask for anything that was likely to involve a charge upon the general revenue for the special benefit of farmers. Eventually the first section of the resolution was adopted, and other sections eliminated, thus simply declaring approval of the action of the government in inaugurating free rural delivery along the line of existing mail routes, and at the same time urging the necessity of going cautiously and profiting by the experience of others.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to follow the advice of the grangers, the advice of the farmers of Canada, who understand their own interest, and who would not like to see the Postmaster General rush in where angels fear to tread. But my hon. friend says: What are you going to do with your surplus? My surplus? No, the surplus of Canada, the surplus of the farmers of

Canada. Has my hon. friend followed the expansion of the department of late years? Does he not remember that under the regime of his friends there was a huge deficit of $700,000 a year in round figures, every year? When Sir Wm. Mulock took office he administered the department in such a way as to wipe out that deficit and to create a surplus. But did he not do anything for the people of Canada with that surplus? While he increased the revenue of the department, he was at the same time able to reduce the rates and thereby to reduce the postal taxation. The inland letter rate has been reduced from three cents to two cents per ounce or a fraction thereof; the letter rate from Canada to the United States was reduced from three cents to two cents per ounce; the letter rate from Canada to Great Britain and to every portion of the British empire was reduced from five cents to two cents per half ounce; and in October last it was made two cents per ounce or fraction thereof; the rate on drop letters in cities has been reduced from two cents to one cent per ounce, a lower rate than exists in any other country of Europe or America; the rate on Canadian newspapers and periodicals sent from publishers in Canada to subscribers in Great Britain and every other part of the empire, was reduced from eight cents per pound to a quarter of one cent per pound; the rate on Canadian newspapers and periodicals sent by the general public in Canada to correspondents in Great Britain and other parts of the empire, was reduced from eight cents per pound to four cents per pound, a reduction of 50 per cent. It is also to be borne in mind that the reduction in the rates on papers sent by publishers in Canada to subscribers in Great Britain tends to the wider dissemination throughout the empire of Canadian newspapers and other publications. So it is easy to see what has been done by the Postmaster General with the surplus in the department since 1897.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how have we served the country with our surplus? Let us look at the expansion of the service as shown by this table:

EXPANSION OF SERVICE.

Number of post offices.

1896	9,103
1908	11,823

Increase, 2,720.
Percentage of increase, 30 per cent.

Money order and postal note offices.

1896	1,310
1908	9,637

Increase, 2,720.
Percentage of increase, 636 per cent.

Post office savings bank.

1896	755
1908	1,084

Increase, 329.
Percentage of increase, 43 per cent.

Total miles of annual travel of mails.

1896	30,551,683
1908	43,986,149

Increase, 13,434,466.
Percentage of increase, 44 per cent.

Number of letters carried.

1896	116,028,000
1908	396,011,000

Increase, 279,983,000.
Percentage of increase, 241 per cent.,

Total number of articles carried in mails.

1896	177,178,136
1908	519,452,045

Increase, 342,254,909.
Percentage of increase, 190 per cent.

Amount of money transmitted by money orders and postal notes.

1896	$13,081,860
1908	55,284,595

Increase, $42,202,735.
Percentage of increase, 323 per cent.

Number of depositors in savings banks.

1896	126,442
1908	165,691

Increase, 39,249.
Percentage of increase, 31 per cent.

Financial results.

1896 (deficit)	$ 781,152
1908 (surplus)	1,101,827

Making a financial improvement of $1,882,979.

I said a moment ago that in 1896 there was a deficit of $700,000 a year; last year we had the magnificent surplus of over a million dollars. These, Mr. Speaker, are some of the things we have done with the surplus of the Post Office Department.

My hon. friend stated a moment ago that the box which was supplied by the Post Office Department for this special service, was a box unknown in the United States. For the information of my hon. friend let me tell him that in the United States they have nearly 300 styles of boxes in use, and it was decided lately to do away with all of them and to adopt the box which Canada has been the first to adopt. In the month of July or August last there was a committee appointed by the United States Congress to examine the latest pattern of postal boxes with which to replace the 300 patterns which they have been using there, and that special committee decided unanimously that the best box to be used in that great country was the one selected by Canada. The box they have adopted, following our example, is one which can be used without the letter carrier being obliged to dismount from his carriage, thereby saving time, and giving better collections and better delivery to the carrier. My hon. friend says the box costs $2. It would be easy for this government to make cheap popularity by saying to the farmer, we will give you that box free of any cost. That would sound so well before a general election.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might I ask the Postmaster General a question? In his speech at Niagara Falls did he make any definite statement of what it would cost the farmers, or did he say in the first pamphlet that he issued anything with regard to the cost?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The question was not put to me at Niagara Falls. I did not enter into details, I simply stated that it was decided to inaugurate a system of rural mail delivery. I did not say anything about the cost of the box, but every man knows that if he wants a box in front of his house he has to pay for it, just as every man must know that when he goes to the post office to mail a letter he must buy a stamp. I stated that this box would cost $3. When the box was examined at Ottawa, not only by the post office authorities but by members of the government, the question was asked if the price of $3 would always be the same. Of course if the number of boxes is much larger, as it will become later on when the system expands, evidently the cost will be much less because the manufacturer will be able to supply a larger quantity at a smaller profit. At that time, however, we took only 6,000 of those boxes at $3 each and we had them examined by an expert, a manufacturer in this city, whose name I cannot just now recall. That expert said that to manufacture the same box in Canada would cost more than the $3.

Mr. S. HUGHES. As I understand the system, it is only those who happen to reside along the mail route and will pay for the service, who will get this delivery?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, and those who reside on the outside concessions have also the privilege of putting their boxes at the cross road.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. Did this expert say, how much more the boxes would cost if manufactured in Canada?

Mr. LEMIEUX. He said that to manufacture a similar box would cost in Canada more than the $3.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. How much more?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have not his report here, but I will be quite willing to lay it on the table. One of the boxes will be exhibited in the Liberal room and another in the Conservative room, and my hon. friend will have an opportunity of examining it.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. Unless the box costs a great deal more in Canada than in the United States, would you not prefer having it made in Canada?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It was said in the press during the elections that Mr. Lemieux had betrayed the interests of Canada because forsooth he had not provided for the manufacture of that box in Canada. Well, I was very prudent and cautious, as I was urged to be by the Grangers. When I decided to inaugurate that system, here is the letter I wrote to the Rural Automatic Mail Company:

August 14, 1908.

Dear Sir,—Referring to the several interviews we have had with respect to the adoption in Canada of your rural mail delivery box, I beg to say that the Post Office Department views the box with approval, and is desirous of making experiments as to its adaptibility for service in Canada. For this purpose we are prepared to buy from you six thousand (6,000) at the price of $3 per box f.o.b. factory in United States, such box to be delivered to our order on or before the 10th of September prox.

In giving this order it is the intention of the department to distribute the boxes for experimental purposes as widely as possible throughout the Dominion. Our expectation is that they will prove successful, and that they will be largely adopted on the existing mail routes in Canada. If this expectation should prove correct, we should, of course, be ready to order larger quantities of boxes for future use, and in that case, if we are able to give you assurances as to satisfactory quantities, we should require you to establish a factory for the manufacture of the boxes in Canada.

As stated above, we view the box with approval, and fully expect that it will be widely adopted in Canada, but we do not feel free to bind ourselves for the future until after we have made the experiments as proposed.

Yours respectfully,

(Sgd.) RODOLPHE LEMIEUX.

Dr. Harriss,
Representative of Rural Automatic
Mail Company, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

So that we have been very careful not to commit ourselves to the adoption of any box. We wanted the best and the latest pattern and one which would serve the people best. Since three months the system has been in vogue, and these were three winter months, the worst part of the year. During these three months we organized forty-three routes; and since I gave that answer to my hon. friend a few days ago, we have organized some eight or ten more, so that we have altogether fifty routes since the 15th of September last. These are serving actually 3,500 people. We have in use 700 boxes on the 43 routes and on the 50 we shall require 750. So as time goes on, and in view of the many petitions which are pouring into the department, I expect that within say two years many thousands of people will be served by that system throughout Canada.

The remuneration which the department has decided to pay to the contractor for the mail service for depositing into and

collecting from the King Edward boxes erected along his route, is as follows:—

$1 per box per annum for a service once a day or more frequently.

75 cents per box per annum for a service less frequently than once a day but more frequently than once a week.

50 cents per box per annum for a weekly service.

The scale of remuneration for this service is uniform throughout the Dominion.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask if those routes are established in thickly settled parts of Canada?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, as a general rule.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it working well?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is. I have here some testimonials from various postmasters:

From the Postmaster, Hamilton, Ont., re Ancaster-Hamilton route.

I have inquired of a number of the patrons as to whether the new system was quite satisfactory to them or if they had any complaints or objections to make. All expressed themselves as well pleased and thoroughly satisfied.

From the Postmaster, Waterloo, Ont., re Waterloo-Crosshill route.

The system adopted to deliver the mail to the patrons on the Waterloo and Crosshill route has been quite satisfactory to the patrons.

This office has a case with sufficient pigeon holes to have one labelled for each patron and the mail for each patron is placed in the pigeon hole after each mail has been assorted. When all the mail for the route is assorted the letters and papers are tied into parcels for the respective patrons and handed to the courier. By this method we have found errors to be at a minimum.

The patrons of this route have apparently taken advantage of the opportunity offered by the free rural mail delivery as most of them are now taking a daily paper, and the number of letters and other correspondence has also been on the increase since the establishment of this route.

From the Postmaster, Milton West, Ont., re Milton West-Mount Nemo route.

I have made inquiry and find that the system is altogether satisfactory. The mail courier informs me that all the patrons are well satisfied.

Then, the post office inspector at Vancouver, speaking of the Terra Nova and Vancouver route, says:

I beg to say that since the inauguration of the rural mail delivery on Vancouver route No. 1, I have taken advantage of two or three opportunities to interview the patrons regarding the same, and without exception they all expressed themselves as well satisfied, and some went so far as to say that the accommodation was invaluable. The boxes appear to work satisfactorily. No complaints have been received from the patrons and the only trouble I have had was with the council of the municipality of Point Grey who considered the boxes an obstacle to traffic and requested that they be removed, but this was amicably arranged, concerning the particulars of which you have already been advised.

So far as the Vancouver office and the intervening offices are concerned, they are each doing their part satisfactorily, in fact, so smoothly is the system working that it leaves nothing further to be desired.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the former mail courier on the Milton-Mt. Nemo route declined to do the work for what the government offered. Has the government secured the services of a new courier?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In some instances the mail courier has refused to do the additional work for the remuneration offered and we are obliged to give notice to cancel the contract and to call for new tenders. It may happen that the same courier will tender at a little higher figure and accept the new contract.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has that been done in the case I refer to?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I cannot say.

Mr. BARR. Do you advertise at so much per box?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We say the department will pay $1, or 75c. or 50c., depending on the frequency of the service. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) said that the mail delivery in the United States had produced quite a large revenue, but my information is that the United States postal authorities have been able to ascertain the revenues on only 21 of the best equipped and best paying routes, and as regards all others they have been unable to say what share of the revenue was derived from that service. The United States postal authorities are however well able to say that the cost is increasing by leaps and bounds. Perhaps it might be interesting to read the following letter from Mr. De Graw fourth assistant Postmaster General of the United States to Mr. George Ross chief post office superintendent of Canada:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Office of the
Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.
Washington, January 22, 1909.

George Ross, Esq.,
Chief Post Office Superintendent,
Toronto, Canada.

My dear Mr. Ross,—I gladly comply with your request of January 19, 1909, for further information in relation to the average annual cost of rural delivery routes in the United States.

In the communication sent you January 14, 1909, the rate named of $865.58 per route was based upon the average cost for service by

carriers alone on routes in operation December 1, 1908.

On January 2, 1909, rural delivery service was in operation in the United States as follows:—

No. of Routes.	No. of Times Served.	Annual Cost.
38,920	Six times per week..	$33,954,474
650	Three times per week.	302,094
Total..		$34,256,568

These routes were served by 39,441 carriers; 129 of the carriers served two tri-weekly routes each on alternate days. On this basis of the cost of service for carriers the average per route, January 2, 1909, was $865.72, and per carrier, $868.55.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1908, various sums not included in the above estimate were expended as follows:—

Clerks-in-charge rural stations...	$ 7,921 52
Tolls and ferriage..	9,655 35
Substitutes..	1,159,717 35
Supplies..	54,037 00
Total..	$1,231,331 22

This miscellaneous expenditure for the current fiscal year will be somewhat greater and will probably reach $1,300,000. If this last named sum is added to the total cost of $34,256,568 for carriers on routes in operation January 2, 1909, there would be a gross annual expenditure of $35,556,568 or $898.57 per route.

In explanation of the fluctuation in average cost it may be stated that during the month of December, 1908, the increases in length caused by amendment of routes largely exceeded the decreases and the number of routes on which service was increased from three to six times per week exceeded the number on which frequency of service was reduced.

Very truly yours,

P. V. DE GRAW,

Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

It will be seen that on each route the United States there is an average expenditure of $898.57 but the United States authorities have been unable to say what the revenue is. However, a technical newspaper in the United States which has given considerable attention to this matter has come to the conclusion that the deficit between expenditure and revenue on each of the routes served by rural mail delivery in the United States is about $400. Of course, it is difficult for me to make a comparison between the revenue on the Canadian routes and the revenue on the American routes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if that is the paper that he quoted from a year or so ago?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. He does not know the name of it or where it is published?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are so many papers published in the United States that I cannot off-hand remember the name. The Post Office Department of the United States is unable to state what is the revenue derived from the free rural mail delivery system. They have been able to state what was the revenue, from 21 of the best equipped routes, but that is all.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does the hon. minister expect that these fifty routes which have already been started in Canada will be self-sustaining, or does he anticipate that the general revenue of the Post Office Department will be drawn on to any extent in order to maintain them?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of course our routes are not the same as the American routes. In the United States the rural mail carrier goes from door to door, and last year he received a salary of $900. In Canada we have not the same expenditure to meet; our system is less costly; but I am not yet in a position to say that it will be self-sustaining. At all events, the government are quite ready to take a slice of the surplus in the Post Office Department in order to give the farmers of Canada the boon, as it has been termed by some hon. gentlemen, of the star-route system.

My hon. friend has reminded me that there has been some undesirable literature circulating in our towns and cities. I can only say to my hon. friend that I am as anxious as he is to stamp out undesirable literature in this country. So far as the Post Office Department is concerned, we are doing our best to prevent any such literature passing through our mail boxes or our mail cars. We have been able, since two or three years, to do away with nearly all the objectionable literature which came from some of the western states. I do not know that there is at present any quantity of such literature circulated in Canada; I think there is not; but if there is, the people have the weapon for dealing with it in the Post Office Act. Any man can institute proceedings in any police court of this Dominion, against the merchant who sells any such undesirable literature. As to a board of censors, I would not say that is impracticable, but it is very difficult to establish one. We are all jealous of the liberty of the press. I am asked sometimes by over-zealous clergymen, I will not say to what denomination they belong, to suppress some papers which in their opinion are published against their particular faith. Well, it is very difficult for the Postmaster General to act as censor in such cases. The common sense of the people will be the best judge. I cannot take upon my shoulders the task of judging of the heterodoxy of a publication which may or may not serve the purpose of any religion or any sect in this Dominion. But as regards filthy literature, I am as desirous as

any one to suppress it, and I am pleased to say that under the regulations of the Post Office Department, since I have been Postmaster General at least, in the mining districts, such as Cobalt and others, where I have been myself a witness of what has taken place, filthy literature has been completely suppressed. I had the testimony of the postmasters themselves, and I myself visited the mail boxes, and so am able to testify that in those districts filthy and yellow literature has disappeared completely. At the same time, it is always prudent and wise to watch, and I intend to watch in the future as I have done in the past.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, before the motion is adopted, I wish to say a few words.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can only do so by the consent of the House.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understood that the Postmaster General was quite willing that I should have the privilege?

Mr. SPEAKER. But there is a rule of the House that a member cannot speak a second time on the same motion.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have no objection personally.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will only take a few moments.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the House so understands it; but I may say that it is a very dangerous precedent for the House to make, because any other member might claim the same privilege.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not wish to infringe on the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can put a question, but should not make a second speech.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I will not attempt to say anything further. I am sorry that I am not given the privilege of making some reply to the statements made by the Postmaster General.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Mr. Speaker, if I am in order, there is a matter which I would like to refer to the Postmaster General. There is a feature of the administration of his department in my constituency which I think has been very unfair, and I believe that in this case the Postmaster General has been bossed, overruled, by a man who at one time in our country had considerable power—power enough to be called the young Napoleon; but of late he has certainly been plucked of his plumage, and has no longer the same influence in the west, and I did not think he had the power to overrule fair play and justice to the extent that he has done in this particular case since the elections of October, 1908. I refer to the dismissing of postmasters.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) who is ill, asked me to request my hon. friend not to bring up this question of the dismissal of postmasters, for which the hon. member (Mr. Sifton) takes full responsibility, until he is present. It will be only a few days until he is here.

Mr. STAPLES. He was in his seat on Monday and if he was well enough to be here then, he is well enough to be here today.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If it is the desire of the Postmaster General, I shall be glad to accede to his request.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. member mean by saying that the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) accepts full responsibility for the dismissals?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not throw the responsibility on his shoulders. I take the responsibility of the dismissal, but the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) recommended the dismissal and I acted on his advice.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. He bosses the government all right.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, no.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

River Saguenay—dredging and other improvements, $30,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Some returns ordered have not yet been brought down. The minister would think us harsh if we refused to grant Supply without them, and we do not wish to be put in that position.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I have spoken to my deputy about these returns, but he explained that we have really no room in our department for extra help. I told him he must arrange for two or three temporary clerks and he said he would do so at once, so as to expedite the returns.

Mr. AMES. What is the Saguenay work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are doing dredging upon the Saguenay, improving and straightening as well as deepening the channel. Last year we had an appropriation for this purpose of $40,000 and there was an expenditure for work done under contract by the General Construction Company's dredge of $23,291.17. There were also the working expenses of the tug 'Storm King,' $6,158.53 and the Canada Improvement Company did dredging to the amount of

$3,280.10. We are asking this vote of $30,000 to continue the work of dredging upon the Saguenay. It is very necessary in order to enable deep draft vessels to reach the important town of Chicoutimi.

Mr. BLAIN. Will this be a continuous expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will take some years to thoroughly complete the work.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. You cannot very well estimate definitely in dredging of this kind because it depends upon the depth to which we go. There are about six or seven miles below Chicoutimi which require to be straightened and dredged out to make a perfect channel.

Mr. FOSTER. What depth will you get?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the turning basin we are going to a depth of 20 feet and hope to continue to dredge the channel to a depth of 20 feet as well, but of course it will take some few years to obtain that.

Mr. AMES. If you look over the public accounts as given by the Auditor General during the last two or three years, you will find that a good deal of money has been spent and is being spent from time to time under the head of 'Saguenay Dredging,' and you will find also that the local engineer manages to interpret the term 'Saguenay Dredging' in a pretty broad sense. For instance, in the Auditor General's Report for 1907 is an item concerning the River du Moulin. $1,409.39. And in another year you find a further item relating to the River du Moulin. And when you come to inquire you find it difficult to see why this work on the River Du Moulin is charged to 'Saguenay Dredging.' Now the story of the River du Moulin is this: This is a small stream which comes into the Saguenay from the south, if I remember rightly, just a little to the east of the town of Chicoutimi. The people of that town had been accustomed to use an old wooden bridge across the river, and they were extremely anxious to have that wooden bridge replaced with a steel bridge upon stone abutments. They endeavoured to pursuade all and sundry to come to their relief, not wanting to pay for the work themselves, but without much success. They approached the federal member to ask his good offices in this particular, and the federal member interviewed the engineer to know if there was any way in which the River Du Moulin wooden bridge could be replaced with an iron bridge and charged to 'Saguenay dredging.' The engineer apparently suggested this exceedingly ingenious expedient: In the spring of the year, some earth comes down from the mountains and passes out into the Saguenay river by way of the River du Moulin; therefore let us charge to 'Saguenay Dredging' what it may cost to protect the banks so that they will not wash away. Now, inasmuch as the dredging is five miles below the point where the River du Moulin enters the Saguenay, and inasmuch as there is a depth of thirty feet for three miles below the place, and inasmuch as the River du Moulin is a very small stream which brings down very little silt each year, it took a pretty long stretch of imagination on the part of the engineer to find it possible to charge this to 'Saguenay Dredging.' However, with the aid of the local member they were able to accomplish it. They made a report that it was necessary to build a concrete pier on the left side of the river, right under where the old wooden bridge used to rest. As a matter of fact, there was already a wooden protection, all that could possibly be needed to prevent erosion, and this wooden protection had to be taken down in order that it might be replaced with the concrete pier. Then, the people of the municipality arranged with a contractor to build a stone pier directly opposite, and so they had the two abutments for the bridge. If the minister is interested, I shall be glad to send him a photograph, so that he may see the concrete pier under the iron bridge on this small river some distance up from the Saguenay, which concrete pier has been charged to 'Saguenay Dredging,' which dredging is being done on the main river seven miles below.

Now, when we are asked to vote money, we like to know what it is for, and when we are told it is for one purpose we do not like to have it used for another. In this particular case, I would like to ask whether the minister has disciplined the local engineer whose misleading statements undoubtedly induced this item to be charged in the way it has been, and also whether he or his predecessor was aware of the fact that when they were asking parliament to vote an appropriation for the dredging of the channel leading into the upper river at Chicoutimi, they were really asking that a portion of that money should be used to build a concrete pier under a municipal bridge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am unable, at this moment, to enlighten my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) as to what knowledge my predecessor had in regard to what would be done with the vote given for the 'River Saguenay, Dredging and other Improvements.' My attention was called to the fact that the bridge had been built either immediately adjoining to or upon a part of the foundation of the glance pier. I made inquiry and was informed by the engineering staff of my department that the object of building this glance pier was to prevent

the silt which came down from this river to which my hon. friend referred, flowing into the Saguenay river and so nullifying to a considerable extent the dredging work being carried on.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Does the photograph show it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Photographs are very deceptive. I could have a photograph taken of my hon. friend (Mr. George Taylor) from such a position that his best friends would not know him. A great deal depends upon the photographer.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. That photograph looks perfect.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is evidently taken from the landward side of the pier. A photograph from the river side would present a very different appearance and might give a different impression from that conveyed by this photograph.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What does the engineer say?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He would not recognize it from this photograph. Having asked him, I may say that another reason he would not recognize it is that he has never been there. I can say to my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) that, in asking parliament for this vote for the 'River Saguenay Dredging and Other Improvements,' I can assure the committee that directions will be given that the money shall be used entirely upon the river Saguenay and that it will be used for Dredging and Other Improvements of the river Saguenay. I think that my hon. friend will admit that the dredging work is very useful, that the channel is a very crooked channel, that it is difficult if not dangerous for vessels to approach Chicoutimi by the present channel, and that it is very necessary to improve the position by widening and straightening, as well as deepening, the channel.

Mr. AMES. No doubt, it is necessary that the channel, which is six or seven miles below Chicoutimi, should be deepened and widened so that steamers can come up. But, in this particular case, I think it required a very great stretch of imagination to bring this pier under the vote which this parliament passed for 'Saguenay dredging.' One feature I call to the attention of the minister which takes away, I think, the only argument that he has advanced. It is this: At the place where the concrete pier was built, there had previously stood a completed wooden structure which protected the banks from erosion as effectively as this concrete pier does, and this wooden structure had to be taken away so that the concrete pier could take its place. Thus, so far as erosion was concerned, there was as good protection before as there is today. No, the whole matter was hatched between the member and the resident engineer with a view to saddling on this government an expense which the federal government should not bear. That is the same story all along down the Lower St. Lawrence, and if there is any way in which they can disguise these expenditures so that they will escape the attention of the minister or of the members of parliament, whose duty it is to study the documents in connection with these cases—if there is any way in which it can be disguised or concealed, that will be done. Before we get through this afternoon I shall have the pleasure, unless six o'clock is reached too soon, of showing other cases like this, where money is voted by parliament under, I might almost say, false representations, because it is expended for other purposes entirely than those which parliament intended it should be expended for.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the resident engineer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Tache.

Mr. FOSTER. How long has he been there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has been in the department 35 years. He was formerly at headquarters.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the engineer here that passes his work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer, Mr. Lafleur.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know how the minister feels with reference to this. I do not know how members sitting on either side of the House feel about it, but I cannot find language too strong to characterize a transaction of that kind. What are we here for? To misrepresent, to conceal? Surely it cannot be that. It makes no matter whether we are Liberal or Conservative, —do we approve of stealing the money of the people under false representations, and actually expending it, and coming to parliament and lying about it? If they want it to build a glance pier at Riviére du Moulin, seven or eight miles above where the channel is being dredged, why not come in an honest way and get a vote for it—explain it to the House, and if the House stands under it, then do it. But here is a vote for dredging the river Saguenay, and they are dredging a channel below Chicoutimi, as I understand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Below and in the vicinity of Chicoutimi.

Mr. FOSTER. It is at least seven miles below the River du Moulin, which is a small insignificant stream. They have absolutely gone to work and have spent a sum of

money in taking down a wooden protection to the bank of the stream in this River du Moulin, and building a concrete pier, and on that concrete pier a bridge has been placed. Thus the government is spending out of the Saguenay river dredging vote $1,000, $2,000 or $3,000 to build a concrete pier. The municipality have built another pier on the other side at their own expense, and then a bridge is put across. If it is to build an abutment for a bridge, come to parliament and ask for it. If it is for the purpose of protecting the stream in any way, come to parliament and say what it is for. But to get a vote for dredging in the River Saguenay and make a channel deeper and wider, and then go seven miles above into a little bit of a stream and build a concrete pier, and try to justify it by saying that it is meant to keep the silt from coming down the River du Moulin——

Mr. HUGHES. How far is this from the Saguenay river?

Mr. FOSTER. The River du Moulin runs into the Saguenay river. Now this is not an isolated instance, it is being done over and over again in the province of Quebec, it may be in other provinces. We bring them up and make these statements, and the minister plays a little piece of comedy about it, glosses it all over, winks his eye to show how nicely he has done it. I want to ask the minister whether, if the statement is true that has been made by my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), he has not a duty to perform. Will he perform that duty, or is he going to cover it up, as he has done in case after case, make a laugh of it, and pass it off by some glib words? That is not what the minister ought to do, that is not what members of parliament ought to allow. What impression does it create? That the department is not to be trusted. If the state of things is as stated by my hon. friend, it means that the engineers are not to be trusted, that the resident engineer has condoned the taking away of the moneys of parliament voted for a certain purpose, and applying them to another purpose; that the engineers in the department here condone it, or support it, or show negligence, if they do not know it. It is a very poor answer to have from the engineer here who finally passes the account, to say that he has never been there and does not know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend does an injustice to Mr. St. Laurent, he is not the gentleman I mentioned. I said that it was Mr. Lafleur, the chief engineer, who passes the work. It is the assistant deputy that is here in the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether it is the gentleman sitting here or not, but it seems to me the chief engineer is responsible for his resident engineers scattered throughout the country. This matter has come to the department, the minister said that he had information with reference to it. What have the minister and the engineer done? It would seem to me that if that state of things exists, as stated by my hon. friend, the resident engineer has some accounting to make. Why, would a gentleman who has a business who has a man in his employ, allow that sort of thing for a minute? Should the minister of a department, or the legislature of a country, who are acting as trustees for the people's money, allow that sort of thing for a moment? Case after case has been brought to light where bridges are really being built where a municipality or village is spared its proper expenses, and benefits by this subterfuge of doing something as a Dominion work. If that sort of thing were done in the vicinity of Kingston, where all men could know it, it would not pass. It is done in out of the way places, and I think the minister has a duty to sit down on that sort of thing. What he ought not to do is to make light of a case like that. It is the indication of a great deal else to make light of it in his department. It is one of the things which shows us on this side of the House that there is a necessity for a thorough investigation, and a reorganization of the system in the Public Works Department. There is too much of this hand in hand work between the representative and the resident engineers in the outside offices. They are continually putting their heads together, not to do justice to the country at large, not to do justice to the minister under whom they are serving and the parliament of which the representative is a member. At least the minister should have stated that he would look into it and see that discipline is carried out. He said that nothing like that should be done in the future. That is an admission that something wrong has been done, but a condemnation in a laughing way here is not enough. The officials at fault ought to be dealt with sternly and taught that they cannot indulge in that sort of thing with impunity.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work was done some four or five years ago. It was done under a vote for improvements and dredging in the Saguenay river. Now, I understand that this glance pier was erected in the Saguenay just at the mouth of the du Moulin. When I became minister, the fact was brought to my notice that part of the pier had been used as a foundation for a bridge. I had no evidence, and I do not know that the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) has any, that when the glance pier was placed there, it was built with any intention of being used as the foundation of a bridge. It was

placed there by the department on the report of the engineer that it would serve a useful purpose by preventing the silt from flowing into the Saguenay, and so rendering the dredging to a certain extent less effective.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Is it up on the shore?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is right on the Saguenay river just at the mouth of the Du Moulin. My hon. friend says that I turned this off in a laughing way. I have not done anything of the kind. I could not undo what had been done some years before I became minister, but I did what I could. I gave instructions that in the future no wharf shall be erected, if the main purpose is to utilize it as a foundation for a highway bridge. My hon. friend says that I should have disciplined the resident engineer. I suppose he means that I should have discharged him. Well, I did not feel called upon to do that because the resident engineer, in examination before the Public Accounts Committee, pledged his professional reputation that this work was one which might properly be done in connection with the improvements on the Saguenay river. I have done what I could so far as the future is concerned. I have given those instructions, and in several instances I have refused to authorize construction of glance or ice piers in the rivers where I thought they were not required for the improvement of the rivers, but as the foundations of bridges. Where urgent demands have been made I have refused to put any sums in the estimates for that purpose, and the vote we are now asking will be used entirely for dredging and other improvements in the Saguenay river and not for the construction of glance piers or piers of any description.

Mr. PRICE. I happend to know this locality very well, as I spent a couple of holidays there many years ago, and have many times passed that place. In my opinion those two piers were put there for the purpose of building a bridge. I can see no other reason. To say that a great deal of silt goes out into that river is nonsense.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the hon. gentleman correctly informed when he speaks of two piers? My information is that the government only erected one.

Mr. AMES. The government only erected one and the municipality erected another exactly opposite.

Mr. PRICE. I said two piers. There may be only one erected by the government and the other by the municipality. I do not think the government should have built this pier. As a matter of fact, it is used for a bridge, and I do not think that this government should build piers of that sort for bridges. That kind of work does not come under our jurisdiction.

Mr. AMES. As my hon. friend who has just spoken has said, he knows the place thoroughly. His company built a construction on that side and there is no silt going down at all. The bottom of the river is bed rock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For what purpose did the hon. member's company build a construction on that side?

Mr. PRICE. When that part of the country was opened up, my people had a mill there, and they built those wharfs for the purpose of shipping.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Were they removed when this pier was built?

Mr. PRICE. No, they still remain.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is your wharf that was shown on the photograph?

Mr. PRICE. Yes.

Mr. AMES. But a piece was cut out of that wharf in order to make room for the pier.

Mr. J. D REID In the building of these wharfs in the province of Quebec there appears to be case after case in which, instead of being used as wharfs, they are practically piers for bridges Where the public money is spent for a wharf and it turns out afterwards to be a bridge, what does the government do with the engineer? Before undertaking this expenditure does not the government send an engineer to report as to whether a wharf is necessary at that particular point, what boats are likely to land there, and what business is likely to be done ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When a petition is presented for the construction of a wharf at any place, I send it to the chief engineer with instructions to report as to the necessity of it from a public standpoint and the cost. On receiving that report, the question of asking parliament for an appropriation is considered by the department.

Mr. AMES. The chief engineer is the man the minister asks to get a report?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and he sends to the resident engineer?

Mr. J. D. REID. When it turns out afterwards that the pier, instead of being a wharf, is required to be used as the foundation of a bridge is there any censure of the engineer on whose report the government acted? I have not heard of a case yet where any engineer has been dismissed or suspended for having made a report of that kind. Last session one of the members from an adjoining county, who seemed to

know all about the situation in a particular locality, stated that a wharf had been built there by this government, which turned out subsequently to be simply used as a municipal bridge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which one was that?

Mr. J. D. REID. The Disraeli wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The department has caused careful inquiry to be made about the Disraeli wharf and the information is that there are three steamers and two gasoline vessels on the lake and they use the Disraeli wharf.

Mr. J. D. REID. This wharf was built—

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was not intended to be a wharf. This was a glance pier intended to give another direction to the silt coming down the Du Moulin river.

Mr. FOSTER. Before that was built, was a report made by the resident engineer to the chief engineer at Ottawa, giving a plan of the proposed work and estimating the cost, and was it approved by the chief engineer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a very proper question and I shall have the information looked up and submitted.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the minister to state in a definite manner the details of the whole transaction from beginning to end. I do not want to do any injustice to Mr. Lafleur or the resident engineer, but if the facts are anything like what have been stated some one has made a blunder that ought not to be passed over.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall get the information.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I will send over to the minister a photograph taken from the other shore and he will see that the pier is several feet up on dry land so that his statement cannot be justified that it was for the purpose of turning the channel and preventing the silt coming down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If that is a recent photograph it may not give accurate information as to the beneficial results which have followed the erection of that pier because the pier itself might stop the silt in its progress and cause the very accumulation which we see there.

Mr. BLONDIN. Did the minister get the information which was asked for the other night about Mr. L. P. Girard ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the evening this matter came up in the House I caused a telegram to be sent to Mr. Taché the resident engineer as follows :

Ottawa, 12th March, 1909.

To J. C. Taché, resident engineer, Chicoutimi.

Was Mr. Girard's son, who is now lawyer at Chicoutimi, ever employed at Clark City by the department? If so, when, for how long, and in what capacity? Was he in sole charge or was there an engineer over him? If an engineer, who? Reply immediately, minister wants information this evening.

(Sgd.) J. B. HUNTER,
Deputy Minister.

To that there came a reply from Mr. Taché as follows:

Chicoutimi, March 12, 1909.

J. B. Hunter,
Deputy Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Yes, M. Girard was employed at Clark City under Mr. Lamoureux.

J. C. TACHE.

That information was not sufficient because it did not give all the information desired so I had this telegram sent:

Ottawa, 12th March.

To J. C. Taché, resident engineer, Chicoutimi.

Please give all information asked by my telegram. Your message no answer.

(Sgd.) J. B. HUNTER,
Deputy Minister.

To that there came this reply:

Chicoutimi, 13th March, 1909.

J. B. Hunter, Ottawa.

L. P. Girard was employed at Clark City in 1904, on the survey of Seven Islands bay, as chainman from 24th of June to 12th Sept., and in 1907, as assistant to engineer in charge from 15th of June to 18th of Sept. Joseph Lamoureux, of Ottawa, was the engineer in charge on both occasions.

(Sgd.) J. C. TACHE.

Then I received a memorandum from Mr. Lamoureux as follows :

March 15, 1909.

Memorandum for the Hon. the Minister.

Mr. Girard worked under me as sub-inspector and general help during the summer of 1907 at Clark City.

During that season the contractors removed part of the old work preparing the beds for new cribs. Two cribs, 100 feet in length each, were built and sunk. Mr. Girard helped me in taking levels, measurements, keeping gauge readings, &c., spending most of his time on the work under my instructions, when I could not be there, and reporting to me what was being done. During that summer I made surveys of Magpie bay, and at Ellis bay, Anticosta island, being away about two weeks at a time at each place. On my return Mr. Girard reported to me as to what was done by the contractors, and every difficulty that arose was adjusted by me.

He helped also in reducing the soundings taken at Magpie bay, and doing general office work.

(Sgd.) JAMES LAMOUREUX.
Assistant Engineer.

Mr. FOSTER. That was the son of the member ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Who is now practising law at Chicoutimi and who was then a law student?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. My hon. friend was right as to that.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was Lamoureux working there the whole season?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, except for about two weeks when he was working at Magpie bay.

Mr. J. D. REID. This young man was put there and he knew nothing about the work. He was simply a law student and this was a scheme of the government to pay him while he was on his holidays $2.50 a day and expenses, including Sundays. If Mr. Lamoureux required an assistant from June 24th until school opened in September he certainly required an assistant during the whole season or he did not require one at all. I do not know anything about this young man, but on the very face of it it is clear that the government adopted this scheme to pay him $2.50 a day and expenses during the holidays so that he might educate himself during the winter. You see, if he had been put on as chain man he would not get $2.50 a day, for the chain men on the St. Lawrence canals only get from $1.50 to $2.00 a day, and so in order to get $2.50 per day of the peoples' money, Lamoureux deceived the minister by putting him down as inspector.

Mr. FOSTER. Lamoureux states that he was sub-inspector, and he was paid as inspector. What has Mr. Lamoureux to say about that? Anyway what about this policy of working in with a member of parliament and making a situation for his boy? Is it not very poor business? The evidence shows that he was simply there to help to do some calculations, and that reported to the inspector would act occasionally as a chain man, and the like of that. Who was the inspector?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Lamoureux was the inspector and engineer in charge, and he used this young man as sub-inspector. For a number of years it has been the practice, and I have never heard it complained of, to give employment to students.

Mr. FOSTER. The sons of members?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Although the employment has been largely limited to the students of technical schools, this young man had been under Mr. Lamoureux in 1904, and it may be that he was an intelligent young man, able to do his work well, and could be relied on to keep the accounts and see that the men did their work. He was only paid $2.50 a day, although in some cases we pay inspectors $3 and sometimes $3.50 a day.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister defend that kind of transaction?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would depend on the circumstances. If I knew that he was a capable young man, and did his work faithfully, I would defend him. But I do not know whether he was or not. I would assume, from the engineer having employed him, and having certified that he was capable, and that he did useful work, and did it well, that he was worth $2.50 per day. That is not an unreasonable wage, and is considerably less than we pay to the inspectors in charge of such work.

Mr. AMES. Is the minister aware that all his expenses were charged, so that what he got was $4 a day?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The expenses which were charged were his travelling expenses to and from the work.

Mr. AMES. And all his board while there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The inspectors get thir board too when engaged on such work in remote districts.

Mr. J. D. REID. No, no.

Mr. AMES. Is it customary to pay a sub-inspector $2.50 a day and his expenses going and returning, and his board during the entire summer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will bear in mind that this young man was employed by Mr. Lamoureux to act as his assistant, and that he did his work well, as Mr. Lamoureux certified, and I do not think $2.50 a day with board in that remote district would be an unreasonable wage to pay him.

Mr. TALBOT. Would my hon. friend on the other side (Mr. Ames) allow me to ask him if he is not a little severe in this matter? Mr. Girard is a member of parliament, it is quite true. He is the father of a very large family and a man of very limited means, and he is giving an expensive education to his son. We know that it is customary to give university students a chance to earn a little money during vacation. It is done in the United States and in every other country in the world. Because Mr. Girard happens to be a member of parliament, and his son, to whom he is giving a university education, is given a chance to make a few dollars to aid him in pursuing his studies, I do not think it is fair to accuse this poor man who has a large family and is doing the best he can with it.

Mr. BARR. I want to remind my hon. friend that this is not a charitable institution, and the fact that a man happens to have a large family is no reason why it should be supported by the country.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FOSTER. What business will the government take up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We intend to proceed in Supply. I understand that notice has been given that to-morrow afternoon is desired for a certain amendment, and that is in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL. I beg leave to inform the government that to-morrow afternoon, on the motion of the House to go into Committee of Supply, I propose to introduce an amendment dealing with the question of deferred elections, and I will have the honour to transmit a copy of the amendment to the right hon. Prime Minister to-morrow.

At six o'clock House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 18, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

CREW OF DREDGE 'NORTHUMBERLAND.'

Mr. RHODES asked:

1. How many men are employed as officers and crew of the government dredge 'Northumberland'?
2. What are their names and places of residence?
3. On what terms are they severally employed?
4. If in the service of the government, where are they at present employed?

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

1 and 4. At the present time there are only six men employed repairing and outfitting the dredge for the coming season. They are working at Pictou Landing, Nova Scotia.

2 and 3. Their names and the terms of their employment are as follows:—

U. H. Lyons, captain, $100 per month; J. Ledingham, chief engineer, $90 per month; H. Allen, second engineer, $80 per month; F. Rush, operator, $80 per month; G. Hunter, oiler, $35 per month; H. Oaks, fireman, $35 per month.

When employed by the government their residences were given as follows:—

U. H. Lyons, Barrington, Nova Scotia; J. Ledingham, New Glasgow, Nova Scotia; H. Allen, St. John, New Brunswick; F. Rush, St. John, New Brunswick; G. Hunter, Bridgewater, Nova Scotia; H. Oaks, Bridgewater, Nova Scotia.

The department has no record of their present places of residence beyond the fact that they are now at Pictou Landing.

FAIRY LAKE RESERVE.

Mr. JAMESON—by Mr. Rhodes—asked:

1. Is the Fairy Lake Indian Reserve, in the counties of Annapolis and Queens, N.S., under lease to any person or persons? If so, to whom, what is the date of the lease, the terms of lease and the rental?
2. What revenue, if any, was derived from this land annually during the five years next previous to date of lease?
3. Upon whose recommendation was lease granted?
4. Has permission been given to cut the timber on the reserve? If so, is such cutting going on?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes. The lease is dated the 5th of June, 1908, to C. W. Mills, and is for a term of 25 years from the 1st of May, 1908, at an annual rental of $30, for camping purposes.
2. None.
3. On recommendation of the local Indian agent.
4. No.

USE OF DISRAELI WHARF.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. How many vessels carrying passengers or merchandise regularly called or landed at Disraeli wharf during the navigation season of 1908, and called or landed at all during the season; what were the names of these vessels and of what tonnage were they?
2. What vessels, boats or craft of any kind called or landed at or used the said wharf during said season, and to what extent was it used?
3. What is the area of the lake called Lake Aylmer into which the stream passing under Disraeli wharf empties?

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

1, 2 and 3. As no wharfinger has yet been appointed to take charge of this wharf, there are no records in the department to show the exact number of vessels which called or landed at Disraeli wharf during the navigation season of 1908. The resident engineer reports on March 16 that after inquiry he finds the following boats called during last season: the two steamboats of the Brompton Pulp Co., of 14 horse-power, called No. 3 and 4 respectively; the 'Francis' and the 'Coursier,' 35 and 40 feet long respectively, 12 horse-power each; the 'Strathford,' 10 horse-power; the 'Garthby,' 4 horse-power; the 'Borden,' 15 horse-power, and the 'Laurier,' 5 horse-power. All these boats land passengers, lumber, produce and general merchandise.

According to Lovell's 'Gazetteer,' Lake Aylmer is about eight miles long and three miles wide.

BOAT HARBOUR, SKINNER'S COVE.

Mr. MADDIN—by Mr. Rhodes—asked :

1. When was the work of Boat Harbour, Skinner's Cove, Pictou county, Nova Scotia, commenced?
2. How much has the expenditure been in each year since the work was commenced?
3. What is the total expenditure to date?
4. Is the work completed?
5. What further sum, if any, is to be expended to complete?

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

1. 1st June, 1905.
2. 1904-05 .. .. $3,225 14
   1905-06 .. .. 7,763 95
   1906-07 .. .. 1,759 91
   1907-08 .. .. 822 37
   1908-09 (to date) 2,433 45
3. $16,004.82.
4. No.
5. $6,000.

IMPROVEMENTS AT ST. JOHNS, PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. George Taylor—asked :

1. What is the nature of the improvements being carried out on the Richelieu river at St. Johns, province of Quebec, what is their object and what is the estimate of the total cost?
2. Who prepared said estimate?
3. What is the object of the office opened at St. Johns, province of Quebec, last autumn in connection with said improvements?
4. How many are employed in said office and what is the cost per day of said office?

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

1. (a) Dredging, blasting and construction of a movable dam. (b) To prevent flooding and improve navigation. (c) $185,000.
2. Engineer J. L. Michaud.
3. It was intended to let the dredging by contract, but the tenders received were so high that the department decided that, by providing its own dredging plant, the work could be done more cheaply; therefore an engineer was placed in charge, with an office at St. Johns. The latest reports received show that, in doing so, a considerable amount of money has been saved.
4. Paul Paradis, engineer in charge, $1,900 per year, $5.20 per day ; Albert Gosselin, assistant engineer, $3 per day ; Edmond Papineau, rodman, &c., (temporarily employed on surveys), $2.50 per day; rent of office $20 per month, 67 cents per day; total per day, $11.37.

COLD STORAGE SHIPMENTS.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. What amount of produce of the following lines has been shipped to Great Britain or other countries in cold storage, or cooled air chambers, during the years 1907 and 1908: apples, in barrels or other packages, pears, plums, tomatoes, grapes, fresh meat in pounds, fowl, fish, butter, eggs and cheese?
2. To what country or countries were they shipped, and what was their condition on landing?
3. What system of cold storage is principally in use on the steamships carrying such produce?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). This answer will be too long to read in the House and I would ask to have the question stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

SOUTH AFRICA VETERANS' WARRANTS.

Mr. EDWARDS—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked :

1. How many warrants have been issued to veterans on account of services in South Africa?
2. How many homesteads have been issued by virtue of such warrants?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. 5,500 warrants issued by the Minister of Militia and Defence.
2. 4,993 land certificates issued by the Minister of the Interior, of which 230 have been located on homestead land, up to the last returns received in the department from the land agencies.

PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES FOR MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I call the attention of the Finance Minister to question No. 9, and ask him if he can have that facilitated so that we can get the answer tomorrow, if possible?

Mr. FIELDING. I will see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries later in the day on that subject.

SUPPLY—DEFERRED ELECTIONS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). I beg to move in amendment

That all the words after 'that' be struck out, and the following words be substituted therefor:

This House is of opinion that for the purpose of enabling the electors to exercise the full rights and privileges of their franchise, the general elections should be held on the same day throughout all the provinces of Canada.

In introducing this subject dealing with deferred elections in Canada, I do so be-

cause I have had it impressed upon me that it is a duty I owe to my constituents, and I believe in a larger sense to a considerable portion of the people of Canada. I am endeavouring to introduce the question in such a way as that it will not mean in any sense a want of confidence in the government. In its broadest aspects I need not say that the matter is hardly controversial, the amendment simply enunciating a principle the soundness of which will be admitted by both sides of this House, and which I trust the government will be able to see their way to accept. In dealing with the question of the franchise we are dealing with a matter which is vital to the whole system of democratic and representative government. Underlying all democratic government is the basic principle that the source of political power is the people. It is true that this principle has been weakened, or distorted, in practically working out the transfer of power from the people to the delegates or representatives who finally wield that power. The process is very imperfect in most communities; and in passing I am free to confess that if the system of transferring such power were adopted which was recently so ably expounded in this House in a scheme of proportional representation, it might achieve far more satisfactory results than those we obtain under our present system, it would greatly strengthen the personnel both of the government and of the assembly, and would form a more faithful reflex of popular opinion. But sir, imperfect as our present methods may be, and imperfect as the results we want to achieve may be, yet in a very real sense the basis of political power is the suffrage, and anything therefore which touches the character of the suffrage, or the franchise, and its exercise demands, and I think will receive the thoughtful consideration of this House. Many hon. members who are present, representing as they do the people in the parliament of Canada, are doubtless familiar with the long struggles for constitutional power and for a more faithful expression of the public will, which took place in Great Britain for hundreds of years, and which is yielding to-day such beneficent and far reaching results. Gradually the scope of the franchise has been extended and widened. Many timorous people fear the results of its development, but they have got to adjust and reconcile themselves to the great movement which is leading, in nearly all cases, to a government by the people and for the people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my belief, not only in the value of the franchise, but in the necessity of every man exercising his franchise in the true spirit, is the reason for introducing this amendment to-day. To my mind the time has arrived for the abolition of deferred elections throughout Canada. Nor do I believe, to use the words of the amendment, that the full rights and privileges of the franchise can be exercised or enjoyed by many thousands of people who are not permitted to take part, who are not permitted to raise their voice in helping to decide the great issues before the country in a general election. Under the attendant circumstances of a deferred election the franchise is crippled, is robbed of half its value, and by so depreciating its worth we are doing something we have no right to do, namely, we are lessening and weakening the interest which thousands of Canadians have to-day in the public affairs of the country.

Now the suffrage has been defined by one authority as a 'voice given in deciding a controverted question, or in the choice of a man for an office of trust.' By another high authority the subject has been defined as follows:

> A voice or an opinion of a person in some matter which is commonly to be determined by a majority of the voices or opinions of persons who are empowered to give it.

Judge McCreary, in his treatise on the American law of elections, remarks:

> In the United States the object of the suffrage is twofold: first, to select representatives of the people for their government; and secondly, to determine the will of the people upon such questions as may be submitted to them.

Now Sir, it will be noticed that in each of these definitions it is conceded that the one great value, the one great power of the suffrage, is that its exercise may enable the holder to perform a duty, and to perform his share in deciding great controverted questions. I am not taking the ground in this argument that in a vast and sparsely settled country like Canada all deferred elections in the past have been totally unjustifiable, but I am taking the ground, and I want frankly to express to this House the conviction, that in so far as their having any voice in deciding the great controverted questions before the country, the 30,000 or 40,000 electors in the constituencies where the elections have been deferred, have been, I may say, absolutely, disfranchised.

Now let me give you an illustration. I had the honour, and the very arduous task, of contesting an election in Yale-Cariboo, B. C., in 1904. The great question at that time before the country was, as hon. gentlemen all know, the Grand Trunk Pacific project as put forth by the government. For six months I had to campaign through the whole of that country, and campaign practically on the great issues concerned in that one great transportation problem. But towards the close of that campaign I found that I was out-manœuvred by the government postponing the election, because when the general elections

came round, that whole question was settled and the government was sustained by a majority of something like 66. Absolutely nothing more was to be said. For three weeks I had to face the people in that constituency practically with no programme at all, because this great question having been settled, there was a grievous lack of interest throughout the constituency, and certainly the voice of the people so far as that great question was concerned, was absolutely stifled. It means, practically, disfranchisement and it certainly also means apathy on the part of a large number of electors. It is injurious to the welfare of the state and it is an injustice to the individuals who compose the state. It is necessary that elections should, if possible, be held on the same day, and I think I can demonstrate to this House that it is possible to hold them on the same day and that there are no sufficient reasons why elections should be deferred in a country like this.

It may be retorted by some hon. gentlemen that election to the mother of parliaments in England are not all held on the same day. I need only point out in reply that the history and traditions of that country are entirely different, that the members are not concerned in appropriations for great public works, and that for a variety of reasons which I might point out, the case of England is not analogous in any way to that of this country. I have had the opportunity of discussing this question with public men of various shades of opinion in the old country, and I have found that there is a steadily increasing sentiment that they are coming to the point of one man one vote, and that elections should all be held on the same day. But let me turn from general argument to particular cases. I do not propose to deal with the question as it affects the province of Quebec as others are more familiar with that great province than I am, although I believe that the conditions attendant upon the postponement of elections are the same and that the same arguments will apply with equal strength to Quebec as to British Columbia. But I want to refer particularly to my own province and to deal with the various arguments advanced for the postponement of elections in that province. In 1904 there was the creation of a number of constituencies by the subdivision of larger constituencies. At that time Mr. Fitzpatrick was the Minister of Justice and he discussed the question of deferred elections. He proposed to defer the elections in a number of constituencies not only in British Columbia but elsewhere. The old constituency of Burrard was to be divided into Vancouver and Comox-Atlin. The constituency of Yale-Cariboo-Kootenay was to be divided into Kootenay and Yale-Cariboo. In Ontario the constituency of Algoma was to be divided into east and west Algoma and there was also the question of the constituency of Nipissing. In dealing with the arguments which were advanced at that time, arguments that were chiefly founded upon the impossibility of reaching all parts of these ridings in the statutory time to enable the elections to be held on the same day as the elections in other constituencies, Mr. Fitzpatrick spoke as follows and this seems to have been the whole force of his argument:

> Why should any group of men be deprived of their right to vote? Is it not fair to say that if the conditions existing at the time the elections are held are such that any important group in the community may be deprived of the right to vote that the returning officer shall have power to postpone the election in order to give them the right to vote?

The hon. leader of the opposition at that time, and also at a later date, made some observations and I will quote his exact words:

> There should be very strong, in fact, imperative necessity before any election is postponed.

With this I think we shall all agree.

He was referring to the province of Ontario, and he added that provincial elections were held on the same day in those ridings and that was a cogent reason for not postponing the federal election. Fortunately there were in the House at that time not only Liberals but Conservatives who were strongly interested in these Ontario constituencies. They knew their exact conditions, they were anxious to ensure the full value of the franchise to every elector and they put up all the arguments they could and showed the minister exactly what the conditions were. The result was that the minister dropped one after another of his proposals first in East and West Algoma, and then in Nipissing, conceding that the principle was right to hold the elections on the same day, if the conditions made it possible. I shall turn now to British Columbia and I shall quote his words again. The Minister of Justice said:

> As to the province of British Columbia I would ask the members from that province to explain the conditions there.

Unfortunately, there was in the House at that time no one familiar with British Columbia, or with British Columbia conditions, except the Liberal members and, Sir, I am absolutely within the truth when I say that in the case of my own constituency especially the reasons put forth during that debate were inspired by the knowledge that my opponent wanted a deferred election because he recognized the impossibility of winning in a fair and even fight. It was an

extraordinary thing to me because the people of that constituency—and I refer now to all shades of political opinion, to Liberals and Conservatives alike—did not ask that this election should be deferred and showed absolutely no wish to have it deferred. In justice to the hon. gentleman, the member for Kootenay at that time, Mr. Galliher, I ought to say that although he put up the bulk of the argument on that occasion I do not think he needed or wanted the election to be deferred as far as he himself was concerned, but that he was doing it to help a weaker brother in a section of the country to which they applied their argument. What was their argument? The argument, summarized very briefly, was that the territory was too great to permit the returning officer to get around with the notices and distribute the ballot boxes, that the geographical character of the constituency was such that the returning officer could not possibly get over the whole of that great district in order to post the proclamation and distribute the ballot boxes within the statutory period. I need hardly say that the argument is an essentially weak one inasmuch as we know perfectly well that the returning officer does not have to personally visit all portions of the riding for that purpose. As a matter of fact this work is done by the various deputies, the express companies, telegraph companies, the stage coaches and all the other facilities which he has at his command, and it is only a question of putting on a sufficient number of men to do the work throughout the riding. But, driven from one position to another the member at that time finally put the argument as follows:

So far as I am personally concerned I do not care to have the election postponed, but I am told that it is impossible to hold it on the day of the general election, and I know it is impossible.

Then we find that the member for Burrard at that time (Mr. Macpherson) came to the rescue with arguments about a constituency with whose conditions he was not entirely familiar. He referred to the new mining camps scattered at a great distance all over the district and he said that it would be impossible to reach Barkerville and other remote points in time. So, finally, a postponement in 1904 took place. I come from the riding of Yale-Cariboo, I know it perfectly well, I know its people, I know its conditions, I have been over practically every foot of that great territory to the farthest point of it, namely Barkerville in North Cariboo, and so far from it being impossible to reach Barkerville in 1900 and 1904 in the time prescribed I had a conversation with the deputy returning officer, a strong Liberal, a man who voted against me—not that I had any occasion to blame him in any way at all—and who told me emphatically that in 1896 the elections were held on the same day, that he was in Barkerville, the farthest point north in that constituency, the ballot boxes were delivered in time, that he polled his vote and that he resented having a deferred election subsequently. As far as that point goes, the people never asked for this postponement and I do not believe that it would have been possible to have got a petition signed by a dozen people, even Liberals, asking for the postponement that took place in 1904 or 1908, while it would have been possible to have got a large petition subscribed by people of all political shades of opinion asking that the elections should be held on the same day. When we come to 1908, once again the Election Act was amended and reasons were advanced for the postponement or practically for the disfranchisement, for that is what it meant, of 7,000 electors in my constituency. The contention was again advanced by this gentleman who was anxious to retain his seat because he felt he could not retain it in any other way. He found, however, he could not retain it even by resorting to that means. Again last year the question came up and the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) moved an amendment designed to have the elections held uniformly on the same day, and although his amendment was defeated by the government supporters, I have to thank the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) for placing the question before the House. In that debate the leader of the opposition asked the Prime Minister what he thought, and the Prime Minister replied:

I am told there are some provinces where it would be absolutely impracticable to hold all the elections on the same day. The member for Yale-Cariboo said it would be impossible in his own riding.

Well, I think I can prove beyond cavil that the member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) had his own particular reasons for wishing the election deferred, and I do not think he was a safe authority for the Prime Minister to take. However, Mr. Macpherson again jumped into the breach and he asserted with great fervour that it was impossible to reach all parts of Yale-Cariboo within the time, and he said there was also great difficulty with respect to Comox-Atlin. Let me summarize the argument advanced by Mr. Duncan Ross. He first disclaimed any wish to postpone the election, on the very curious ground that once the Conservatives were hopelessly defeated at the general elections the Liberal organization would all go to pieces, and therefore he would not get as many votes as he otherwise would. This is a very extraordinary argument, because if the Liberal organization went to pieces with the Liberal government in power, what do you think would be the moral effect of a great Liberal victory upon

the Conservative organization? The insincerity of such an argument need only to be stated. I would remark in passing that my opponent admitted that there were about 1,000 less votes polled in a by-election in 1904 than there would have been at the general elections. Is it not a proof of the evil of deferring an election if it can have the effect of causing 1,000 people not to exercise their franchise? But Mr. Duncan Ross went further and he added that it would take three weeks, between nomination and election, also three weeks to post the proclamations in some parts of the riding, and he also said that on the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific, in the Peace river country, there were large settlements which it would take six weeks for the ballot boxes to reach. Inasmuch as only 19 days actually were allowed, the inconsistency of that argument will be apparent. As to the large settlement on the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific, referred to by Mr. Ross, I have in my hand a copy of the election returns from the total number of 161 polls in that riding which has an area of about 70,000 square miles, and I find that only three polls were held in that great north country. The total vote cast in my election was 6,518, and the total vote in that north country, where those people had to be looked after, as Mr. Ross said, was only 18 votes, of which my opponent got 10 and I got 8. I most certainly agree that every effort should be made to give every voter in a constituency an opportunity to exercise his franchise, but I must again refer to the insincerity of the argument of the then member for Yale-Cariboo in this respect, because no poll was held at Fort George, where there were a considerable number of voters. Based on insincere and incorrect arguments the election was deferred in that constituency in opposition to the wishes of the best people and with the evident design that a government supporter might be enabled to retain his seat. Now, although I believe that in 1904 every point in that constituency could have been reached within the statutory time, I will admit that in 1908 it would have taken 12 days between nomination and election to have reached the most northerly portion of it. But what are the facts? The tenth parliament of Canada was dissolved on September 17; the writs were issued on September 18, the general elections were held on October 26, giving an interval of 38 days. In order to do the same justice to the electors of Yale-Cariboo that was done to the electors of the rest of the country these 38 days afforded ample time to cover the whole territory, even allowing 12 days between nomination and election. Let me return for a moment to the governmental view of these matters, and let me endeavour to ascertain definitely the position taken by the government. Speaking of the province of British Columbia—and I think I may safely say the same applies to Quebec—the riding of Comox-Atlin is the most difficult of access of all. There would be more reason for deferring the election in Comox-Atlin than in any other electoral district. In 1904, Mr. Macpherson, then the member for Burrard, in arguing for deferred elections, spoke as follows (Hansard 7654) :

I would like to put the facts of the case before the leader of the opposition, who seems inclined to take the stand that the Dominion elections will have to be held upon the same day. The district of Comox-Atlin is 1,500 miles in length, as the crow flies, from the polling subdivision which will be at Squamish to Surprise lake. If the election is held in the winter time, you will require a dog train to take up the polling boxes; if in the summer time, you will require canoes to take them up. My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) has said it is a physical impossibility to hold an election in Kootenay in the time required by law, and it is equally impossible in Comox-Atlin. In fact it is more difficult in Comox-Atlin than in any other district, for the reason that the facilities for travelling are much more difficult. To illustrate by a case in point. On the occasion of the last election the returning officer went into the then district of Burrard—Comox-Atlin is a little larger than the district of Burrard—and he was obliged to travel five days with a dog team. He had first to travel on snowshoes to break a trail for the dog team to bring the ballot boxes in. It takes him almost fourteen days from the time he leaves. If he takes Nanaimo as the central point of Comox-Atlin, it would be a physical impossibility for him to get into Surprise camp or to Atlin, as my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Earle) can substantiate, in less than fourteen days.

That is the argument advanced by Mr. Macpherson, and he supported it by adding that it would take a flying machine to get into these distant parts of the constituency in the statutory time. Well, the House will discount some of these statements when it learns that even in winter the provincial elections in these various constituencies were all held on the same day. It is true that Comox-Atlin is a more difficult constituency to reach than Yale-Cariboo, and much more difficult than Kootenay is, and the argument of the hon. gentleman from Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) in favour of deferring the election in that riding was absolutely without justification.

Let me point out that, not very long ago, there was a by-election in Comox-Atlin, by virtue of which—if that is the right word to use in this connection—my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) sits in this House to-day. The time from the issue of the writ to election day in the general elections was 38 days. As everybody knew that the general election was coming on there was a certain preparation. In Comox-Atlin, in the

by-election, the result of which was that the Minister of Inland Revenue obtained a seat which he now occupies, there was no knowledge of an election to be held. There was complete darkness on the subject so far as the formation of public opinion went. I do not wish to suggest for a moment that there was not a certain amount of knowledge as between my hon. friend (Mr. Templeman) and the gentleman who resigned his seat that he might take it and also a few of their faithful friends. But, so far as the great public was concerned, there was no knowledge of an election coming on in that constituency, and I believe it was a matter of some doubt as to which constituency would be the best hunting ground for my hon. friend. This makes it all the more reasonable and natural and necessary that the election in this great district of Comox-Atlin, which district was so graphically described by Mr. Macpherson, should have all the notice that could possibly be given. But what happens? Let me turn to a series of questions I asked the government on the subject of the Comox-Atlin election. I refer to 'Hansard' of February 8, where it will be found that I put these questions:

On what date was the writ issued for the vacancy in Comox-Atlin?

What date was fixed for nomination and what date for polling day?

Who is the returning officer, and where does he reside?

Was such returning officer advised of his appointment by telegram?

Was he by telegram instructed to prepare the proclamation before the writ could reach him? If so, by what minister or official was the communication sent?

The answers I got to these questions were these:—That the writ was issued on 22nd of January, 1909; that the returning officer fixed the date for nomination and election, and the government therefore had nothing to do with it. (Of course, it is certain that the Minister of Inland Revenue—Mr. Templeman—would have a good deal to do with it), and that neither the Secretary of State, nor Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, nor anybody in authority had sent instructions by telegram. Now, let us examine this statement for a moment. The nomination in Comox-Atlin took place on February 8, and election day was fixed for February 20. So, from the time the writ was issued in Ottawa until the date of election there was a total of 29 days, or nine days less than the time allowed for the general elections. We are told by Mr. Macpherson, as I have pointed out, that this is the most difficult of all constituencies, that one would need a flying machine to reach speedily these places where some of the voters reside. Now, it seems to me the government must take one horn of the dilemma or the other. They have either proven by their action in this case that it is possible to hold all elections on the same day, or they have deliberately in the case of Comox-Atlin, disfranchised absolutely those whom the Minister of Justice described as groups of men whom it would not be right to deprive of their vote. Now, one further word in connection with this answer given by the government. The Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) said that no telegram had been sent 'by the Secretary of State or by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, or, so far as I am aware, by anybody in authority.' Let us see, for a moment, how this thing works out. I have maintained, and still maintain, that, if any doubt were shown to exist of the possibility of holding the election in any constituency in British Columbia on the same day as in the rest of Canada, by sending out the writ by wire you would save practically seven days. However, we were told that this was not done. I am going to try to see what happened in Comox-Atlin. The writ was issued on January 22. It would take, as every one knows, at least seven days, and I am not sure but that, as the returning officer resides in Prince Rupert, it would take more for the writ to reach him. Even if he had come to some nearer point he would not receive the writ until January 29. He had fixed the date of nomination on February 8. But section 87 of the Dominion Elections Act provides:

Such proclamation shall be posted up in all the electoral districts at least eight days before the day fixed for the nomination of candidates, neither the last day of posting it up nor the day of nomination being reckoned.

That is, the proclamation would have to be posted up in Comox-Atlin on January 29. But the writ was issued on January 22, and if no telegram was sent, as we have been told, it would reach the returning officer only on the 29th, and he had no time to prepare the proclamation and send it out all over Comox-Atlin. We are driven by the logic of the facts to the conclusion that the gentlemen concerned did send that writ by wire, in spite of their statements.

I wish to deal for a moment with another aspect of the question of deferred elections I have already said that the case of England is different from that of this country, and it certainly is. To some extent, in a new country like Canada, a country in the making, a country which deserves and demands incessantly enormous appropriations for public works, we can understand that any great appropriations that the government will promise must necessarily have great weight in influencing constituencies, if the people are convinced that those who make the promises have the power to perform. This is appealed to by all parties; whatever party is in power gets into the habit of promising certain things. In the general election, there is some degree of

uncertainty whether the party promising will have the power to perform. But in a deferred election such as that of 1904 and 1908, when the government was returned by a substantial majority, appeals making these promises, when made by those in power and able to perform were made with almost irresistible force to the minds of people in a new country. Take as an illustration the election of 1904 went to show that every man who desires the growth of this country on progressive lines should favour the abolition of all deferred elections. In 1904, the present government was returned by a majority, if I remember right, of 66. Elections had been held in British Columbia, and all had gone Liberal. Other elections were deferred. For the last three weeks in that campaign, almost single-handed, I was confronted by about fifteen of the most prominent Liberals in the west. My ammunition, the Grand Trunk Pacific matter, had gone, and I simply had to appeal to the manhood of the electors, to the danger of big majorities—an appeal which after all had some foundation in reason as we have since found out—and ask them to judge the election on its merits. With what argument was I met? Simply with the big stick argument. On my platform, in my own town of Grand Forks, we had some very distinguished gentlemen. We had Mr. W. W. B. McInnis, late Governor of the Yukon and later the defeated candidate in Vancouver, who thundered against the folly of electing a man who was going to Ottawa to oppose the government and who consequently could get his constituency nothing, when they might elect a man who could get them everything they wanted. We had there also another distinguished gentleman, the Minister of Inland Revenue, Mr. Templeman, who was kind enough to say nothing to me personally, except what was pleasant. He said I was a very decent fellow, but he nullified that admission by asking: What is the use of sending him to Ottawa if you want the needs of your district attended to? So effective was that argument with a great many people—and one is not inclined to condemn them altogether—in my own town —so effective was the argument expressed with all the earnestness and the eloquence of the hon. minister and the propspect he held out that they were going to get a new post office and a lot of other things if they only elected the government candidate.—that the opposition candidate was left behind. But what have the people got after their four years' waiting? All they have got is a post office site, and they got that six days before my election last November The argument used over and over again with deadly, crushing effect—and used not only by speakers who might not be considered responsible men, but also by prominent public men, was that politics were only to be used for what could be got out of them. Their motto was that expressed in the familiar words of Hosea Biglow.

> It ain't by principles or men
> My prudent course is steadied;
> I scent which pays the best and then
> Go into it bald-headed.

When our friends went over to the neighbouring riding of Greenwood we had there most extraordinary exhibitions. Again the Minister of Inland Revenue went on the platform and among the things he said—he will correct me if I am wrong—was this, that if the people saw fit—and he was sure they would—to return a supporter of the government, in the person of Mr. Ross, he, the minister, would probably consent to come and spend three weeks at Greenwood and give the people during that time the light of his countenance.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend's last statement as to what I said was no doubt a jest. But a moment ago he said that at some place in his constituency I had pointed out to the electors that it was useless to send my good friend to Ottawa because he could not get anything for the people. I challenge him to produce any evidence that in any one of the meetings in his constituency at which I was present I ever uttered such a sentiment.

Mr. BURRELL. Of course if my hon. friend assures me of that, I have, in a parliamentary sense, to accept his assurance. But I want emphatically to say that I am not quoting my own personal friends, but from friends of the hon. gentleman in Grand Forks.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am astounded. I was never in Grand Forks at a public meeting.

Mr. BURRELL. Does the hon. gentleman say he was not in Grand Forks ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have not been in Grand Forks since I passed through going to the west with my deputy minister, visiting some of the mines, and no public meeting was held then.

Mr. BURRELL. My hon. friend will pardon me when I suggest that I am speaking of 1904.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I beg pardon.

Mr. BURRELL. I hope my hon. friend will understand that I do not want to strike a single blow below the belt in anything I say. I specifically stated that I referred to 1904, when I am convinced the hon. gentleman did go on the platform and take the line of argument to which I have drawn attention. The remark I made about his paying a three weeks' visit to Greenwood may be dismissed as a light matter, but he certainly did go on the platform at Grand Forks and other portions of my constitu-

ency and deal in that line of argument. Let me quote here what my opponent did say on the platform at Greenwood two nights before the election. I do not like to refer to him, as he is absent, in any way. De mortuis nil nisi bonum. Nothing but good of the dead, and of course, Mr. Ross is politically dead; and if I refer to what he said, it is because it vindicates my line of argument. I was on the platform at Greenwood, at a meeting of my own and extended to my opponent every courtesy and opportunity to speak. To my amazement he took the direct line of argument and said, in so many words that if the people wanted to get anything for their constituency, public works or anything of that kind, they could not get it by sending an opponent of the government to Ottawa, but should elect a man who supported the government. And I told Mr. Ross then that while I had heard that kind of doctrine occasionally spoken in private, that was the first time I had heard a man brazen enough to go on the platform and preach it in public. If my hon. friend (Mr. Templeman) had gone through so bitter, exhaustive and up-hill campaign as I had to go through in 1904, he would have felt sympathy for any man placed in the position in which I was; and in spite of every one of the influences attendant upon a deferred election, the majority after all against me was only 161. I am glad now to take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of the loyal and unselfish efforts of those men all over my own constituency, who had absolutely nothing to gain but who felt that thy had a duty to perform and supported our cause to the last hour.

Let me refer again to the recent deferred election when we had the powerful influences of the government brought to bear against the man unfortunate enough to face a deferred election. We had in 1908, my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Templeman) speaking on the platform in my constituency, but the people did not attach so much weight to his speeches this time for an obvious reason. We had some other very distinguised gentlemen of the party opposite on the stump there. We had the Hon. Walter Scott, premier of Saskatchewan, my distinguished friend the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Oliver, other gentlemen from Alberta and a great many prominent men from British Columbia, who all concentrated their efforts to secure my defeat and the defeat of the other Conservative candidates.

Now, take the case of the Minister of the Interior—and again I, of course, dissociate myself from anything personal in these remarks, I am simply dealing with these matters with reference to the principle at stake. I am sure the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) will not deny being present at that meeting and saying such things, because I have here a copy of the the 'Inland Sentinel,' published at Kamloops on October 30, 1908. This paper is a recognized organ of the Liberal party in the interior or at all events in the Kamloops district. This copy contains a very careful report of the speech of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) from which I shall read an extract. The minister spoke as follows:

> The people of Canada had said at the elections just held that they favoured the Liberal policy of development. That question is settled; the Liberals are in power and whichever way the people of Yale-Cariboo may go will not affect that fact. But the people of Yale-Cariboo now have to decide whether they favour western development. If they do they will vote for Mr. Ross; if they do not want western development then, of course, they will vote for Mr. Burrell and the government will be guided by the opinion so expressed. He pointed out that the influence of a member of parliament is measured—

I am sure that members on both sides ought to sit up and take notice of this doctrine,

> —by the vote he receives and the larger the majority given a member, the greater is his measure of influence in obtaining concessions from the government.

If I may apply that remark in its very broadest sense, then I trust the Minister of the Interior will remember how large my own majority was.

But upon that speech a leading article is based in this same paper. This article reads in part:

> So far as deciding whether Liberals or Conservatives shall govern the elections, the fight in Canada is finished and the people of the country have voiced their desire for a continuance of the policy of the Laurier administration. The fight in Yale-Cariboo is still on and will not be over until November 12. The question before the electors of this district is this: Now that the Dominion has placed the Liberals in power again, will the interests of Yale-Cariboo be best served by sending to Ottawa as its representative a man opposed to the government or a man friendly and whom the government regard with friendly eyes? There are many public works needed in this great district; who is most likely to get from the government the necessary appropriations to carry out these works? Will the opinion of Mr. Burrell be more likely to prevail with the government as against that of Mr. Ross? After all, that is the question the people of this district have to answer. If they wish to have the government carry on works in this district necessitating large expenditures, they can best show that desire by returning Mr. Ross at the head of the poll by the largest possible majority.

That is the way the matter is looked at out there. We now come to the Vernon district. I have here the semi-weekly 'Okanagan,' the Liberal organ in the great Okanagan country, dated November 4. It

contains a report of a speech of the minister in that city. Here is a phrase.

Western Canada has been the great work of the government; and to a great extent, this good city of Vernon and the beautiful settlements throughout the Okanagan valley are evidences of the success of the government's policy in the last 12 years.

If one had time it would be easy to show that for every inch of development in that valley due to the guidance or assistance of this government, there are a good many feet of development due to the assistance of the provincial government. However, I wish to deal with a leading article in this newspaper, which says in part:

Mr. Ross has, however, kept before his mind the highest, the best ideals of his duty to his constituents as a whole, and to say he has been pre-eminently successful in pressing upon the government the rights of this immense constituency, is doing him scant justice. . . During the years of Conservative rule, practically nothing was done for this constituency in general or the Okanagan district in particular. Now we have an excellent telephone service to almost every part of the district.

I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite will be glad to know that because there seemed to be some doubt some time ago as to whether there was a government telephone in existence. This particular government telephone service was put into operation just prior to my election campaign of 1904, and achieved the results intended. There were also very busy operations in the extension of this system just prior to the election of 1908. The article proceeds:

The mail service has been improved a hundred per cent. Public buildings in keeping with the growth and importance of Vernon and other towns are being built.

I shall deal with that remark and show what bearing it has on this whole question of deferred elections. The paper claimed and my opponent claimed that the government was doing a great deal for this particular constituency. It had waited, it had the promise of this public building, although this article assumes that the building was being constructed. I have here another copy of this same paper dated October 21.

This town has a population of 3,500 and a customs revenue of $35,000. It had waited for a public building for a long time and then on October 21, there appeared an advertisement calling for tenders for a public building. A remarkable thing is that the tender dated at Ottawa, October 20, 1908, asking for tenders for the construction of a public building at Vernon appears in this British Columbia paper the next day. The full tender and a beautiful cut of the building are published. There are also references to the advertisement. I call to your attention the picture of this magnificent building for which tenders were called shortly prior to my election. The article is headed in large type.

Tenders are wanted for new post office. Will cost between $30,000 and $40,000.

As will be seen by advertisement in another column, the Department of Public Works is calling for tenders for the new post office and customs house to be erected in this city. . . The new structure will be three stories in height, and will be of brick with stone facings. It is estimated that it will cost when completed between $30,000 and $40,000 and will be a credit to our city. One thing is certain, it will be much superior to any public building in Vernon if not in the interior.

The 'Okanagan' has obtained a photograph of this latest evidence of the progressiveness of the Laurier administration, which is reproduced below. The people of Vernon should know who to thank for this handsome structure. By dint of hard work and by constantly representing to the department the needs in the city of a building of this kind, our representative in the last Dominion parliament, Mr. Duncan Ross, succeeded in having provisions made whereby the same could be erected during the coming year.

They wind up by saying:

It will be a credit to our beautiful city, to the government which built it and to Mr. Duncan Ross, our representative, who, by his untiring efforts secured the same for us. This is only one of his many good works for his district, and he is deserving of the thanks of the community.

You can understand that when one is fighting the battle of his party on the questions of the day, in so far as he can in a deferred election, to encounter something of that kind does infuse a certain amount of bitterness into a man. He thinks it is reasonable to ask his opponents to conduct a fair fight. I do not think that sort of thing is justified and the extraordinary thing is that although we have this as an evidence of the latest phase of the progressiveness of the Laurier administration, and although the promise was not repudiated, yet, in spite of all, after the elections are over, lo and behold there was no magnificent structure, there was no post office at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may point out that all this appeal had no effect so far as my opponent's wishes went, and for various reasons. One of the reasons why my opponent was not returned to this House was the reason which is the basis of my whole argument, namely, that the people of the western constituencies, regardless of party shades of opinion, had absolutely no use for deferred elections; they did not believe they were justified by conditions, and they did not believe they were justified by the facts, but they did believe that fair-play and a fair fight should be given, and should be the practice adopted by the government.

Now I want particularly to appeal to the Prime Minister, who from indisposition, I regret is not in his seat to-day, because I know that the Prime Minister, and I believe the other ministers as well, are not opposed to holding the elections on the same day if they knew there are no reasons for deferring them. The Prime Minister has certainly expressed that view. I have shown that in the case of Comox-Atlin not only was there no necessity for deferring the election more than 12 days after the nomination, but the government have cut the ground from under their own feet by doing it in less time than was given in the general election. I see no valid objection indeed to a longer time being given to the whole country, a period say, of six weeks after the issue of the writs before the general election. I believe then that not only could all the elections be held on the same day in all the provinces, but that the election could be held in the Yukon on the same day as well—but on that point my hon. friend representing the Yukon (Mr. Congdon) can speak with better authority. One of the objections raised to having a longer period before elections is that the country is too long a time unsettled. I would ask if there is any valid objection to such a proposition? After all, we in the larger constituencies who have to campaign something like four, or five, or even six months, cannot quite sympathize with that view. There is a great deal to be said in favour of a fixed term for holding elections, such as they have in the United States. Although a fixed term would perhaps involve quite a constitutional change, I believe that if we adopted a fixed term it would do away, as it does in the United States, with a great many of the evils to which I have referred. Of course hon. gentlemen opposite will retort to that argument that the form of the elections would not be so representative, the form of government would not be so representative as is ours, and they will argue that on any great question in the United States a fixed term for the elections does not allow so well for any rapid change in public sentiment. It is all very well to argue that way, it is right in theory, but how does it work out in practice? I may say that in many parts of Canada, although the theory is that our government being able to appeal to the country at any time is therefore more representative than it would be if elected at a fixed period, the custom is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Let me give you two instances. If there was ever a case in the political history of Canada where, if this government was to be a reflex of popular opinion or wished to ascertain the public pulse and the public sentiment on big questions, and that therefore they were justified and compelled, in virtue of being a representative government, to find out what that sentiment was—if, I say, there were ever any occasions in which that theory should have been put into practice, it was on two notable occasions, when, in fact, it was entirely ignored, one was the Autonomy Bill, in regard to which the voice of the people was never heard until afterwards, and the next was this very question of the Grand Trunk Pacific. We know very well that that great measure was never referred to the people. It was brought up in the third session, and then there was another short session for the purpose of ratifying better terms for the company, but in neither case was the question referred to the people at all, until after the measure was passed, and when the people would have been placed in the position of repudiating a contract entered into by the government.

In quoting these two instances I am free to admit, that the argument will apply to all political parties alike, in greater or in less degree, and that unfortunately at these times statesmanship is merged in political opportunism, and is trying to get snap verdicts, because unfortunately those are times when all are for the party and none are for the state. Now I would like this point to be seriously considered. We in the larger constituencies are kept necessarily in an unsettled state for a very long time, some of us for months. As a matter of fact, the country generally knows fairly well that an election is coming on. If I wanted to give you proof that the country does know that elections are coming on, I need only read a portion of a letter that I have in my hands which was written by the Prime Minister of this country to my opponent as long ago as the 21st of March, although the elections did not come on until October 26. This letter I may say was written to the secretary of the Liberal Association of Yale-Cariboo, and this is the tenor of it:

Ottawa, 21st March, 1908.

My Dear Sir,—I understand that a convention is called for the purpose of selecting a Liberal candidate in the district of Yale-Cariboo. It is an encouraging sign to see that the Liberals in your district are thus getting ready for the contest. The loyalty and enthusiasm of the Liberals of the west have always been an inspiration and an encouragement, and I feel sure that my friends in Yale-Cariboo will see that so far as they are concerned there will be no breaks in the ranks of the solid seven from British Columbia.

The result was a somewhat ironical comment on the letter. It winds up:

It is not for me to interfere in the choice of the electors; that is a matter as to which they must be left absolutely untrammelled. If I may, however, be permitted to express a wish, I can assure you that no man could be more acceptable to myself and to the Liberal members of the House of Commons than our

friend Duncan Ross, the gallant sitting member.

Yours very sincerely,
WILFRID LAURIER.

I merely adduce this letter to show that after all, if there is any objection to the government giving six weeks before an election on the ground of unsettling public sentiment, public sentiment is really unsettled for a much longer period. Another illustration. Every hon. gentleman in this House knows that after a second session there is a possibility of appeal to the country, after a third session that possibility and that unsettlement are increased, and after a fourth session the country is getting still more unsettled as the inevitable election draws nearer. So there is no reason in the argument that a longer term would unsettle the country, or that it would be inadvisable to give six weeks or two months that the people might have full time to discuss the great controverted questions that agitate the country. I am persuaded that the unsettlement would not be objected to by the members of this House, or by the people of Canada, if it would prevent the wiping out of deferred elections the disfranchisement, practically, of 30,000 or 40,000 of Canadian electors.

In closing my remarks let me quote a few words from a well known writer, in which he arraigns our political system as it is conducted at the present time:

> In political life there is no rest or peace possible. Every one is either fighting or hiding in ambush, lying, listening, hunting for trails, or removing traces of his own; sleeping with one eye open and his gun in his hand; looking on every one he meets as an enemy, his hand against everybody and everybody's hand against him; slandered, traduced, badgered, provoked and wounded—in short, he must live like a redskin on the warpath in a trackless wilderness.

I am sure that any hon. gentleman in this House will feel the tragedy of public life as it is depicted in that passage. We can thank God that there is a brighter side to the picture; otherwise the burden on those who are taking up this life with a sincere desire to do something in the interest of our country, would be unbearable. But, we want to better the conditions and every man who wants honestly to better the conditions in Canada will willingly accept the unbiased verdict of the people whether it places him in a seat in this House or puts him out. I believe that I have shown that it is feasible and that the time for the abolition of deferred elections has arrived. I believe that the manifest evils of deferred elections have been abundantly proven, and I trust that the government, in spite of its natural desire for power, will see its way to adopt the full letter and spirit of this amendment and that we can all join in the abolition of deferred elections, which after all is a plain matter of justice to individuals and is necessary to the betterment of political conditions throughout the whole country.

Mr. F. T. CONGDON (Yukon). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has introduced this amendment (Mr. Burrell) told me some days ago that he proposed to direct the attention of the House to the matter of deferred elections and if there is any member of this House who is interested in deferred elections I think it will be generally conceded that it is the representative of the Yukon. Not only in this parliament, but in a former parliament, the member for the Yukon, by reason of deferred elections, was obliged to wander around the corridors of this building very much like a dismembered spirit seeking admission to the Elysian fields and only securing it after a long wait. When the hon. gentleman announced to me that he intended to introduce this subject, I expressed the greatest interest in it and I added that I hoped he would bring it before the House in such a manner as would enable the House to arrive at a practical solution of the difficulty that presents itself. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is aware of the fact but the amendment which he has proposed to the House has eliminated altogether the question of elections in the Yukon from the consideration of this matter, because, as I understand, it is limited purely to the provinces and the Yukon is not yet a province of the Dominion.

Mr. BURRELL. I did that for the reason that as I was not thoroughly familiar with the conditions of the Yukon, it might perhaps be difficult for me to include it in the amendment, but I spoke of it and I specifically said that I believed it might or it would include the Yukon. However, I desire to say that I am entirely in sympathy with the abolition of deferred elections in the Yukon.

Mr. CONGDON. At all events the resolution will work no cure for the Yukon and will work no such cure as is desirable possibly for any of the other constituencies. The matter of these deferred elections is not a matter of fair play or justice; it is simply a matter of geographical considerations, and if it is possible that the election in any constituency can be held at the same time as the elections generally throughout Canada I think it will be conceded by both sides of the House that it would be desirable that it should be so held. With regard to the Yukon, when the hon. gentleman mentioned the subejct to me, it did seem to me that there might possibly be some practical way of holding the election in that constituency at the

same time as the elections in the rest of Canada, and no one, I am sure, in the Yukon will be better pleased if that result can be arrived at than I will be, because, undoubtedly, there is always a very much greater interest when the result of the election does not merely mean the selection of one man or the other but may possibly mean the determination of the fate of the government. I have looked over the various periods allowed since 1874 between the date of the issue of the writ for a general election and the date of the nominations for general election, and I think it must be generally admitted that these dates selected, partly by one political party and partly by the other, are fair indications of the periods which should elapse between the issue of the writ and the election. I find that in 1878, twenty-four days elapsed between the date of the issue of the writ and the date of the nomination; in 1882, 26 days; in 1887, 29 days; in 1891, 22 days; in 1896, 53 days; in 1900, 22 days; in 1904, 28 days, and in 1908, 31 days. So that these figures will give an average period, which I think is a reasonable period for a general election throughout Canada, of thirty days between the date of the issue of the writ and the date of the nomination. Now, it simply comes down, in my humble judgment, to a question of whether, in these various constituencies in which the elections are now deferred, it is possible to hold the elections within that period, allowing thirty days between the issue of the writ and the date of the nomination. I had thought at one time, considering the period of thirty-eight days which elapsed between the date of the issue of the writ and the holding of the last general election, that possibly in the Yukon it would be possible to hold the election within that period. It certainly would not be possible under the existing Act, but with the permission of the House I propose later to introduce some amendments to the Dominion Elections Act with the view of shortening time. The present Act does not contemplate at all possibility of an election in the Yukon concurrent with other elections. Under the Act it is absolutely essential to allow twenty-one days for the writ to reach Dawson from Ottawa. I think that period might be greatly shortened by making provision for telegraphic communication on this subject, as also there might be provision for telegraphic communication in other regards. But, as there needs to be a difference between the issue of the writ and the general election of somewhere about forty days, it is, in my opinion, utterly impossible to bring on the election in the Yukon at the same time as other elections. I can only say that in regard to this I would be most anxious that the election should be held there on the same day, but it comes down simply to the question of whether the House deems it advisable, and will pronounce itself to be of that opinion when the question is brought before it in a proper way that the Elections Act should compel a longer period than that which at present elapses between the issue of the writ and date of a general election.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, the principle of simultaneous polling is one which has been accepted in Canada for a very long time and I suppose we can accept it as a general principle. Strange to say, it is not so accepted in the mother country to which we usually look for our example, and I do not know that any very good reason can be given why it has not been adopted in the United Kingdom. There the conditions of transportation, the density of population, the means of communication by mail and telegraph all seem to make for the convenience of simultaneous elections. For reasons which seem to them sufficient that method has not been adopted, while we in Canada, with the many disadvantages in the way of communication, have, for a long time, found it possible to carry out that principle with very few exceptions. With our geographical conditions it might very well be expected that there should be occasional exceptions. In the resolution which the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) has put before the House he does not leave room for any exceptions whatever. I think we will all agree that as time passes and as distant places in the Dominion are brought into easier communication, as the population becomes thicker, and as the facilities for communication become better, we will be able from time to time to drop out some of those exceptions and apply the general principle of simultaneous polling, perhaps to some of the constituencies in which to-day we have deferred elections. My hon. friend, however, makes the general statement and declaration that there shall be no exceptions. He will take no account of any geographical conditions. I have not the knowledge of British Columbia which my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) has nor am I familiar with the topography of the several constituencies in which elections are now deferred, or the transportation facilities available within them, but I am advised on good authority that even to-day it would be difficult to adopt without any exception the principle which the hon. gentleman has embodied in his resolution. Therefore, it would not be wise for the House to adopt the resolution, even though the general purpose my hon. friend has in mind might commend itself to us. I am obliged to take exception to the resolution on another ground. I was rather surprised to find my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) stating that this

was not to be regarded as a vote of non-confidence, because if the hon. gentleman desired to move non-confidence in the government, the procedure he took would be the most effective for his purpose under our parliamentary practice. If we assume for the moment that there is need of reform in this matter then the question comes as to which is the best procedure to accomplish that reform. The hon. gentleman might have introduced a Bill striking out these exceptions from our Elections Act, or he might have put on the Order Paper a notice of motion—as my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) did with regard to a matter which he considered for the public welfare—a discussion of which would have opened up the whole subject and probably laid the basis for the introduction of an amendatory Bill. The hon. gentleman has brought this motion as an amendment to Supply, so that the House is confined to a consideration of the words of his motion and these words only, without being able to offer an amendment. Under the practice established in parliament his motion moved in this way must be regarded as practically one of non-confidence. I regret that the hon. gentleman—for whom I have the highest respect as a new member and an old friend—should have taken the wrong way to bring about a reform which in his mind he thinks necessary. I do not for the moment say there is no room for change; I do not say that the experience of the last few years may not have shown that some of these exceptions in the Elections Act might be removed without inconvenience, but since my hon. friend offers his suggestion in the form of a non-confidence motion I am obliged to ask the House to not approve of it.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I could not help thinking, while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) was speaking, of the lines:

> On forms of government let fools contest
> What's best administered is best.

because my experience in this House tells me that in many instances supporters of the government of the strongest dye have proposed amendments to Supply and have had public questions discussed in this form, and then we have seen occupants of the treasury benches arise and gracefully accept these motions. I remember that a supporter of the Minister of Finance, who now sits on the bench of Nova Scotia, moved an amendment to Supply in exactly the same way as did my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) this afternoon, and I think my memory does not fail me when I say that the Minister of Finance himself, speaking for the government, declared that the amendment would be accepted.

Mr. FIELDING. Probably it was a very good motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. That is just the point. The government certainly does not regard all the amendments to Supply as motions of non-confidence, but I suppose it depends to some extent on the political complexion of the hon. gentleman who moves the amendment. For my part I think the procedure adopted by my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) is quite appropriate to the ventilation of this grievance. He has brought before the House a long standing grievance, and I trust that after the very eloquent appeal he has made the government will take steps to end an abuse which has become intolerable all over the country. I rose merely to speak of this grievance as we experience it in the province of Quebec, where we have not the spirit of resistance which the people of British Columbia apparently have. We have in the province of Quebec the counties of Gaspé and Chicoutimi, which since confederation have been practically disfranchised by the system of deferring the elections in them. I do not say that at one time, because of the lack of communication within these counties, it may not have been necessary to defer the elections, but that day has past. It might be necessary in these counties to notify the returning officers a few days before the other returning officers were notified, but surely there could be no objection to that. The turmoil of a general election begins months before the day of nomination, and even if it were necessary to notify by telegram the returning officers in these counties the same day that the writs were mailed to the other returning officers, there would be ample time to have the general elections in Gaspé and Chicoutimi on the same day as the others. These two Quebec counties require public works, and post offices and government aid in one way and another, and so for twenty years it has been an understood thing that they would elect supporters of the government. In these counties they wait until the result of the general elections is known all over the country, and then they proceed as it were pro forma to the election of a government supporter.

Mr. TALBOT. Is that what happened in British Columbia this year?

Mr. MONK. In British Columbia they seem to take a different view, and that is why I spoke of the independence of the electors of that province. It is well known by those who take an interest in politics in Quebec that no serious candidature is offered in Chicoutimi and Gaspé until it is ascertained what party has been returned to power. These counties as I have said require public works and aid from the government in a multitude of ways, and under the shameful system of patronage, which is the bane of this country,

they can only get these necessary public works if they are represented by supporters of the party in power. I apply that to all parties. And that is the way the electors of these two counties have been obliged to proceed ever since confederation. Is this necessary? Is there any reasonable ground why the electors of these two large counties should not enjoy the franchise exactly as it is enjoyed everywhere else in Canada—perfectly independent electors to select to represent them in parliament an absolutely independent man. I say we have had conclusive reasons this afternoon why the present system should be abolished. I did not hear what was stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Congdon), representing the Yukon, but I understand that the rule could be made to include the Yukon also. After all, there are a great many people—and I am one of them—who think we should have the general election on a fixed day, without interfering with the prerogative of the Crown to have a dissolution when that is necessary. I think it would be far less unsettling to the country than the present system. At any rate, if the old custom is to be continued and a dissolution must proceed from the government, I do not see any reason why we should continue to persecute—because it is nothing else—a certain class of our electors.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I protest as vigorously as I can against the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that since confederation the county of Gaspé has been practically disfranchised. It certainly has not been disfranchised, if I have heard correctly the very severe criticisms during the discussion of the estimates in this Chamber. The county of Gaspé, as a matter of fact, has been represented by the true representatives of its people. There is in Gaspé a strong opposition; I have been favoured with it ever since 1896, and I have had to fight for my life at each election. But the hon. member (Mr. Monk) is not well informed concerning the peculiar geographical position of the county of Gaspé. Should a dissolution take place at this moment, or had a dissolution taken place say a month ago, it would not have been humanly possible to hold an election in Gaspé. This applies even to the mainland. We have there a stretch of 250 miles of coast without railway facilities—that is, the railway is under construction but, even when it is finished it will not be sufficient to meet the requirements of the case. In the course of this stretch of 250 miles of coast there are twenty-five or twenty-six rivers, some of them quite large, to cross. Unless the returning officer had the use of one of the government steamers to carry the ballot boxes, posters and other supplies necessary for the election, he could not cover the ground within the period allowed for the general election.

Mr. MONK. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that on the mainland the ground cannot be covered within the period?

Mr. LEMIEUX. On the mainland it can hardly be covered within a month—that is if the returning officer does his duty, chooses the polling booths, posts his proclamations, delivers his ballot boxes and so on, unless he divides the work with other people. There are three municipalities in the county of Gaspé. We have three court-houses, three jails,—they are always empty, I must say—and all the machinery of three municipalities. It is an immense territory. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has visited only that section of the coast which is frequented by the tourists in summer; but the other section, the portion traversed by what is called the maritime road is very hard to cover at any season of the year. But this is only the mainland. We have also the Magdalen Islands, one or two hundred miles distant from the mainland. At this season of the year, you simply could not hold an election on the same day as a general election—unless you wired the proclamation, the instructions to deputy returning officers and so on. But, even so, what about the ballots? There is no printing establishment on the Magdalen Islands; would you favour the system once followed in the county of Chicoutimi, where a match box was used as a ballot box, and the ballots were not printed but written by some of the officers?

Mr. MONK. If the law were amended so as to permit the instructions to be telegraphed to the Magdalen Islands, what possible difficulty would there be in holding the election on the same day as elsewhere?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does not the hon. gentleman see that that is a system open to very serious objection? The date might be telegraphed wrongly. There might easily be an error in wiring the name of one of the candidates. It certainly is not a proper way of holding an election to wire the instructions, the names of the candidates and so on.

Mr. MONK. I only urge that point because I have taken the trouble to inquire of people who reside not only there but lower down the river, and I am informed that there is no obstacle to holding the election in Gaspé on the same day as elsewhere.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have pointed out what seem to me very serious difficulties. If we had nothing but the mainland to consider, when the railway is completed from Paspebiac to Gaspé, the territory can be covered easily within the election period, but,

so long as the Magdalen Islands form part of the county it would be impossible to cover the whole county within the time at certain seasons of the year. At the last election—I was not there on the day of election, but I am aware of the fact, the returning officer had the use of two of the government steamers for the delivery of the ballot boxes on the Magdalen Islands and the mainland.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman knows that they are not always used when necessary.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In this instance they were used because it was necessary in order to hold the election on the day fixed in the proclamation. Now, this point is not a ground of complaint on the part of any of the parties in Gaspé. Before 1896, and since, the two parties have admitted that the election cannot be held in Gaspé on the same day as elsewhere. Nor is this regarded as a grievance in that constituency. I repeat that the county has not been disfranchised. Ever since confederation there have been the two parties, well organized in that county. The county was Liberal when hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side. It so happens that the county has been Liberal ever since 1896, but that does not mean that it has been disfranchised. As regards Saguenay and Chicoutimi, the hon. gentleman is in error, because in the last general election the polling took place there on the same day as elsewhere.

Mr. MONK. But the law allows a deferred election.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the election had taken place in winter, I suppose it would have been impossible to have the polling there on the same day as in the rest of the Dominion.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). I just wish to point out that the only objection which appears to have been taken on the government side to the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo is that this resolution is an amendment to the resolution to go into Supply, and that this makes it impossible for the government to accept. That attitude was taken both by the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Congdon). The latter gentleman went further and expressed his approval of the general principles embodied in the resolution. I wish to point out that the government has accepted amendments to the motion to go into Committee of Supply. I myself moved such an amendment in 1905 on a motion by the Finance Minister to go into Committee of Supply, and my amendment was accepted by the government and adopted. Therefore the objection urged by the Minister of Finance to the adoption of this resolution has no sound foundation.

Hon. W. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). I desire to call attention briefly to another reason why this resolution should not pass. This resolution states:

> This House is of opinion that for the purpose of enabling the electors to exercise fully the rights and privileges of their franchise, the general election should be held on the same day throughout all the provinces of Canada.

I assume that means in every electoral district in Canada. This resolution should not pass because it is impossible to carry it out. There are three constituencies in British Columbia in which the elections were deferred, namely, Kootenay, Yale-Cariboo and Comox-Atlin. I am bound to admit that, as regards the constituency of Kootenay, I do not see any reason why there should be a deferred election there. At the last general election, the candidates on both sides were in favour of the returning officer taking the date of the general election as the date of the election in Kootenay, but for certain reasons, which I saw stated in the papers, such as the difficulties with respect to obtaining voters' lists, the returning officer decided against the wish of the defeated Liberal candidate, Mr. Smith Curtis, to defer the election to a subsequent day. As far as Kootenay is concerned, I think that the election should be held there on the same day as the general election, inasmuch as Kootenay is comparatively a compact constituency, and there are railways running to almost every polling division in it, so that it is accessible at all points. With regard to Yale-Cariboo, the representative of that constituency would be better able to advise the House as to what ought to be done. But with regard to the great constituency of Comox-Atlin which I represent, it would be absolutely impossible to carry out the recommendation contained in this resolution. I do not think that the hon. gentleman can have any idea of the difficulties that obtain in the Comox-Atlin electoral district. It is, I think, the largest electoral district in Canada. It is very nearly as large as the entire province of Ontario—approximately three-quarters as large. All over that immense country, in its greatest length 900 miles and greatest breadth 400 miles, comprising about 180,000 square miles, and particularly all along the coast there are scattered innumerable small communities. There is not a railway in the district. The only means of communication is by steamboat and trail, and sometimes dog sleighs. It would be impossible to hold an election in Comox-Atlin on the same day as the general election unless you make the day

of nomination two weeks before the nomination for the general election. The writs for the late by-election were issued in Ottawa on the 22nd and were received by the returning officer, I believe, on the 27th, and there were 12 days between the nomination and the polling day. These 12 days were too short. If we had had a contest, it is absolutely certain that in respect to at least half a dozen of the most remote polling places, the ballot boxes would never have got there.

Mr. FOSTER. Did they get there?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There was no poll. The election was by acclamation.

Mr. FOSTER. Was any preparation made to get them there?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, it is after all a simple matter of distance and transportation and distance. There nomination was held on February 8. The polling was by proclamation fixed for February 20, and the proclamation was sent to the remote polls by wire. There are polling places such as at Telegraph Creek, on the Skeena river, Aldermere, some 60 miles away, east of Hazelton on the Skeena river, and Cape Scott on Vancouver Island, where there is only monthly communication by steamer. It will be easily understood what our difficulties would be in getting ballot boxes after a nomination to those places within that time. I believe that twelve days is too short. However, the election was by acclamation, which was fortunate, because otherwise in a number of polling places the electors would have been disfranchised. Take Telegraph Creek where there are perhaps forty electors. The returning officer had three government steamers at Prince Rupert on nomination day for the purpose of hurrying the ballot boxes off for distribution to other places. We purposed having a steamer go to Wrangle. There were dog teams at Wrangle to take the boxes in to Telegraph Creek, and I was assured by gentlemen who knew the country and all the difficulties, that it was not possible to make the trip in less than eight or ten days, and if the conditions were unfavourable it could not be done in that time. To Atlin of course communication is much easier, but on the western coast of Vancouver Island there is only a weekly steamer in some parts and in the north a monthly steamer. In many polling places on the mainland, such as Bella Bella and Bella Coola, steamers call only once a month. In all these cases special arrangements would have to be made for the delivery of the ballot boxes. Aldermere is a polling place 60 miles east of Hazelton, and it would have been probably imposible if we had had an election on February 20 to have delivered the boxes there in time. Thus it is necessary that the returning officer should give ample time to permit the ballot boxes to get to their destination in Comox-Atlin. I do not think that any member desires to have a postponed election. For my part I do not, and as a representative of the most difficult constituency in Canada in respect to transportation facilities I would be willing to support the proposition in the resolution if it can be shown to be practical to carry it out.

I cannot say anything about Yale-Cariboo. It is twice the size stated by my hon. friend, but I admit that the northern portion is still uninhabited. However, with the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific within a year or two it will be necessary to establish a number of polling places 200 or 300 miles farther north than we now have them. Even in respect to Yale-Cariboo, great difficulties would be met with in attempting to hold the election on the same day as the other elections. These arguments do not apply to Kootenay and I believe that in future the election in Kootenay could be held on the same day as the general election.

Mr. W. W. RUTAN (Prince Albert). Mr. Speaker, as many references have been made to the constituency which I have the honour to represent, I wish to explain the position there. I am in the same position as the hon. minister (Mr. Templeman), it would be impossible to hold the elections on the day of the general election unless the law was so amended that there would be a longer interval between nomination and election. I know that the returning officer in Prince Albert was willing and anxious to have the election in that constituency on the same day as the general election, but when he went into details and found that we have polls 500 miles away from the City of Prince Albert which would have to be reached by dog train and boat and portages, he found it would be quite impossible. The original arrangement was to have the nomination on October 19 and the election on October 26. The nomination would close at two o'clock on October 19, and then all the ballots and the notices of election would have to be printed, the boxes prepared and the deputy returning officer and poll clerk would have to start out for the northern polls. We have polls at Beaver Lake, Cumberland House, Pas Mountain, Lac La Rounge, Montreal Lake and Pelican Narrows, all of which are from 250 miles to 500 miles distant. It took two days and two nights from noon on the nomination day to print a sufficient number of ballots to supply these polls. The officials then started on their trips and I do not think any hon. gentleman will contend that a man would have physical strength to make such trips as I have mentioned, and

hold the election within five days, as they would have to do to hold the election on the following Monday. These people living in the northern districts claim the same right of franchise as we do. Consequently it is unfair for any one to expect that the elections could be held on the same day and I do not believe our friends on the opposition are sincere in expecting this will be done under the circumstances. It was said by the opposition press that I had gone in with the returning officer to steal Prince Albert. I wish to assure hon. gentlemen in this House that that statement is untrue and utterly unfounded. I told the returning officer that if there was any way possible I would much prefer to have the election on the same day as in the rest of the Dominion, and as a proof of that desire, when the election was deferred, in place of having the nomination day after the election in the rest of the Dominion, it was placed on the day that the other elections were held so that we would not know anything about the result in the rest of the Dominion. Thus there was no chance of taking an unfair advantage of the necessary deferring of the election, as the news of the results in the rest of Canada could not reach these distant polls before the voting took place. It was used as an argument against me throughout the constituency that this was done for the purpose of gaining the election. It does not seem to me that this statement was sincere on the part of the opposition for the very reason that the great argument used by my opponents before notice of the deferring of the election was given, was that the government was about to be defeated, that the Conservative party would be returned to power. Consequently it seems to me that if there was any advantage to be gained by the deferring of the elections it was as great on one side as on the other, especially as the nomination was held before the result of the election in the rest of the Dominion could be known.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). Representing a constituency in which there was a deferred election, I wish to say a few words. I feel that the ground has been thoroughly gone over, and that the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) have been very logical. I am pleased to see that all the members who have followed him have agreed to the principle of the resolution that has been moved. Several speakers, while agreeing with the principle of the resolution, have given various reasons why, at this particular time, they should not support it. First, the Minister of Finance took the ground that to vote for this motion would be equivalent to voting want of confidence in the government and he pointed out that that had never been done.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I did not say that.

Mr. GOODEVE. He said it could not be done without a vote of want of confidence in the government. Now I desire to say that I have a record of a number of resolutions that have been moved by the opposition on going into Supply, and which were accepted by the government:

Amendments to supply adopted by government.

Votes and Proceedings, 1899, page 362, Tupper, responsibility of political heads.

Votes and Proceedings, 1900, page 234, Russell, preferential trade.

Votes and Proceedings 1901, page 288, Davis, Canadian Pacific Railway test case.

Votes and Proceedings, 1902, page 421, Bourassa, embargo cattle.

Votes and Proceedings, 1903, page 125, Costigan, Home Rule.

Votes and Proceedings, 1905, page 782, Armstrong, cold storage.

Votes and Proceedings, 1905, page 954, Lake, civil servants and elections.

Votes and Proceedings, 1908, page , Borden, access to original documents.

In all these cases the amendments were accepted by the government, and in no case were they considered as motions of want of confidence in the government. That being apparently the only argument advanced by the Minister of Finance, I trust that he will now be able to accept this resolution and ask his supporters to accept it. In regard to the question raised by the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Congdon), all his arguments were in favour of the principle of the resolution, his only complaint seemed to be that the Yukon was not included in this resolution. The explanation made by the mover of the resolution was that, not being familiar with the district of the Yukon, he thought it inadvisable to include it in the resolution. But I am sure that the member from the Yukon, agreeing as he does with the principle of the resolution, can vote with us on this question, and it would be an easy matter, when the Bill is drawn up, to include the Yukon. So much with regard to the arguments that have been raised by our friends on the government side.

Again, the Minister of Inland Revenue, in referring to the district of Comox-Atlin, pointed out that the time at present fixed for the general election was not long enough for the constituency which he represented. But as was shown by the actual dates given by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo, in the recent general election the actual time elapsing between the issuing of the writ and the polling day was 38 days, whereas in the by-election, as stated by the Minister of Inland Revenue, there were only 29 days. He himself stated that the writ was issued on the 22nd of January, was received by the returning officer on the 27th of January, and the nomination took

place on February 8. Now if we turn to the Elections Act, we find that it requires that the proclamation shall be posted eight clear days, not including the day of posting or the day of nomination, before the nomination can be held. If we had eight clear days to the day when the minister himself says the returning officer received the writ, namely on the 27th of January, you will see there was not sufficient time given, only two days were given. Again we find that in the recent campaign, if we may believe the public press, he himself stated that he was in favour of this very district of Comox-Atlin having no deferred elections; so he has practically pledged himself to our proposition.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I stated at Prince Rupert what I have stated here to-day. I pointed out the difficulties and the impossibility of holding the election in Comox-Atlin on the same day as the other elections.

Mr. GOODEVE. I accept the hon. gentleman's correction, but I understand that he made the stipulation that it would be necessary to have further time if they were to have it on the same day. I want to point out that we can fairly ask for the support of members on both sides of the House, inasmuch as we are only asserting a principle ; the details can be worked out in a Bill when it comes up for consideration. Now in regard to my own district of Kootenay which I have the honour to represent, let me point out that the people on both sides of politics in that great district are strongly of the opinion that there should be no deferred election in that district. I can advance no better argument than the statement of the Liberal candidate himself in the recent election. When he was nominated some months before the general election, he stated in his address accepting the nomination of the convention, that on no account would there be a deferred election in the constituency of Kootenay. When interviewed by the press, he again reiterated his opinion that the principle of deferred elections was vicious in principle and unfair in practice, and for that reason he assured the people of Kootenay that there would be no deferred election in that district. But he went further than that. When I was nominated by the Liberal-Conservative party in convention, the Liberal candidate wrote me a personal letter of congratulation, and again reiterated the statement he had made in public, that in no event would there be a deferred election in Kootenay, but they would fight it out in a fair field. But, Sir, what was the result? We find that notwithstanding the statement made by the Liberal candidate, both to his own party and through the press to the public, and again personally in writing to me over his own signature, as the campaign wore on, and there seemed to be in the minds of the people a general feeling that the government would not be supported, at least in the western provinces, and particularly in the district of Kootenay, his committee urged upon him over and over again the necessity of deferring the election. And what was the argument advanced by the committee for deferring the election? It was the argument that has been advanced by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo in debating the evil of deferred elections, it was the argument that his only hope of carrying that seat was by deferring the election when, if the government should be returned to power, they would have the influence and the prestige of a victorious government to elect him. The result was that the attitude taken by his committee forced him to consent to deferring the election. In our campaign, both the Conservative press and myself on the public platform, gave the Liberal candidate credit for the attitude he had taken up at first. We felt that he had taken a statesmanlike and manly attitude in regard to this question, which was a burning one in that portion of the province. In every case where we spoke, and in every case through our daily papers, we gave him credit for that attitude. But the very first night when we had a meeting, and were both standing on the same platform, when we knew that the committee had urged upon him the necessity of deferring the election, I took occasion to express the opinion that they had taken an unfair advantage in the middle of the contest, in other words, that after they had agreed to certain conditions and we had accepted these conditions, it was not fair that they should then back out and place upon us a handicap. I may say that the audience agreed with me that the action of the committee was most unfair. Now I do not mention this matter for the purpose of ventilating any incidents of that campaign, but merely for the purpose of showing how unfairly deferred elections may be made to work against the opposition candidate. On that occasion the Liberal candidate asked my permission to address the audience, and he stated over and over again that as far as he was concerned he was still of the opinion that it was unfair and unjust to the district of Kootenay to defer the election, and he disclaimed any personal responsibility for it, and threw it all upon the government. He went further, and said on the day I was nominated that he had written down to those in authority at Ottawa and assured them that he had given his pledge that there would be no deferred election. On that ground he asked them that the writ be issued at the same time as the writs were issued for the general election.

When the writ did not come in time he

telegraphed them again saying that his personal and public honour was pledged to having the election on the same day and urging them to forward the writ. He said that notwithstanding that the writ was not issued in time to enable him to have the election on the same day, the argument being that there was no opportunity, when, as a matter of fact, the government themselves held back this writ against his wishes in order that they might have the advantage in that particular constituency of a deferred election. What is the feeling of the people of British Columbia in regard to this matter? Let us look at it from two or three phases that have not been mentioned. We have in this House 221 representatives from every portion of the Dominion and out of these 221 representatives there are seven from British Columbia, one at least of the greater provinces of this country. Of these seven representatives we had no less than three deferred elections, or, in other words, three sevenths of the entire electorate of British Columbia were practically disfranchised by deferred elections. I say that it is no wonder that the people of British Columbia felt indignant at the treatment that they received at the hands of this government. It is no wonder that they felt that they would resent such an injustice to them and to their province. That is one of the chief causes that led to the opposition to the government. But, there is another question that, it seems to me, enters into this. I believe that in deferring the elections in these various districts there is committed an injury to each particular district in which these elections are held. Let me illustrate: In Kootenay, which I have the honour to represent, as you know, in addition to the great mining industries that we have there, we have, in recent years, learned that the great valleys surrounding our lakes are suitable for fruit culture. Boards of trade and individuals have spent large sums of money in advertising the natural resources of that particular portion of British Columbia and of its adaptability to horticulture. They have sent these advertisements all over Canada, to the old country and to the United States. They have been advertising these resources and the chief argument they have advanced in regard to them was that not only were these districts capable of growing all kinds of fruit of the best quality but that they were also close to the market, that they had good railway facilities which would enable them to reach their natural market, the prairies to the east, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Under these circumstances they were offering inducements to people to come in there and settle the land. What was done? Just at the time when Canada was engaged in a general election, when every newspaper was devoting its front page and its editorial columns to the contest that was going on, just when the eyes of the mother country were focused upon the contest between the two great parties for the control of the affairs of this Dominion, it was announced that in certain portions of the province of British Columbia our means of communication were so backward that it was impossible to issue the writs and hold the elections on the same day as they were to be held in other parts of Canada. It did more harm to the district of Kootenay and those portions of British Columbia in which we had deferred elections than will be offset by many years of hard work and a large expenditure of money. I do not hesitate to say that the people of these districts resented the position taken by the government with regard to these deferred elections. They felt that they had been dealt an unjust blow. They felt that all the work that had been done for years was undone by the position which these hon. gentlemen took with regard to this question. As to the position with regard to British Columbia I venture to say that it applies largely to other portions of the Dominion.

In addition to the arguments which have been so logically advanced by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) I can only add that we have been unfairly dealt with in regard to advertising the great natural resources of that part of the Dominion. The time has come when we must show to the world at large that we have such good means of communication that all portions of the Dominion can be reached by the writs within the statutory time. It is a very important matter and one that affects every one of us. The country has spent large sums of money in making known its resources to other parts of the world. You find that the Minister of Agriculture and Minister of the Interior have spent large sums of money with regard to immigration and agriculture, advertising the great natural resources of the country and sending out agents at great cost, and yet, just at the time when a general election comes on, just at a time when we have an opportunity of advertising Canada, certain sections of the country are picked out and are unfairly dealt with by having it announced to the world that they are in such a backward position with regard to transportation facilities that elections cannot be held within these districts at the same time as they are held in other portions of the Dominion. I do not intend to take up the time of the House any longer with regard to this question. I believe that it has been fairly dealt with and I can only say that this is not a resolution that has any party advantage or object in view. I think we have shown that the time has arrived

when all men are agreed that we should have our general elections held throughout the Dominion of Canada on the same day. We are only asking the House to say at the present moment that this is a principle which should be adopted, and when we come to work out the details of a Bill all arguments with respect to particular constituencies may be considered. With regard to the argument of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) when the Dominion Election Act was being discussed in 1908, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), dealing with this very point, asked that the principle of this resolution should be adopted by providing that the time for the proclamation be set a few days or weeks earlier in those districts where it was proposed to hold deferred elections than in those districts where they did not require so much time to get out the proclamation, but that suggestion was refused by the government. If that suggestion had been adopted then the arguments which have been advanced by the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Congdon) and the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, would have no foundation. I cannot see any objection to making the proclamation in these outlying districts twelve or fifteen days before the polling day. I ask, on these grounds, that the members of this House, regardless of party affiliations, declare themselves in favour of the adoption of the principle of the resolution as we have it before us.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). Although not myself the representative of a constituency in which deferred elections are held, as there are three constituencies in the province in which that principle is adopted, it may be neecssary for me to give my opinion on the question which is under discussion. Last session, when the question of deferred elections in British Columbia was being considered, like my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman), I thought that it might be possible to provide for having the election in the Kootenay district on the day of the general election. But, I had very grave doubts from the knowledge I had with regard to Yale-Cariboo whether that would be possible there. I was absolutely certain that without some very serious change in the General Elections Act which would involve every constituency in Canada, it would be utterly impossible to provide for the Comox-Atlin district as the hon. minister has described to the House. From the days of confederation in Canada, and owing to its peculiar and extensive geographical conditions, it has been considered necessary, on the part of both parties, that deferred elections should be held. In England, as my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) said, with its large centres of population, it has been considered necessary at certain periods to have deferred elections. The peculiar geographical conditions of Canada has necessitated all governments since confederation to defer the elections in certain constituencies.

Mr. BURRELL. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that I contended that geography had anything to do with deferred elections in England? Surely he knows that the elections are not held on the same day in England because of the basis of the franchise which gives a man the right to vote in several constituencies where he is qualified?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I was stating that the conditions in this country gave far more reason for deferring elections than do the conditions in England. At all events all political parties since confederation have followed the same policy in that respect. My hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) based his whole argument against deferring elections on the beneficial results which he said would accrue to the candidate supporting the party in power, but no stronger refutation of that argument can be found than the living presence of the hon. gentleman in this House. If the voters elect a man because he has charge of the flesh pots and can distribute them, and if a deferred election gives a government supporter great advantages in this respect, then the hon. gentleman would not represent the people of Yale-Cariboo in this House. The hon. gentleman said he preferred the system of having the general elections on a fixed date which incidentally of course would mean that each parliament would be elected to sit for a specified and fixed term. Well, that is a proposed change in the British constitution which I am not prepared to subscribe to.

Mr. BURRELL. I did not say I preferred that system ; I merely said there were arguments in favour of it as there were arguments against it.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Under the principles of the British representative constitution which we have incorporated into the constitution of Canada, the people of this country can at any time they find good reason for doing so turn out the government in power. Seven days after they have voted to put a certain party in power, they may, under the elasticity of the British system turn that party out of power again; but, under the United States system, which is less democratic, they elect their representatives for four years, and for four years whether the policy of the Congress may be approved by the people or not, the men so elected remain at the head of the nation. I am entirely opposed to that

system. Now, as to deferring elections, I agree that so far as it is possible we should hold all the elections in Canada on the same day. The hon. gentleman calls upon me to vote non-confidence in the government because they have, as all former Canadian governments have, deferred elections in certain constituencies Well, even supposing the government is wrong in that, surely we can find a remedy without voting against a good government which in other respects has done so much to advance the material interests of the people of this country. Even though I should disagree with the government in regard to one particular item in their policy, and that certainly not a very important one in comparison with others, I would be very loth indeed to vote against them on all questions because I might disagree with them on one point. I believe this debate will have a tendency to influence this government, and all future governments, to reduce the number of deferred elections to the narrowest possible limit. I said a year ago in this House that I believed it was not necessary to defer the election in Kootenay. My hon. friend from that constituency (Mr. Goodeve) has told us that the government candidate denounced the provision for a deferred election and stated in his election address that he preferred that the election should be on the same day as the general elections and we are told that on account of the alleged unnecessary and unreasonable deferring of the election a great many of the voters in these British Columbia constituencies voted against the government. It is quite evident, if this be true, that the Liberal party had no political motive in having a deferred election. If the Liberals of these districts and the government candidates for these districts were against deferred elections, how can my hon. friend say that there was any political motive in holding the deferred election? I believe the people of these constituencies generally do think that provision could be made to have the elections on the same day. Personally, I think it would be very difficult in Yale-Cariboo; it may be possible in Kootenay; I think it is impossible in Comox-Atlin. I am convinced that there are geographical conditions because of which, unless there is a very radical change in the law, it will be impossible to apply the rule of simultaneous elections in some of the constituencies for some years to come.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). It certainly is interesting to note that two very intelligent men on the other side of the House, the Minister of Finance, (Mr. Fielding), and Mr. Ralph Smith (Vancouver), could have persuaded themselves that they had convinced each other that this was a vote of want of confidence. If the hon. member for Vancouver was convinced by the argument of the Minister of Finance that this was a vote of want of confidence, does he accept the necessary conclusion that every amendment to Supply is a vote of want of confidence and that to vote for such an amendment is to vote against the government?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I would ask the hon. member (Mr. Foster), in return, if it is possible for me to have my views expressed in the form of an amendment to this motion.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not the point. The hon. member (Mr. Ralph Smith) said that one of his reasons for not wanting to vote for this resolution was that he does not want to turn out a good government, notwithstanding the fact that, so far as the proposal in that amendment is concerned, it ought to be carried out if possible. The Minister of Finance rather surprised me by making the statement in the categorical way he did. He not only said this was a vote of want of confidence, but that the only method by which a vote of want of confidence could be moved was by amendment to a motion for Supply. I do not think he really believes that.

Mr. FIELDING. It is the most common way.

Mr. FOSTER. But the minister did not say that; he said it was the only way, and he called upon his supporters, in as clear terms as he could use, to vote against this amendment because it was a motion of want of confidence. My hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) has cited seven or eight instances of amendments to Supply accepted by the government and carried unanimously, some moved on the government side, and some moved on the opposition side. Such instances occur almost every session.

Mr. LENNOX. We had two last session.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, we had two last session as my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) observes. Common sense is against regarding such an amendment as necessarily a vote of want of confidence, and all parliamentary practice is against it. A motion of want of confidence is defined by what the motion itself contains. If my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) were to move that the administration of the Minister of Finance had been corrupt and wasteful and therefore unworthy of confidence, that would be a clear motion of want of confidence, and it would not make a bit of difference whether it was moved in amendment to Supply or as an independent motion. I quite agree that, if the ministry wish, they can declare any motion to be a motion of want of confidence, and call upon their followers to treat it as such. In such a case it is for the independent minds behind the

Treasury benches to decide whether it is a vote of want of confidence or not and also how they shall declare themselves concerning it.

Another point that has been made is that the amendment should not be passed because there are details which would make it impossible to carry it out except after amendment of the law. As my hon. friend (Mr. Goodeve) has pointed out, this is simply the declaration of a principle, a principle which has been accepted, in the main, by the Minister of Finance himself, by the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman), by the member for Nanaimo and by all the others who have spoken on the other side of the House. As this is merely a declaration of principle, if there are details to be arranged in order to carry it out, those details can be considered after. This would be a mere expression of opinion of the House, an instruction to the government, that the principle ought to be carried out; it would be for legislation to come in afterwards and make the merely mechanical re-arrangements with respect to time and distance to carry the principle into effect.

But I wish to call attention to an argument upon which the hon. member for Nanaimo seemed to plume himself a good deal. He said that the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) was a living demonstration that the position he took was not a valid position. It is true, I suppose, that dynamite exploded in proximity to a man is apt to damage the man. It is also true that a case may be found where the discharge has gone in another direction, so that the man, though apparently in imminent danger, has escaped damage. Would the hon. member (Mr. Ralph Smith) contend that because, in one case the man had escaped, that that was an argument against being careful about leaving dynamite around where it may explode when some unoffending citizen of this counary is near at hand? That was an argument used by my hon. friend from Vancouver which did not do him justice. He can make better arguments than that. But he has been up against it this afternoon; in order to find a reason to vote for the government he had to have recourse to an argument like that. If, now and again, a constituency rises superior to the influence of a deferred election, if a constituency, outraged by the continual application of this method decides that it will take the bit in its teeth, and, government or no government, will vote emphatic denial of such a principle, can that be considered an argument in favour of deferred elections? Because that happens now and then, is it an argument that you can use those things and should use them, and that the abuse should not be taken away. But the thing underlying that, and my hon. friend knows it well, is this: is it proper, when it is not necessary to have a deferred election, for the government to defer it and thus better use the kind of argument used in these constituencies. That is the principle which is under it, and my hon. friend is too intelligent and straightforward to stand for a thing of that kind. But what does he think of the action of his own government? The two candidates, Liberal and Conservative, who knew their constituency, who knew their geographic limitations, came to a compact and agreed that they did not want any deferred election but a fair, straight combat in the ring without any handicap. The Liberal candidate both wrote and wired his government to give a square contest on the day when everybody else was casting his ballot in the Dominion. But your Finance Minister and your Prime Minister, whom you do not want to turn out and censure, rode rough-shod over him and said: You shall not have a fair fight, but we will put a handicap in your favour, and will do it by means of a deferred election. There was not a word of reprobation of an act like that by my hon. friend. He is so anxious to stand at the back of the Minister of Inland Revenue and support his loins, his arms, his shoulders and his head, that he would not reprove the wrong action for fear he would cause some damage by imputation to that heaven-sent minister.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. When the House rose I was dealing with some arguments adduced by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith). I always listen with pleasure and interest to what the member for Nanaimo (Mr. R. Smith) says. He is a man of wide experience, a man who thinks for himself and who appears to be exceedingly well informed on a wide range of subjects. I have heard him make most excellent arguments in this House. Of course it is difficult for a man to make a good argument if he has a poor case, and I attribute the weakness of his argument this afternoon to the poor case he had to defend. The member for Nanaimo (Mr. R. Smith) has won his spurs. He has conquered his constituency, he has kept it after conquering it; in many a hard fight he has proved the winner. After the election of 1908 he came here with his spurs on. I cannot say quite the same of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman). The Minister of Inland Revenue did not quite win his spurs in the same way as the member for Nanaimo. It strikes me that some years ago there was something of a deal by the transference to the Senate of a par-

ticular person to give him a seat in this House and enable him to enter the cabinet. He entered the Cabinet without portfolio, but afterwards became a full-fledged minister. In the election of 1908, like many another good man, he went down before the wrath of the people and he is now here by virtue of another arrangement. The elected member for Comox-Atlin, the man who fought the contest, who stood at the polls and took the battle upon him, came out victorious and came here as a full-fledged member of this House. It seems that there must be sacrifice somewhere and in some way or other the sacrifice was accomplished and the Minister of Inland Revenue, by way of Mr. Sloan, sits in this House to-day. So I say that for a man who has won his spurs in many a hard fought battle, who has fought consistently and always in his own consituency. it must come a little hard and it must be from a high sense of public duty that he stands so loyally to the back of the minister and his colleagues. The member for Nanaimo (Mr. R. Smith) I think has good cabinet material in him, he had won his position and might well have looked for preferment when preferment was possible; but instead of that the member for Nanaimo is not recognized and a deal is made by which the Minister of Inland Revenue gets into this House. I was interested this afternoon when the Minister of Inland Revenue was making his argument. He told the House plainly that if there had been an election contest in Comox-Atlin large numbers of electors would have been disfranchised. Did the minister have it so arranged that he knew from the first there was going to be no election. Suppose that, contrary to his supposition, if he had any in that respect, some obdurate man had been found in Comox-Atlin who would have stood at the polls and have forced a contest; by the admission of my hon. friend himself a large number of people in Comox-Atlin would have been disfranchised. By whose action? By his own action. Before he left Ottawa he and his government had arranged exactly what time should be given and they so arranged the time that if in the natural course of things there had been an election a large number of residents and electors in his own constituency would have been disfranchised. My hon. friend this afternoon deplored anything of the kind. He is in favour of deferred elections lest perchance somebody in a constituency shall be disfranchised and yet he and his government set the whole machinery into operation by virtue of which, if there had been an election, hundreds of his own constituents would not have had a chance to vote. The only supposition that will reconcile the minister's actions with his expressed desire that no one should be disfranchised, is that from the first, when fixing the dates and arranging the machinery, he had a pretty good idea that there was going to be no election.

Now we come to the argument of the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) who declared that in Gaspé it was physically impossible to hold the elections on the same date as the general elections, provided all the machinery was exactly as it is now. What were the arguments he used? Two hundred and fifty miles of an extension, but that is not insuperable in these times and finally the Postmaster General himself admitted that it would be possible to hold the elections on the mainland of Gaspé on the date of the general election, but he thought it might not be possible, under certain circumstances, on the Magdalen Islands. Yet the Magdalen Islands have complete telegraphic communication with the mainland. He was afraid there might be some possible mistake in a date in transmitting the telegram to the Magdalen Islands. It is the simplest thing in the world to have a telegram repeated so that the man sending it knows that it is received exactly as he sent it. Thus, by his own admission, it would be possible to carry out the general law. What is the kernel of the whole matter? It is the urging of a lot of technical and easily removed objections in order to retain a system which it is acknowledged by all should be abandoned if it is possible to do without it.

Now on the one side, what is it? Technicalities, geographical difficulties, mechanical difficulties and the like of that; on the other side, an acknowledged grievance, an acknowledged disability, an acknowledged bad method. Will any one stand up in this House and argue for a single moment that a deferred election is fair between man and man as candidates in a contest? I do not think any one will. In a contest where the whole Dominion is engaged upon public issues, public men on each side go into the contest and they have a fair field so far as it can be given to them. Each one has the right to argue and instil into the minds of the electors that his party is the best party, has the best methods, and will likely rule the country for the next four or five years. Each stands on a level. It depends on the men which of the two shall be the better persuader of his audience. But when you put a deferred election on, and you have the issue already decided in the Dominion, and it is no longer a question as to which party shall be in power for the next five years, no man can say that it is a fair fight as between man and man. Don't we believe in fair fighting? Whatever government is in power, does it want to keep in power by unfair fighting? Does it want to load the dice? Surely not. Then I say that one of the great evils of a deferred elec-

tion is that it does not play the game fairly, it handicaps one man in favour of another, and he the nominee of the government.

I say it is not only unfair between man and man but it is unfair between party and party. Go into a general election contest, even though we use those methods which we deplore, suppose the government candidate says: If you want public works in your constituency you had better elect me, for my party is going to be in power. The man who listens to him looks up in his face and says: Well, that is yet to be tested, you don't know, and we are not at all sanguine that your party will be in power. The candidate on the other side gets up and says: Vote for me, for my party, and for my party's policy; and he meets the argument of the other man by saying: I believe that my party will be in power, and that consequently we will have rule in the Dominion for the next four or five years. You put the two parties on as fair and equal footing for the fight as you can. But make it a deferred election, and what do you do? You handicap one party entirely, so far as you can, you read it out of any chance or hope of being successful in the election contest, because they are up against an issue which is decided already in the country. So it is not fair between party and party. I hold that no matter what a party may gain by that kind of thing, in the long run it loses if it offends the principles of fair play and just warfare as between the two great parties in the country. Some time or other it will come back on them. It hits first one party and then another, if it is carried on. But it is not good for either party.

But there is a higher issue than that. It defrauds the elector in the deferred constituency of any chance of deciding the public issues of the day. What is the whole theory of our free and responsible government? It is that by aggregating the units of voices throughout the whole country you get a proper conclusion as to the policy which shall rule the country. Is it not essential, then, that the contest should be carried on under conditions which give to each man a chance to have a voice in deciding the final issue? Your deferred election takes away that chance from the man in the minority party, and the moment he presents his policy he is told, the issue is already decided, and you have a matter of public policy in which the voter has no chance at all to decide what it will be, it has already been decided, and it is a dead issue in that constituency. Now what is the effect of that? What do we want in this country, dead constituencies or live constituencies? Is it best that we should have the finest spirit, is it best that we should have the liveliest and keenest discussion, is it best that we should have the energies of all the electors devoted to the solution of questions that come before them? Evidently so. But by the deferred election you destroy that liveliness, you destroy that independent participation, and you throw a dead issue into that constituency, and consequently you do what militates directly against public spirit, and the better public life of that constituency and of the country at large. It is not right, and it is not expedient. It is not right, because it deprives the elector of his proper position; it is not expedient, because in the long run it discourages public spirit and is a disadvantage to the country.

Well, then do we agree upon that? I ask the Finance Minister, in the way of reasoning this out, do we agree that it is not a desirable thing to go into any consituency and to try to get a vote by the bold promise of public works and of public patronage? No man, I think, will get up in this House and argue on that brute idea. He will hedge about it, even though he believes that he or his party will use that kind of an instrumentality, he will not advocate it baldly and boldly. The issues of the day, the discussion of these great public issues, the great public policies, the interests of the country at large, these are the things which should be discussed in the election, and to leave those aside and to replace them by, or give greater prominence to, the brute arguments and promises of what the government will do in the bestowal of money, and franchises, and public works, and that kind of thing, debauches the constituency. It is a course which is deleterious, nobody can stand up in this twentieth century, and go in for and advocate that sort of thing. But your deferred election gives force and power to that argument. The two men on a platform in a general election have a fair show, neither can say that his party is in, or that his principles will triumph. But in a deferred election a government is in, that government has the patronage, that government dispenses the money—Vote for me, or you will get nothing for your constituency in any way, shape or form. That is the bald argument used over and over again. It is used with tremendous force when all are fighting on the same day, it is used with tenfold more force when you defer an election and you give to one party or to one candidate power to say: 'We are in for five years, we dispense the patronage, we build the post offices, we appoint the officers, we do all that sort of thing, and you will not get a smell of patronage unless you vote for me. The government will be kind to its friends.' My good natured friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), says that is human nature, and that every party will always be more favourable to its friends. Another puts it in a different way,

and so we have it. But when it is put so baldly as that, and in a deferred election, even my good natured and human friend, the Minister of Railways, would, I think, rather balk at that kind of a statement in its bareness and its foulness, I do not think he would stand at the back of that. Therefore, I say that the deferred election is the enemy of the country, of the commonwealth, of good public life, because it gives the greatest possible force to the worst kind of arguments, the argument of patronage, when a man says, 'I belong to the party which is going to exercise this patronage for the next five years, make me your man and I will get these expenditures in your constituency.' What have you on the other side? You have, on the other side, simply what has been urged here this afternoon, that there are geographical difficulties in the way. You will have to use the telegraph; in some cases you will have to send couriers out; in other cases you will have to have this, do this and that as a mechanical expedient in order to expedite the work to have everything made ready for the decision on polling day. What are these things?—simply technicalities, little mechanical difficulties which, if it were determined that the principle shall triumph, we are abundantly able in half an hour to meet by legislation. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) has shown how it can be met in Comox-Atlin and he has held up Comox-Atlin as a conspicuous example of a large and unwieldy constituency. That situation can be met by making the proclamation two weeks in advance. We are competent to meet that by legislation. It is the easiest possible thing in the world to do. If we want to establish this principle we can easily smooth out all these little mechanical difficulties and put the matter where it ought to be. But, remembering the illustration given by my hon. friend (Mr. Goodeve), I am afraid that the real reason why the deferred constituency is kept is that the government itself is favourable to it and does not want to relinquish the hold it gives. It will not hurt us to give that illustration once more before I stop talking on this phase of the subject. What was it? The Liberal candidate in Kootenay wanted no deferred election, the Conservative candidate wanted none, and the two, like brothers in a good, square, fair fight agree that there should be none. What happens?—the candidate of the government wires to the government: 'I want the election on the regular day.' He writes to the government: 'Please set the election on the regular day.' The government do not. Why not? Not because it is not feasible or practicable, but because it wants to handicap the man who is opposed to it and give an advantage to the man who is running in its interests. So long as that is the spirit of the government no wonder the Minister of Finance strains every constitutional and reasonable principle and declares that an amendment like this involves a vote of want of confidence and calls upon his followers to vote against it. No wonder that my self-sacrificing friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) treats it, on the ipse dixit of the Minister of Finance, as being a vote of want of confidence and says: 'I do not want to turn out this good government: better a thousand deferred elections and all that they involve than that this government that I support should go out.' There it is. It is up to parliament just now to say whether or not we will adopt the principle which we all believe to be correct and then set ourselves to smoothing away the difficulties in the way of carrying it into actual practice, or whether we will go on in the old way, the way which accentuates the difficulties that we are strong enough to overcome now in the political life of Canada.

Mr. W. H. WHITE (Victoria, Alberta). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion on both sides of the House on the question of deferred elections. According to the speech made by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) one would imagine that it was a Conservative candidate who in all cases suffered by deferred elections. I happen to represent a constituency in which I was the sufferer, and not only that, but a large proportion of the constituency was disfranchised by reason of the fact that the election was not deferred. I may say that although the member for Yale-Cariboo may think that he put the question, as it appeared to him, fairly, it must be remembered that there are other places in Canada as well as Yale-Cariboo. There are districts probably as large and just as hard to get over as the constituency my hon. friend represents. I have the honour to represent a constituency extending from the city of Edmonton to, you may say, the North Pole. I wish to inform the House that although there is a large settlement north of the Athabaska river there was no poll in my constituency north of that river. Some hon. gentlemen might think that there was a desire on the part of the Liberals in the late election to act unfairly and that there was some motive for not placing a poll north of the river, but, I want to point out that the district of Athabaska is represented in the Local House at Edmonton by a Liberal. He was elected by acclamation. I think I know the people in that country probably better than any man in the House, if not as well as any man in the Northwest, and I do not know the name of one Conservative north of that

river. I know that there are over 300 votes in that region and that we only had to place a poll there to secure those votes. The Liberal associations at Fort McMurray and Fort Smith applied for a poll but the government did not see their way clear to establish one although I, as the representative of the party in the recent contest, was very anxious to have one placed in that district. We could not get it and the result was that a large portion of the constituency was disfranchised. I would be sorry to see this occur again. I hope that in the next election these people will have an opportunity of casting their votes. Unless there are great changes which we do not now expect, such as the extension of railways into that north country, when the next election comes on these people will be in exactly the same position as that which they occupied in the last election. I think it is unfair that such a large proportion of the electors should be disfranchised and I am therefore very much opposed to the resolution doing away with the deferred elections while there are voters in remote corners of any constituency who do not have an opportunity to vote. My opponent in the late election was very anxious with regard to this matter. His agent approached me and said he hoped they would not place any poll in that country. His agent tried to make an arrangement with me which, of course, I had no authority to make, his reason being that it was impossible to go up there. If a poll had been placed there I would have had a great advantage over my opponent. The local member who is a friend of mine would have looked after my interests there while my opponent had no chance of sending anybody in and I would undoubtedly have secured the vote. If these people are disfranchised in the next election I do not think they will be very well satisfied, I do not think they should be, and I promised them that I would do all in my power to secure to them in the next election the opportunity of casting their votes the same as the voters in any other part of the district. I have only to add that I will vote against the resolution in the interest of constituencies which would suffer if there were no deferred elections.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw). Mr. Speaker. I shall endeavour to make my remarks fittingly brief, and in the first place I shall touch upon the observations made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). The major part of the hon. gentleman's speech was devoted to jeering at the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith), and at the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. He takes exception to the manner in which the Minister of Inland Revenue finds a seat in this House. It is true that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Templeman) was defeated by a narrow majority at the recent elections, and it is also true that he was defeated by most despicable means. I for one who support the government am here to say that when we remember the means by which the Minister of Inland Revenue was defeated, he has not the slightest fallen in our estimation, but on the contrary we think the more of him. It is true, as the hon. member for North Toronto has said, that in 1906 the Minister of Inland Revenue found a seat in this House because of a vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Riley, now a senator. The people of the city in which the Minister of Inland Revenue lives were glad to elect him on that occasion and they would have been glad to have elected him on the 26th of October last if they had not been misled and deceived. But, when we look at the records of how the Minister of Inland Revenue has found a seat in this House and of how the hon. member for North Toronto has found a seat here, I do not think the comparison is very much to the credit of my hon. friend from North Toronto. I had rather be in the position of the Minister of Inland Revenue who found a seat in the city in which he lived for many years and of which he is one of the pioneers, known and respected, than be in the position of the hon. member for North Toronto who, I am informed, started his political career in a place called the County of Kings in the province of New Brunswick down by the sea. I am told that from there he went to another county ; he wandered to and fro on the earth, and he found a lodging place in the county of York——

Mr. AMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask, has this anything to do with the question before the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I will hear the hon. gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. AMES. I ask has this anything to do with the question under consideration?

Mr. FIELDING. I submit that it has as much to do with it as the speech of my hon. friend from North Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. You don't mean that.

Mr. FIELDING. I do.

Mr. AMES. My point of order is that the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) are not pertinent to the subject under discussion, and I ask your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is that the House go into Committee of Supply, and on that motion considerable latitude is allowed. There is an amendment relating to deferred elections, and as I have allowed considerable latitude to the mover of that

amendment I think I would not now be justified in restricting the scope of the debate.

Mr. KNOWLES. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) next went to the city of St. John, and he again was a candidate. There was no doubt good reason why he left the county of York, but there was no good reason evidently for his going to St. John, because he was defeated there by the late Hon. Mr. Blair who polled an overwhelming majority. Then, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) went forth wandering to and fro on the earth, seeking whom he might——

An hon. MEMBER. Devour.

Mr. KNOWLES. Seeking whom he might represent, and in the course of time he came to the riding of North Ontario. in the old province of Ontario. He ran against a young man, a little more than out of his teens, and my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) with all his record behind him—I don't say because of his record, but perhaps I may be more courteous and say in spite of his record—with all his experience, with all his ability, with all his prestige as a prominent member if not the leader of the once great Conservative party; he went down to defeat before this boy, George Grant. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) tried again at the general election of 1904, and he went to that city of Toronto where even the hon. gentleman can be elected, since he is a Conservative. I will admit this with regard to my hon. friend: He may be against deferred elections because he experienced great deferring of his own election on that occasion ; time after time for four years his election was deferred and the expression 'deferred election' is, I have no doubt, one which makes the hon. gentleman anything but pleasant. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that while he was a member of the Conservative government, I think for some eleven years, there was a general election in 1887, another in 1891, and another in 1896. During all this period the hon. gentleman was a prominent member of the Conservative government, a clever member, and I have no doubt a worthy member so far as I have any knowledge. But in each of these three elections the government of which the hon. gentleman was a member were responsible for deferred elections, and for these he must share the responsibility. It it only fair that I should say that he has by supporting the policy of the government of which he was a member admitted that deferred elections are not in themselves wrong, but are necessities, and justifiable under certain circumstances, or else of course he would not have supported his government. I have before me the Consolidated Statutes of Canada for the year 1886, and I find set forth in the Elections Act a list of constituencies in which there should be deferred elections and these constituencies are the electoral district of Algoma, the electoral district of Gaspé, the electoral district of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, and would the House believe it, every one of the electoral districts in the province of British Columbia. That is the law which was in force when my hon. friend was a member of the government, and it is only fair we should come to the conclusion that to-day he cannot consistently lay down the policy that deferred elections are in themselves never justifiable. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) referred specially to the fact that Mr. Smith Curtis, the Liberal candidate in Kootenay, was desirous of having the election upon the same day as the other elections throughout the country. My hon. friend told us twice that the two candidates were desirous of standing up like brothers in a friendly fight, and say to each other: 'We will have nothing mean, we will fight this thing out fair.' By that, of course, he implies that the government endeavoured in the province of British Columbia to use underhand methods, and I have no doubt he in some way endeavoured to cast the asperations on the Liberal party for the manner in which they fought the elections in that province: I want to say that we have no need to sit at the feet of gentlemen opposite to learn how to conduct elections in British Columbia. It has been stated by some gentlemen that because an election is deferred, there is therefore a greater probability that the people will be unduly influenced to vote for the party in power. To my mind that is not a compliment to the people of British Columbia. The hon. gentleman from Yale-Cariboo has said that in England it is different because conditions are different, and that the electorate there are not susceptible to the influence of the government in power. I think that on reflection the hon. gentleman will withdraw the invidious comparison as between his own constituents and the voters in the British Isles, because I believe it will be found that the electors of the Dominion of Canada and the electors of British Columbia are just as competent to give a fair and unprejudiced vote on political affairs as are the voters in England, Ireland, or Scotland.

Only one case can I recall in which the people were ready to lay aside their allegiance to the principles of their party and support the Liberal party because it was in power, and that was the case of the recent by-election in which the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) was elected. On that occasion, we found the Conservatives of Victoria, we found the Conservatives of Vancouver, so disgusted with the election methods of their party

last October, that they came out flat-footed and said: 'To show that we are ashamed of this system by which our party has disgraced us, let us call for the withdrawal of the man who has been put up in Prince Rupert. True, we elected Conservatives in October last, but we did so because we were deceived by forged telegrams, but now we know better.' And the result was that against his own wishes, and by the influence and pressure of the Conservatives in Victoria and Vancouver, he was withdrawn from the contest. And so these people to that extent, redeemed themselves and paid this compliment to the hon. minister. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) tried to make it appear that the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) had, so to speak, swallowed himself on this question. The hon. member for Nanaimo does not require that I should hold any brief for him. He has been many years in this House, and no member of this House is held in higher esteem. He is not the man to disguise his principles, nor can he fittingly be made the subject of such remarks as those of the hon. member for North Toronto. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) also jeered at the hon. member for Nanaimo because in this instance he had been loyal to the Minister of Inland Revenue—'this heaven-born minister,' as the hon. gentleman said, with some sarcasm, I suppose. I will admit—nay, I will claim — that it is quite possible that the hon. member for North Toronto may not be able to understand loyalty to colleagues nor to the minister; we have heard of the 'nest of traitors.' To him, it may be a passing mystery, which he can only treat sarcastically as something that he cannot understand, that the hon. member for Nanaimo and other Liberal members who support this government have in their hearts an honest loyalty to the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) as to every other member of the ministry. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was greatly exercised about the power of patronage—that the poor innocent elector should be misled or unduly influenced by the expectation that, since a certain party is in power, certain things will be done. That is something that would never be practised by the hon. member for North Toronto while in this House. Does he remember a trip that he made to Prince Edward Island? Did he ever hear of the building of a tunnel to Prince Edward Island? I am not going into the merits or demerits of that remarkable construction that was proposed; but I will say that I do not think it is any worse for candidates to say frankly to their electors that if they are returned to parliament their constituents will have the sympathy and ear of the government in presenting their petitions, than to hold forth to the people of Prince Edward Island the prospect that if the leader of the opposition is brought into power a tunnel will be built. I am not saying that I defend this style of electioneering, at all, but I say that the first of these is better than the other.

With regard to the specific matters that have been spoken of, if I understand my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo, he himself admitted that it would require twelve days to reach certain parts of his district. I submit, there can be no justification for disfranchising these people who are twelve days' journey removed from the centres of population. These people have all the rights of franchise that people living in the city of Vernon have, or in the town of Grand Forks, or in the city of Kamloops, or in the city of Nelson. The principle which he himself declared for, this afternoon, the principle that nobody should be disfranchised, should cause the hon. gentleman to rise to-night and vote against his own motion, because he himself has shown that to do away with deferred elections means that you must disfranchise many hundreds of people in this Dominion. I think we had that very clearly demonstrated this afternoon by my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. Rutan), whom I am very happy to see here. That hon. gentleman has demonstrated to this House that in his own riding there are seven polls where 228 votes were cast, which are from 250 to 500 miles from the city of Prince Albert, where, of course, the returning officer would almost necessarily live. That journey is made partly by pumping a hand car to the Pas, partly by portaging, and by hundreds of miles of canoeing up stream. That journey cannot be made in one day less than two weeks. And, away up there, there are about 250 people who have as much right to vote as the people of Prince Albert have. I was for ten days occupied in assisting my hon. friend from Prince Albert in that election, and I never met a single Conservative who seriously said there was any injustice in that deferred election. On the other hand, Conservative after Conservative admitted that it would have been an injustice and an outrage that these 228 votes should not have been cast, for the people in those remote sections had as good a right to cast their ballots as the people in the centres. We are not afraid of the polls in the cities nor those far removed. We say: 'Let all the people in all parts of the country have the opportunity to exercise their franchise.' Another illustration is that in the Dominion constituency of Edmonton there are two local provincial constituencies, Athabaska and Peace River. In the recent general election, because they did not have deferred elections, in the provincial constituency of Athabaska only one poll was held, and in the provincial constituency of Peace River, not

a single vote was polled, poll was held, or vote cast, because these British subjects were too far removed from the place of polling, and therefore could not exercise their franchise. In my own riding there were nine polls that could not be held, and were not held. If they had been held, I think, beyond question, I should have had a majority of 150 more. I do not say that to boast, but lest any person should think that there was purpose in not holding these polls. I see my hon. friend laughing sarcastically. My majority was over 1,000, so that I would not have been in danger even had these polls gone against me. If we had had a deferred election these votes would have been polled. The application of the very principle which my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) asks this House to adopt, resulted, in the riding of Edmonton, in the disfranchisement of two provincial constituencies, and in my own riding it resulted in the disfranchisement of at least nine polls. There was one poll where they made their own ballot box, and their own poll, and cast seven solid Liberal votes. They wanted to vote for good government, but they had not the chance. Therefore I say that the people living in the outlying parts of the prairie should be protected; and instead of the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) and his associates in this debate endeavouring to further take away from that franchise, they would be much better employed if they would take better precautions to prevent the disfranchising of these electors.

Instead of having to apologize for the vote I propose to give, I should, if I voted for the principle contained in this resolution, be absolutely wrong. Let us bear in mind the circumstances and conditions which existed when the decision was arrived at to have deferred elections. It is well known that if a person is charged with wrong-doing, you must consider his conduct from the view point of the circumstances at the time he did the alleged wrong. It is said that we did wrong in deferring the elections. Before deciding, let us consider what were the circumstances which induced the government to defer them. According to the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite, the decision to defer the elections could only be wrong if thereby the return of the government was rendered more likely than its overthrow. But which was the more likely at the time ? My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in an interview which he gave the press a few days before the general election, said that they would be a repetition of the general elections of 1878. Surely then he must have been convinced that the deferring of certain elections, if the result was to be in favour of the government, would have the effect of returning the Conservative candidates, since the general elections were to be a repetition of those of 1878 and the Conservative party be in power. The offense must be judged from the view point of the circumstances that existed at the time the wrong was committed; and since the circumstances then pointed to the overthrow of the Liberal government and party, the Liberal party stood to lose and not to gain by deferring these elections, and therefore the deferring of them was a kindness done the opposition, because after sweeping the country the opposition could come in and gather a few more crumbs.

Mr. G. H. BARNARD (Victoria, British Columbia). It was not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to take any part in this debate until I heard from the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Knowles). He saw fit in his wisdom to dilate upon the circumstances of the election in the city of Victoria and to cast some animadversion on the Liberal-Conservative party in respect to that election and to profess a great deal of sympathy for the Minister of Inland Revenue over its results. Hon. gentlemen opposite have, during the present session, seen fit on more than one occasion to refer to that election in terms in themselves somewhat amusing, and for my part I was perfectly content they should so amuse themselves if they saw fit. It was not my intention or desire to lay before the House the facts concerning the career of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, (Mr. Templeman), as regards elections in the city of Victoria, so long as hon. gentlemen opposite confined themselves to their little pleasantries. But when they take part in a serious debate and raise that question in a wholly irrelevant manner, it seems to me high time that I should say something on the subject.

As regards the incident referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Knowles) I had nothing to do with it, and am as innocent of any connection with it as the hon. gentleman himself. To be absolutely candid, I have probably more reason to regret it than has the Minister of Inland Revenue, for the very good reason that had I been defeated, I had no one to whom I felt called upon to make explanations, but my hon. friend the minister, I have not the slightest doubt, found that little incident very comforting to him when explaining to his chief how the government candidate came to be defeated in the city of Victoria. At the same time, I deny that that particular incident had anything to do with the result in that city.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BARNARD. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but let me just read to them a

few lines which I find in the Parliamentary Companion. I do not expect them to take my word for anything, but would like to read something which no doubt they will not hesitate to believe. Let me quote from the 'Canadian Parliamentary Guide,' this biography of the hon. minister:

An unsuccessful candidate for House of Commons at general elections*, 1891, at by-elections of 1896, and at general elections in 1896. Called to the Senate, November 18, 1897.

Now that same hon. gentleman, when canvassing in the constituency of Comox-Atlin, held a meeting in the town of Aberni in that constituency the other day. Some remarks were made on the platform regarding the same incident of which I am now speaking, and he was challenged and refused to deny that he had not stated in the city of New Westminster, where he was campaigning in the interests of the opponent of the present member for New Westminster, that the Asiatic question was not an issue in his own constituency at the general elections in October last. Furthermore, with regard to that particular telegram, I may say that I was perfectly satisfied with the situation and never asked for that telegram. I never wrote any one here to give me any declaration on that matter. On that question the issue was clear cut between the two parties. My leader told us he stood for a certain line of policy, and on the other hand we had a declaration from various members of the cabinet on a totally opposite line. There was therefore absolutely nothing for the Conservative party to gain by sending to Ottawa for any further declaration of policy.

What was the position with respect to that election. The Minister of Inland Revenue was in the Senate, and a minister without portfolio. In 1906, a by-election was held owing to his retirement from the Senate and to the sitting member, Mr. Reilly, resigning his seat in this House and taking that of the minister in the Senate. My hon. friend came to Victoria and ran a by-election and was elected by a majority of 800. Prior to that time, during the general election of 1904, the Minister of Inland Revenue posed as the leader of the Liberal party in the province of British Columbia. He stumped British Columbia from end to end, with the result that seven Liberal members were returned from that province and no Conservative. Of course the party which he led were very much pleased. They gave him a banquet in Victoria. All the Liberals of British Columbia attended that banquet; they dined and they wined and burnt incense in tremendous quantities at the shrine of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman). He was the great man, the man who had brought them out of the wilderness and had given to the Dominion government that solid following of seven. He was the great man in British Columbia. That is the man whom I, an untried candidate for parliamentary honours, had to go up against in the Dominion election. Hon. members opposite talk about that telegram altering that election. I would ask any of the ministers what effect such a telegram as that would have if published in their constituencies at the last moment? Would the Minister of Railways go down to defeat on a question of that kind? Was he in such a position that it would defeat him? Why did it not have the same effect on the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. R. Smith)? The same paper that circulated the telegram in Victoria has the largest circulation of any newspaper in the constituency of Nanaimo. What difference did it make to him? If the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) and his party had had the confidence of the people of British Columbia, not one telegram nor fifty of that or any other kind should have made any difference. Before the Saturday night before the election when that telegram was first produced to me and read by me at the close of the meeting, the minister, if he was worthy of his position in the government, should have had me beaten by 500. The trouble was that the people of British Columbia were at issue on not only the Asiatic but on many other questions, with the Dominion government. That particular incident of the telegram had absolutely nothing to do with that election and I think the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) knows it himself.

My hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Knowles) said something about making the ballot boxes in his own constituency. We have heard of ballot boxes made by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite before; we have also heard of special trains. I think that if hon. gentlemen opposite wish to make what are practically personal attacks on members of the opposition, they should first look at home and take the beam from their own eye.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Burrell).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Ames	Macdonell,
Armstrong,	McCall,
Arthurs,	Maddin,
Barnard,	Magrath,
Barr,	Marshall,
Beattie,	Middlebro,
Blain,	Monk,
Blondin,	Nantel,
Bordon (Halifax),	Northrup,
Boyce,	Owen,
Bradbury,	Paquet,
Broder,	Perley,

Burrell,
Campbell,
Chisholm (Huron),
Crosby,
Crothers,
Currie (Simcoe),
Daniel,
Doherty,
Donnelly,
Edwards,
Elson,
Foster,
Fraser,
Goodeve,
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Henderson,
Herron,
Jameson,
Kidd,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lennox,
Lortie,
Porter,
Price,
Reid (Grenville),
Rhodes,
Roche,
Russell,
Schaffner,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Smyth,
Sproule,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor (Leeds),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thornton,
Wallace,
White (Renfrew),
Wilson (Lennox and Addington),
Wright.—69.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,
Béland,
Bickerdike,
Black,
Borden (Sir Fredk.),
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Calvert,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chew,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Essex),
Congdon,
Conmee,
Currie (Prince Edwd.)
Delisle,
Demers,
Devlin,
Dubeau,
Ecrément,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Fowke,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Girard,
Gordon (Kent),
Graham,
Harris,
Harty,
Hodgins,
Hunt,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Lavergne,
McCraney,
McGiverin,
McIntyre (Perth),
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McMillan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Regina),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Molloy,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Parent,
Paterson,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Rivet,
Robb,
Ross,
Roy (Dorchester),
Roy (Montmagny),
Rutan,
Savoie,
Schell,
Sealey,
Seguin,
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Smith (Middlesex),
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Stormont),
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Templeman,
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Low,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
MacNutt,
McAlister,
McCoig,
McColl,
Tobin,
Todd,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
White (Victoria, Alta),
Wilson (Laval).—115.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Law,	Hughes,
Tolmie,	Maclean (York, S.),
Guthrie,	Clare,
Aylesworth,	Osler,
German,	Barker,
McIntyre (Strathcona),	McCarthy,
McLean (Sunbury),	Sexsmith,
Bureau,	Crocket,
Gervais,	Worthington,
Beauparlant,	Bristol,
Dugas,	Forget,
Gladu,	Thoburn,
Macdonald,	Meighen,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Haggart (Lanark),
Warburton,	Cowan,
Oliver,	Lewis,
Stratton.	Gordon (Nipissing).

Amendment negatived, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Saguenay river, dredging and other improvements, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the Committee of Supply last rose we were discussing item 143, $30,000 for dredging the Saguenay river and other improvements. I suppose the committee is now ready to adopt the item.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like the minister to state how much of this amount is for dredging and how much for improvements.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think this is all for dredging.

Mr. JOSEPH GIRARD. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, before we discuss this item for dredging the Saguenay river and other improvements, I beg leave to introduce some explanation about the discussion which occurred yesterday and last Friday, in my absence, and to which I have not been able to answer. I am greatly concerned at believing that in the understanding of some of my colleagues, who spoke chiefly yesterday, they could entertain a personal animosity towards myself, which I would be unable to explain.

Last year about July 15th, the question of the piers built at Rivière du Moulin, was brought up before the House. I was satisfied that I had at the time thoroughly explained the matter, and understood that no further reference would be made to it.

I see in yesterday's 'Hansard' that some hon. gentleman on the other side, in referring to this matter, seemed greatly exer-

cised because the government at a certain date had contributed to the cost of construction of what has been termed a municipal bridge; and some even went so far as to attack the officials who were consulted on the matter and reported favourably as to it. Furthermore, there was handed to the minister and to hon. members a photograph prepared expressly for the purpose of deceiving those who are ignorant of the circumstances, and an effort was made to satisfy the present minister, who was not at the time entrusted with the management of the Public Works Department, that his predecessor in office had been under a false impression directly after his officers, or indirectly by myself.

Well, I may be allowed to refer to the explanations which I gave to this House last year on July 15th. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) commenting yesterday on some photographs which had been exhibited, made in regard to responsible officers criticisms to my mind totally unwarranted. Let me remind him of some photographs which I laid before this House last year showing the piers of the bridge at Grande Décharge, Lake Saint John, the building of which he himself authorized when Finance Minister in 1894, at the request of his colleague, the Hon. Mr. Ouimet, then Minister of Public Works, an achievment of which he was quite proud, as a means of making friends in my district. If the Conservatives deemed it right and equitable and honourable to appropriate moneys from the federal chest for the building of piers as part of a bridge to help along colonization in the Lake Saint John district, a work wholly of provincial interest, is this government to be condemned for having done this very thing, admitting that they have done so, which I deny. True, this government have allowed the appropriation as made to appear openly in the public accounts; while, as evidence of the help contributed towards the building of that bridge in Lake St. John, the Department of Colonization at Quebec was called upon to give a voucher under the signature of Mr. Dufault, deputy minister, acknowledging the receipt of $2,000 as grant towards the building of the bridge.

If those hon. gentlemen who have criticised so loudly yesterday were to come to Chicoutimi and repeat their utterances, they might be surprised at the warm reception they would have at the hands especially of the farmers who signed the petition requesting that these works be undertaken and setting forth reasons in support.

I am aware that my hon. friends on the other side have had pointers from outside in regard to this matter. Let me tell them that they have made a grievous mistake in taking a certain Simon Lapointe, who approached some of them a couple of weeks ago as the authorized representative of the Conservative party in my constituency. Had they inquired before speaking, they might have found out that this very gentleman who poisoned their ears, is merely repeating slanders which others of the same kind, urged by personal spite, thought they might safely spread through the county, vilifying in the most atrocious terms the good name of public officers of the government, and my own, branding us as thieves, perjurers, and so forth. To their great surprise, as soon as the elections were over, some of them, and particularly the said Simon Lapointe, were summoned before the courts to answer for their conduct. Most of them promptly signed papers taking back all they had said; but Lapointe thought fit to let matters follow their course, and he now comes under the cover of hon. members whom he has supplied with information, though not allowing his name to be used, and attempts to vindicate himself by casting aspersions on the leading officers who objected to be made tools of by himself and his gang, a proceeding which is the more cowardly seeing that these officers are debarred from appearing on the floor of the House and defending themselves against these sneaking enemies.

If hon. members on the other side who have opened this discussion think they have thereby helped to make their party popular in my district, they are sadly mistaken. This they will find out by inquiring from the recognized leaders of the Conservative party in my constituency, whom they know, and appreciate no doubt, and whose names, I am confident, have never appeared on any of the documents which they have had or have, or will likely ever have in their possession.

I notice in his seat the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Price). I may say that I infinitely regret for the sake of his prestige among his numerous friends inhabiting my constituency that he should have thought fit to countenance this farce. True, this woodwork to which he referred and which is still in existence, was put in originally by Price Brothers. Nobody denies it or has ever thought of denying it. But if my hon. friend is conversant with the history of his firm, to the same extent as are the people of Chicoutimi, he will be bound to acknowledge that this woodwork was put in at the time in order to prevent the washing away by the waters of the Saguenay, and through the action of frost, of the strip of land which it incloses; and as a matter of fact, wherever the old woodwork is broken down, the shore is eaten up from year to year through the action of

those two factors I have just mentioned. In the near future, these old protection works have fallen to pieces, it will be necessary to renew them; otherwise this piece of land will be washed out in the same way as higher up along the course of the river, the most fertile lands of the parish of Sainte-Anne are yearly being eaten up by the waters of the Saguenay.

As further evidence of the beneficent and effective part played by the government on that occasion, I may state that while, in 1904, there was a large majority of votes polled against me, both in the town and parish of Chicoutimi, in 1908, there was a large majority of votes polled in my favour, although during the election strenuous efforts had been made in Chicoutimi by the Lapointe gang, with a view to securing the express condemnation of the policy pursued by the government in the shape of a large hostile vote which was loudly announced in advance.

The pier referred to was built at the request of the citizens of Chicoutimi, who forwarded a petition bearing numerous signatures of farmers and leading business men of the locality, and urging that the building of such a pier would be a safeguard for years to come, and the beginning of a great work destined to replace the wooden structure previously referred to. The officers of the department have taken the same view; and I contend that no hon. member in this House has the right to insinuate that the minister, the government and the House have been basely deceived in this connection, and that accordingly the officers of the department have acted wrongly. The department deserves credit for the building of this pier both as a work of art and utility, and as time goes by, it will be found, and before long, perhaps, that the insinuations of party politicians in this connection have no foundation in fact, and were inspired by motives other than public interest.

In conclusion, I return to what I said a while ago. Even admitting that this pier was built expressly to support a bridge, I cannot conceive why hon. gentlemen on the other side should flush with virtuous indignation, seeing that when they themselves were in power, they acted exactly in the same manner and instructed their agents to make the most of it in the interest of the party, for they were satisfied it was a meritorious deed, and so it was. Now, if in 1894, it was all right to act in that way, why should it be wrong in 1908? There is no sense in having double weights and double measures, even in politics. The country may reap actual benefit from a fair criticism of a government's policy; but such criticsm, if it be unfair and carried on in a partisan spirit is always injurious.

It is desirable, to my mind, that the necessity for public works should be gauged according to a variety of circumstances, and that the government should be at liberty to help on the development of sparsely settled districts as well as that of large towns and cities. We are called upon each year to vote large sums of money for the city of Montreal, the city of Quebec, and so forth. We appropriate millions towards the development of these important centres. If among the people inhabiting these cities, there were individuals or gangs similar to those met with in Chicoutimi, who would pry into the details of these large items of expenditures, in the hope of discovering something improper, it would be an all-round source of trouble and misfortune. Will my hon. friend from Saint-Antoine maintain in this House that the large expenditure of money made by the city of Montreal or by the city of Quebec could bear such severe scrutiny and unfriendly criticism as that indulged in as regards Chicoutimi? Would not such an inquiry cause the blood to curdle in the veins of so virtuous a man? Cheerfully does the House vote from year to year enormous sums towards the development of the larger cities such as Montreal and Quebec; and heretofore there has been on complaint that the House has been deceived; for we have not been called upon to listen in that connection to such petty discussions as that which has taken place yesterday. Such has been the trend of affairs since confederation be it under Liberal or Conservative rule.

My hon. friend from North Toronto, who felt so indignant yesterday, must have been apprised of the instructions given, in 1894, under the signature of the Hon. Mr. Ouimet, Minister of Public Works, for the building of two miles of a colonization road as an approach to a non-existent wharf. It seems to me that if he was in the right yesterday, he must have been previously terribly in the wrong, and his protest loses thereby a great deal of its weight.. I regret having to recall that circumstance, which he is unable to deny, but I have been constrained to do so. There is one important fact which strikes me in connection with this whole affair, and it is this: that informer Lapointe who is spending all his energy in ill-directed efforts to acquaint the opposition as to the state of affairs in my contituency, never thinks of mentioning an extraordinary attempt at robbing the public chest, engineered by the gang, and whereby $30,000 were to be secured from the government as the price of what was called the booms of the Chicoutimi Pulp Company on the River Saguenay, which booms were not

worth five cents to the government, as the hon. member for Quebec West is aware.

It was a downright fraud intended to benefit a select few only. Had the resident engineer and the chief engineer of the Public Works Department allowed themselves to be swindled out of that report, which at a certain time it was expected that they could be forced to do, in order to recommend that fraud, stupendous as was the transaction itself, these gentlemen would probably not have been treated as they were yesterday for acting conscientiously and in the public interest. The pack of boodlers who are hounding them with such hatred and cause them to be vilified before this House by well-intended members, who do not know them, would more likely perhaps leave them alone, while they busy themselves feasting upon the plunder. But the public interest of the county would have been sacrificed, and public opinion probably would not have approved of them at the last general election.

Now, I come to a purely personal matter, upon which I am loath to give explanations. This matter is all the more personal to me that I am at a loss to find out how it is that my hon. friends have suddenly discovered in the public accounts that, without previous intention or knowledge, a crime had been committed merely because one L. P. Girard had received certain sums of money, a few dollars perhaps, for services rendered the Department of Public Works ; that things have gone so far as to raise a suspicion upon the fitness of that person to carry out the work confided him, and to insinuate, to say the least, that unless that man were my son, he would not have been employed. I may be allowed to state that this charge can hardly be explained, unless it be that personal motives have actuated those who proffered it. It is all the more inexplicable that the payrolls of the Civil Service are crowded with the names of fathers, brothers, sisters, sons, cousins, step-sons, and other relatives of members of parliament, nay, of ministers, that this has been going on under all governments, Tory and Grit alike, and that nobody ever found fault with it. Why should my son be the object of such strong condemnation ? Why should he be signalled out among the throng of others, unless it be for personal vengeance, which, I am willing to admit, is not shared by my colleagues, but necessarily emanates from outside, and under the inspiration of the same crowd that I branded a while ago, and whose voice fortunately my colleagues have echoed in this House. Things have gone so far that aspersions of such a personal character have been cast upon me that I will not take them up. I am quite willing to admit that I am not a great manufacturer from the city of Montreal,

that I am not a millionaire, but I challenge every one of those who spoke yesterday on that question, to overpoise me by one single ounce in the great balance of rectitude and honour. My hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) may be wealthier than I, he may own a million, which I will never own, but as far as honour and respectability are concerned, I boast of as much wealth as he will ever have. My son, I think, worked three times for the Minister of Public Works. He was first a student at the seminary and then in the law faculty at the university. Each time he was regularly and honestly appointed by the Minister of Public Works, and not in any sneaking way by the resident engineer and myself, as was insinuated. He was one of a group of young men who were regularly appointed by the minister to conduct surveys in my district, surveys which the department needed to acquire information in answer to a great many demands by residents of the districts. Salaries were uniform for the whole staff and were fixed by the department and the minister. It has been customary, I think, for a great many years past, to help students, whoever they may be, during holidays, by teaching them practical life and getting them used to the hardships and struggles of life, and this by having them share in some of the government works. And I thought it proper for me, without humbling or depreciating myself, especially in the light of so many precedents, to have my son benefit of this current practice.

That is what the Conservative party had done, and which is still being done by the Liberal party without anybody generally finding fault with it. As I said before, every time my son was employed, the responsible minister duly appointed him, and never to positions which he could not honestly and conscientiously fulfil with as much advantage for the minister who had so appointed him as if he had been replaced by others. I have neither shame nor regret for what I have done, and I don't think I will ever have to repent for it. If any one thought yesterday that he was justified in suggesting anything wrong in connection with my son's appointment, I may be allowed to tell those colleagues of mine that there is as much honesty right here as can be found in them, not excepting even the hon. member for St. Antoine and that each of us individually has far more than the crowd which kept them posted in this matter.

Before I resume my seat, Mr. Speaker, let me claim for my constituency, which is the largest, the youngest and the less developed in the whole Dominion, all the advantages which it is entitled to from the government and from this House. The electors of my county don't raise their voice when millions upon millions of money are appropriated for works in the large centres

of population, such as Montreal and Quebec, for instance, but they regret every time to hear from the representatives of those cities such criticism as will stay their progress. The government of the day has given them their full measure of fair play, and I hope they will keep on treating them in the same manner in the future. I trust I shall have the support of the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Price), who is the leading manufacturer in my county and one of my electors, every time the question of improving the situation of the population I represent, both in large and in small matters, shall be up for our consideration.

Mr. P. E. BLONDIN. (Champlain). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as I was instrumental in bringing out this rather irate answer of the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Girard), by putting that question the other night, I think certain explanations are due. In looking up the public accounts, the name of L. P. Girard was met with, and, as was our duty, we thought we should ask for information. Unfortunately the information was of such a nature as to open up our eyes and to make us challenge the fitness of that employee, who did not seem to possess the qualifications generally expected from one in a similar position. Let me assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Girard), that he is completely wrong in thinking that we were moved by sheer animosity in acting as we have done. I have not got the pleasure to be acquainted with his son, but I may say that all my sympathies are given to the students, to those young men who, during their holidays, try to spend their time in a useful manner. I will say moreover, that far from blaming the government for employing them, I think he is acting wisely in helping them. But it might be expected at least, that when such young men are called upon to superintend public works, they should possess sufficient qualifications to tally up to the usual amount of work expected from an ordinary employee. It is all very well for the government to entrust the superintendence of such works to students, but inasmuch as public documents do not specify that such men were competent to discharge their functions, no one need be surprised if more information was asked for.

I will not protract this discussion, but I am sorry that my hon. friend (Mr. Girard) has seen fit to speak so long, not to show that the information asked for was not proper, but simply for the purpose of casting aspersions upon men who are no more in this House, and others, who are still here, a speech the propriety of which I utterly fail to see. If I were to take up only three minutes of the time of the House, while my hon. friend took up twenty-three minutes, I should be afraid that the government papers would, to-morrow, charge the opposition with unduly obstructing the proceedings in supply. Even if he had not made those remarks, I can assure the hon. gentleman that he and his son would have lived just as high, in my estimation. Those observations do not in the least alter the facts. We are here to seek from the government all the information and explanations which are required by the public before voting any supplies. That is the position I took when I put that question the other day, but unfortunately I find that it aimed at one of my hon. friend's sons.

Mr. GIRARD. (Translation.) I will point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Blondin), that the long speech to which he takes exception in my case, still falls short of the lengthy discussion which took place yesterday on this subject, and which I find recorded in 'Hansard.' I may also tell my hon. friend that it was not he whom I aimed at in my remarks, because this is the first time I heard him on this question. 'Hansard' does not mention him in yesterday's debate.

Mr. BLONDIN. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman must have read hurriedly.

Mr. GIRARD. (Translation.) My hon. friend desires that students should be helped, provided they are fit for the work they are entrusted with. The officers of the department will tell him that every surveying party which my son went with has made satisfactory reports to the minister who hired him. I live at Lake St. John since 1880. I remember that there arrived at my door on the shore of the lake, a party of federal prospectors, made up of a dozen men who spent five or six months at work during the nice season, making a large consumption of strong liquors—to favourably impress the public, I suppose—and then returned to their respective homes in the fall, without finding any possibility of making a report to the minister who had hired and generously remunerated them. Were they better qualified than my son? I ask the question. These are notorious facts; they can be ascertained from the officers of the department here present. However, there were no pointed criticisms, to my knowledge, in the House on the matter; there were no indignant protest, such as this; there were no such malignant insinuations as those that were thrown out yesterday. This is a small matter of history which will in the future teach some that it is better to make sure before talking. Wherever went my son, the country got the worth of its money. Wherever others have gone, the country lost everything.

Mr. BLAIN. I asked a question which I would be glad if the minister would answer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is intended to expend the present vote entirely in dredging operations upon the Saguenay.

Mr. BLAIN. Will you strike out the other improvement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, there is no objection to our leaving that, but this is entirely for dredging.

Mr. AMES. The other night the minister promised to have a statement prepared for us as to the local expenditures in the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure. Has that statement been prepared yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I am sorry it is not ready; it is being got ready as quickly as possible, and as soon as it is completed I will lay it on the table.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked the minister the other day when we were on this item if he would bring down the report of the engineers in reference to the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not that here to-night. It was some time ago and the papers had been removed from the chief engineer's office and had been laid away, the matter having been disposed of. But I may say that the record has been found of the different papers. It appears that there was a report from the resident engineer which was approved of by the chief engineer, but my hon. friend wants to get the report itself. I am trying to get it and I will lay it on the table as soon as I receive it. If this item is carried I think we might take up the Clarke City item and have that disposed of, because the question with regard to Mr. Girard arises with respect to Clarke city.

Clarke city (Seven islands)—wharf improvements, $4,600.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know that I have anything further to say to the committee on that. I read the correspondence with Mr. Taché last evening.

Mr. MONK. I merely wish to crave the indulgence of the committee for a short time. I did not have the advantage of being present when the several items connected with river improvements in the province of Quebec came up for consideration. But I would say to my hon. friend from Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Girard) that I listened to his protest with a great deal of attention and in so far as what was done on this side of the House was calculated to shock my hon. friend's family feelings, I am perfectly certain that there could have been no such intention on the part of any hon. member on this side of the House. I think he might take our assurance as to that. At the same time my hon. friend must not forget, because he is an old parliamentarian of very varied experience, that as was very clearly pointed out by my hon. friend from Champlain (Mr. Blondin), our duty is to look into and find out the reason, why and wherefore of every expenditure. If, in the examination of an expenditure, we come across a name which happens to be associated in the county with the name of the representative of that county surely my hon. friend will not pretend that we are precluded from applying to such a name ordinary criticism. If he happens to be the son of the representative and nothing of an injurious character is levelled against him or his father we have absolutely the right and the duty of inquiring into the qualification of that person, and perhaps the duty is upon us of inquiring with more care than we would in the case of an ordinary person. That is the way I view it. I was not present at the discussion to which my hon. friend refers, but I caught enough of the protests of my hon. friend to lead me to believe that there was nothing in connection with that incident but that particular criticism. I can understand the feeling of the father towards his son going through a course of science and that he feels hurt at any criticism whatever no matter how absolutely just it may be. I think my hon. friend knows us well enough to feel assured that nobody here enters upon that field of criticism with the desire of satisfying a personal animosity against himself. There is no man in this House, I am sure, who would be less likely to be the object of such animosity than my hon. friend himself.

Now, I wish to come to the more general question of river and harbour improvements. What I find in my experience in this House in regard to the province of Quebec is this: We have before us this evening, and we have had for the past twelve years, a number of items of expenditure for harbours and rivers in Quebec. Up to 1900 I, like others, proceeded to criticise these expenditures. There was then before the country no complete scheme for the solution of the problem of transportation. Since I have been sitting in this committee during this session I have heard time and again ministers stating—the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) so stated two or three days ago—that this is the vital question, that this is the question above all others which we must solve and promptly solve. Since 1904 we have had the report of the very ablest men in this country in regard to the solution of the problem, a report that has not been called in question on either side of the House, and which has been referred to in approving terms by the government time and time again. That report dates back now four years and it contains a plan of improvements necessary and urgent from one end of the country to the other. Before that report was presented I referred with others to the necessity of certain works. What happens? You may criticise a wharf in some small place on the River St. Lawrence. I will take an example, although it is very risky work to do so. I will

take the wharf at St. Sulpice, near Montreal, and I will criticise moderately but legitimately, giving reasons for my opinion of that public work. The very next thing which the member for that county does is to give the largest degree of publicity to my criticism throughout his county. He holds meetings, denounces the opposition and points out that you have singled out this small public work, costing $8,000 or $10,000, out of animosity to the county and for the purpose of doing as much injury as possible to the county and to your own province.

I need not say that in past years my experience has been that there was a regular complicity on the part of government supporters to do as much injury as they possibly could in this way. There is another truth, and I have stated it time and again here and I will repeat it in the hope that it may obtain some publicity; I say that the member of parliament who gives no sign of existence in this House, who does not go through the drudgery that most of us go through every day, who apparently takes no interest in what is being done for the advancement of the public business of the country, such a member undertakes as a rule to atone for that lashes on his part by endeavouring to obtain public works for his country so that he may claim that he has done something valuable and durable for his constituents. Look through the estimates any year and you will find confirmation of this. Such a man goes back to his county and he says he has done a great deal to execute the mandate that was confided to him because he has obtained a post office, or a wharf where there is no water. And what kind of a bill does the country have to foot on account of that tendency in our political life? We paid last year nearly one million dollars for works which did not advance us one single step toward the solution of the transportation problem to which I consider the country is pledged. This year we have half a million dollars spread over fifty items for improvements in the province of Quebec. I do not criticise them in detail for the reasons I have stated, but I say that the province of Quebec at the present time is more interested than any other province in the carrying out of the recommendations embodied in the report of the Transportation Commission. The Minister of Public Works tells us he is interested in that problem, and I wonder why a man like him will continue on in the same old rut that was followed, I admit, by all previous governments, although in those former days the question was not as vital as it is to-day. I wonder why the Minister of Public Works does not turn over a new leaf and begin to practise what he preaches. The report of that Transportation Commission deals with the solution of the problem from British Columbia to the Atlantic ocean and Mr. Reford and the gentlemen associated with him on that commission, men competent beyond all question to form an opinion, stated that the port of Montreal, and the port of Quebec, and the port of St. John, and the port of Halifax should be made free national ports. They reported that it was essential that Quebec and Montreal should be immediately placed on a national basis. Here is St. Sulpice which is some distance below Montreal, and surely the district for miles around there is immensely more interested in the nationalization of the port of Montreal than in the construction of a two-penny half-penny little wharf. There are twenty counties around there which are enormously more interested in the construction of the Georgian Bay canal than they are in these small works which are invariably undertaken to please a contractor or to carry out some parochial scheme which really has nothing to do with the general interest of the surrounding country. In Montreal—and I do not speak of my own division but of Montreal and the country tributary to it extending half way down to Quebec—what is our position. We have never received a dollar from the government for the port of Montreal. True, there was a wharf built when Mr. Tarte was minister; and we have excellent harbour commissioners, but our hands are tied and we cannot go a step farther towards nationalizing the port. And, in Montreal this year we are going to do a thing which is exactly the contrary of what they are doing in the United States ports; we are going to load the port with a new burden of increased port dues in direct opposition to the recommendation of the commission of 1904, and in direct opposition to the policy pursued in the ports of Boston, Portland, New York, and Newport News, in the latter of which they are actually paying a premium to bring the traffic there. Quebec has never paid the interest on its harbour debt. It is a very important port and the people of Quebec are sending a deputation to Ottawa to lay before the government what I am now laying before the committee. The Transportation Commission reported that it was essential and urgent that we should have a dry-dock in Montreal. We have room for a dry-dock there without expropriating any property; a plan was approved by the then Minister of Public Works some years ago, but there is still no dry-dock in Montreal and our shipping is immensely hampered as a consequence. In Quebec there is no dry-dock to accommodate large vessels. A few years ago the 'Bavarian' was salved, but she could not be kept afloat and she was hopelessly lost because not being in a condition to face an ocean voyage to an American port there was no dry-dock in which she could be repaired. Surely all these questions must ap-

peal to the government. I believe if such a policy were laid before the electors of the province of Quebec in its true sense they would endorse the immediate execution of these national schemes, including as they do works which are of great moment not only to the province of Quebec but to all western Canada. We had immense shipments of grain from Montreal last year, but they could not be handled economically because the port of Montreal was not as well equipped as American ports which are its competitors. For the reasons I have stated I do not like to enter into a criticism, beyond requiring knowledge and information, of the separate items. The result to-day is that you are denounced as being against improvements in the province of Quebec. And, let the committee notice, that I do not say that any of these works is absolutely useless. There are about fifty of them. I could point out about one hundred and fifty more where bridges, wharfs, some little dredging in a river to make it navigable for batteaux would be useful and pleasant for the people. So it is difficult to say that these works are absolutely useless, although inquiry I think, will give us the information that they are carried out in a most expensive way. But I base my criticism on a higher ground, and say that at the present moment in the province of Quebec, instead of spending from $1,000,000 to $1,500,000 on these small isolated works, it would be ten thousand times more beneficial to the people if we explained to them the expert opinion of the transportation problem in Canada, and why it is we must cease these small expenditures here and there and endeavour to place our province on a proper footing in regard to transportation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was wondering if I heard my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) aright, when he intimated that he was afraid to criticise these items lest this might be made a ground of attack upon him in the different constituencies. He will pardon me if I say that that is not what I would have expected from him as an old parliamentarian and a man of courage. I would have supposed that he would venture to do what he thought right, irrespective of local feeling or prejudices which might arise in regard to his conduct. I understood him to say that all he would venture to do would be to speak in a general way in criticism of these items, without venturing to call the attention of the committee to any special item of expenditure as being, in his opinion, not in the public interest. In my opinion, that is what our hon. friends opposite ought to do, if they think these votes ought not to be asked from parliament. If the hon. gentleman observes in these items any public work which he thinks ought not to be constructed in the public interest, I hold it is his duty to point that out to the committee. I would be prepared to justify the expenditure, and I say now to my hon. friend, that so far as I am aware, there is not a single public work in the province of Quebec for which we are asking an appropriation which cannot be well justified. I am afraid that my hon. friend looks at the question of appropriations too much from the standpoint of the city in which he happens to reside. To the hon. gentleman the city of Montreal is everything, the development, the building up of that great city is everything, and he would be willing to have all the public moneys expended for the benefit of that city and other great cities, although the smaller communities in the various parts of Canada were utterly and absolutely neglected.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) will allow me to ask him in connection with what he is saying, why the government does not carry out the recommendations of the Transportation Commission in regard to the naturalization of certain ports?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government is carrying out, just as rapidly as it can reasonably be done, the recommendations of the Transportation Commission. But let me say that, as one member of this government, and as having to do with the administration of public works, I fail to see that all other sections of the country should be sacrificed for the benefit of these great ports which are part of this great transportation system. What was the recommendation of the Transportation Commission? It was that the ports of Fort William and Port Arthur should be improved and made capable of rapidly assisting in the transportation of the products of the west to the eastern sections of Canada and the Atlantic seaports of our country; it was that the canal system should be deepened, that the port of Montreal should be improved, as also the ports of St. John and Halifax, and, on the Pacific coast the ports of Victoria and Vancouver.

Now, let us commence with the west and see what the government is doing. On the Fraser river, we have a powerful dredge that has been working there for some time, and another dredge in the harbour of Victoria. Within the last few months we have purchased two as good dredges as are to be found in either the Atlantic or Pacific waters of the United States. We have the 'Ajax,' a very powerful dredge, and lately we purchased in Germany a suction dredge of the most superior character, one capable of dredging to the extent of 1,000 cubic yards per hour—a thousand per cent greater capacity than the average dredge we have had working before this, a dredge with enormous capacity and one which will enable

us to do splendid work. Our idea is to make the Fraser river a great ship channel up to the city of New Westminster. We are dredging the approach to the harbour of Victoria, carrying out a definite scheme of improvement of that harbour with which the people there are well satisfied, as shown by the manner in which they expressed themselves through their board of trade and otherwise in appreciation of the work we are carrying on. In Vancouver we are entering upon the work of improving the harbour. This has not been necessary in the past, because the traffic was not congested as it has since become. We are putting on a dredge to improve the entrance to False creek, a very important part of the harbour, and we are having an examination made of the Narrows, the entrance to Burard inlet, and also of the Parthia shoals and some other shoals which require to be removed. Now, coming eastward to the western shores of Lake Superior, we find that this government is to-day spending millions to make Port Arthur and Fort William capable of accommodating larger vessels which ply upon the lakes, so that the traffic of our country may be handled with as great facility as traffic is handled at Duluth. Coming eastward to the eastern shore of Georgian bay, you will find that the government, in conjunction with the two great railway companies, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific, is developing the new harbours of Tiffin and Victoria. The railway companies are building new lines of railway almost as level as this floor, in order to divert the traffic which now goes to Buffalo and through United States ports to Canadian ports and through Canadian channels, spending on these railways no less than $50,000 to $60,000 a mile. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) will see, if he looks at the estimates, that large appropriations are made for the dredging of these ports of Victoria and Tiffin, and he will see that for Port Arthur and Fort William the magnificent sum of $600,000 is appropriated for the carrying out of this part of the great transportation scheme which the commission has recommended to the government. Now, if he comes to the port of Montreal he will find that very recently the government has expended upwards of $1,000,000 on the new pier there, and also that we are lending to the Harbour Commission of Montreal money for the purpose of carrying on vast improvements there and lending at the low rate of 3 per cent. Coming to the Atlantic sea-board, you find that so far as the port of St. John is concerned, this government has departed altogether from the policy of its predecessor, which was that no work should be done by the government in the harbour of St. John unless immediately connected with the Intercolonial. Last year the expenditure of this government at that port amounted to three-quarters of a million. And if he will look at the estimates he will find an appropriation of $500,000 for the coming year, to carry on the work necessary to make St. John one of the great winter ports this also being a part of this great scheme of transportation. If he will go to the port of Halifax he will find great improvement there in connection with the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway. And if he will go to Quebec, he will find that we are engaged there upon works for the purpose of providing ocean terminal facilities, which will run into $2,000,000 or $3,000,000, before we get through with the very large scheme we have undertaken. If he will visit the south shores of the St. Lawrence at Levis, he will find that we have purchased there a property capable of being made into a splendid depot for our terminal, and we have an item in the estimates of $400,000 for the purpose of completing the purchase of this property and beginning the making of improvements. All along the line from the Pacific to the Atlantic, we have been moving forward to the accomplishment of the ideal which this commission had in view and recommended to the government; but while doing that, are we to sacrifice all the other sections of the country? Are we to refuse to give to the people living along the St. Lawrence in small towns and villages the accommodations in the way of wharfs and dredging which they require and the ordinary conveniencies of transportation? Let my hon. friend not forget that the trade problems of this country do not simply concern the great ports and the people inhabiting the large cities, but also the people living along the St. Lawrence and on the shores of our great lakes and the lakes and rivers of the maritime provinces, as well as the people of British Columbia, who live not alone in Vancouver, Victoria and New Westminster, but in Nanaimo and on the west coast and in many small harbours along the coast. All these people in all these sections are doing their part in contributing to the business of the small towns and cities, and these in turn are doing their part in building up the great cities of Montreal, Toronto, Quebec, St. John and Halifax. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, whilst giving attention to this great transportation problem, I am not prepared to lose sight of what might be called the smaller transportation problem, but still one which concerns many thousands of people. Take this item of St. Sulpice, and it is the only item to which my hon. friend ventured to refer. He says it might be criticised. The amount we are asking for is to repair a wharf 25 miles below Montreal, which was built by the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company and which has got sadly out of repair. The people are asking us to put it in repair. That is a place of some 700 to 800 people,

principally farmers, who send a good deal of produce from there, and it would be a great loss to them if the steamers were not able to call at that wharf. We are putting that wharf in repair in order that steamers may call there and the farmers get the accommodation to which they are entitled.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend has given a glowing description of public works generally, but the simple question I put him he has not answered. I asked why the government had not carried out the suggestion of the Transportation Commission, which called for the nationalization of the ports of Montreal and Quebec, and the building of two dry-docks, one in Montreal particularly and generally the completion within as short a delay as possible of the improvements upon the St. Lawrence route. My hon. friend says they have spent a great deal at Port Arthur and Fort William. I say that the government has not even at these points carried out the urgent recommendations of the commission which required that the government, without any delay should expropriate the water front. That was the first recommendation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At Fort William?

Mr. MONK. The hon. minister has not answered my question. I come now to the particular instance to which I referred. I did not state that a wharf could not be of some use at St. Sulpice. What I said was that the county in which St. Sulpice is situated and the neighbouring county were intensely more interested in the carrying out of the practical suggestions of the commission, such as the nationalization of the port of Montreal and the immediate construction of the Georgian Bay canal. These two works are of infinitely more use and benefit to St. Sulpice than the construction of a wharf. My information is that there was a wharf built by the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, which does service in that locality and has done so more than half a century. Why should we interfere? Was it most urgent to make the wharf 15 feet wider? Was that as urgent as the other works to which I have referred? It was made 15 feet wider and the stones were used from the old wharf belonging to the Richelieu Company to fill up an additional 15 feet. The work was not done by contract. If it had been, it could have been done for $3,800, but it was done by days' work, and I think we have got to pay about $7,000. Was the old Richelieu wharf purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was.

Mr. MONK. There was great dissatisfaction at St. Sulpice at the wharf being where it is? These 800 people, to whom the minister referred, were greatly dissatisfied because the wharf was not at the right place, and in order to make things square all round, the mayor was appointed to oversee the work at $5 per day, although he knows nothing about it. He was, however, an influential man.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is only some 800 per cent out of the way. It was $3 instead of $5.

Mr. MONK. Is my hon. friend absolutely sure ? I think I am nearer the right figure than he.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure the hon. gentleman is astray.

Mr. MONK. We want a competent man. It is not because a man is influential or is a mayor that he is particularly qualified to do the work. The wood was not called for by tender and nothing appears to have been done by tender. The wood was bought from a stone merchant, a very influential and important man to conciliate. Was it bought by tender ? I doubt it very much. That is what I have to say about the St. Sulpice improvements. I say that these people are more interested in the large works projected for transportation than in this little work for local convenience. The minister has multiplied words but he has not answered my question, why have the government not nationalized and made free the ports of Montreal and Quebec, when the Americans are competing successfully for our traffic making their ports free, equipping them for traffic and in some cases giving bonuses to the traffic?

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE (Quebec Centre). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has declared repeatedly, to-night, that nothing had been done about dry docks at Montreal and Quebec. He even said that there was no dry dock at Quebec.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I beg pardon, I never said that. I did say that the dry dock at Quebec could not hold such large ships as the 'Bavarian,' which had coused the complete wreck of that ship.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) There is a dry dock at Quebec, which was built by the Liberal party as we all know, which cost a considerable sum of money, and has been in use until lately. Everybody knows that such undertakings are very important and cannot be brought to completion within a day's time.

I expected the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Price) would contradict the statement made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

I am well aware of the fact that pressure is being brought to bear upon the government in order to induce them to comply with the wishes of the hon. gentleman. But

there is many a slip between the cup and the lip and the hon. gentleman will have to wait till the country is wealthy enough to accomplish the dream which haunts his sleep. When his friends were entrenched in power, they neglected to make those improvements. Public money was squandered in the port of Quebec, and that expenditure gave rise to public scandals. But it was the people's money that was spent, when those millions were being squandered, and thrown into the waters of the St. Lawrence, and what was the outcome? As all the hon. gentlemen know, it was those scandals that brought about the downfall of the party then in power

I may say that a strong agitation is being carried on by the interested parties both in Montreal and in Quebec, with a view to securing the building of dry-docks large enough to meet the actual requirements of trade. Influential delegations from Montreal and Quebec have waited upon the government and have had interviews with the right hon. the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). With what results?

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation). The matter has been thoroughly discussed. On the part of the government there was no such answer given as 'non expedit,' that is to say, nothing to show that the government were unwilling to take action. What was stated was that owing to the financial situation, and the vast public works that were being constructed, although the proposal was worthy of consideration, it was not deemed advisable for the present to start works the necessity and urgency of which are fully acknowledged but which could not be constructed within a short time.

All along the shores of the St. Lawrence, chiefly between Montreal and Quebec, vast improvements have been carried on; other great works are being constructed or will be resumed, during the next season. It is in the interests of Quebec and Montreal that the steamer 'Montcalm' is now busy dredging the channel between those two cities, in order to have the river opened up to navigation earlier in the year. Those improvements call for large expenditures which are incurred, no doubt, in the public interest, but more particularly in favour of the county which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier thinks has been sadly neglected by the government.

I do not think there has been any such neglect either in that part of the country or elsewhere. Such sweeping criticisms are calculated to lead astray public opinion and fool the people into believing that we are remiss in our duties. My hon. friend from Quebec West is well aware that such is not the case. He knows that within twelve or eighteen months, the government are going to place at the disposal of the Minister of Public Works with the consent of parliament the appropriations required to complete the necessary and urgent improvements in the harbours of Montreal and Quebec.

River St. Francis, St. Francis du Lac, on west side of river, $4,000.

Mr. DOHERTY. Could the minister give any information as to the extent to which the river is navigable at this point and the amount of navigation there is?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure as to the depth of water, but my information is that there is considerable traffic between this place and Montreal. I suppose it would be by one of the market boats. I am not able to give my hon. friend the information which I suppose he would desire as to the depth of the water.

Mr. DOHERTY. Is the minister in a position to say that there is water enough for any boat to run for more than perhaps a month in the spring time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman asserts from personal knowledge that there is not, I will take his statement.

Mr. DOHERTY. I am not asserting it; I am asking the minister for information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to say.

Mr. DOHERTY. It seems to me that is a matter on which we should have information before voting money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the work. If this were a new work I would have the details but I have not. It is to go on with the work to completion.

Mr. DOHERTY. I cannot make any personal statement but I have information that seems to me to be reliable that it is not possible for any boats to get to that wharf except for about a month in the spring time.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. What county is it in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yamaska.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How much is the wharf going to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure outside of the dredging will run up to about $15,000.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Is it possible for the minister to spend $15,000 where there is no navigation except for about a month in the spring?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There may not be navigation for deep draft vessels, but there is navigation for market boats.

Mr. DOHERTY. The minister has asked me if I had personal knowledge of the

matter. I think it is a fair question to ask him if he is in a position to affirm that there is any navigation there for more than one month in the spring?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will see that it would be necessary for me to look up the files of the department to get that information. If this were a new work for which I was asking parliament to make an appropriation, I would have fortified myself with the reports of the engineers. But this is to continue a work to which parliament is already committed, and to which I presume parliament committed itself with all the reports before it at the time.

Mr. DOHERTY. Would it be asking too much of the minister to fortify himself with that information for the benefit of the present parliament?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. DOHERTY. I think we ought to have the information so as to see the result of the fortification.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have to finish the work already begun. But I will get the information and lay it on the table.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How much is the minister asking for to complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $4,000.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. We had an item up last night where there was no navigation. This appears to be something in the same way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no suggestion of a bridge here.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I think we had better have the information before passing the item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that there is an item in the supplementaries for the current year, upon which he can discuss this item, and in the meantime I will bring down the report.

Mr. AMES. Will the minister at the same time bring down a report in reference to the dredging that is done there in the same river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will make a note of it and have it brought down.

River St. Jacques (Laprairie)—ice piers near mouth on River St. Lawrence, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract, and the item is to pay the balance of the contract.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Any bridge being erected on these piers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. It will protect a bridge, but there is no bridge to be built on these piers.

Mr. DOHERTY.

Mr. AMES. It is to prevent the bridge that crosses a small river from being damaged by the spring floods.

River St. Maurice—channel between Grandes Piles and Le Tuque, $15,500.

Mr. AMES. What does the minister intend to do with the dredging plant on the St. Lawrence this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount is to continue the plant at work for the removal of boulders and improving the river generally.

River Yamaska—landing pier at St. Michel d'Yamaska, $4,500.

Mr. DOHERTY. With regard to this wharf, will the minister furnish the same information we asked for in the other case?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I will get that, and it can be discussed at the same time with the other.

St. Alphonse (de Bagotville)—addition to wharf on south side, $25,000.

Mr. AMES. I want to take occasion on this item to say a little more upon the matter of improvements in the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay. The hon. member (Mr. Girard) who spoke earlier this evening, was greatly grieved because he was under the impression that we made this subject a matter of personal animosity towards himself. Now I wish to assure the hon. member that so far as I am concerned I have absolutely no animosity towards him, nor am I attacking certain items of expenditure in his county through any reason that his personality has anything to do with. I think it is hardly fair for a member of this House to put on a sour face and to consider himself persecuted, greatly wronged and injured if members on the opposition side of the House, in fulfilling their duty, which they are sworn to perform, and in exercising their right of criticism, happen to find occasion to criticise the government and the officers of the government in respect to any item. It was no defence for the hon. member to say that these various expenditures in the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay had the approval of the Conservatives of the county; for certainly I for one wish to go plainly on record here that whether Conservatives or Liberals in any county in the Dominion are in favour of an expenditure which I may consider to be illegal and illicit, my criticism of it would be just the same if every Conservative in the county was in favour of it. We have no objection to a county having spent in it federal money for strictly federal purposes when there has been presented in this House a statement which parliament accepts, and on which parliament votes money, and when that money is being spent as parliament agreed and intended it should be spent. Now in respect to this place, St.

Alphonse de Bagotville, we can quote another little piece of history on a par with that which we discussed in connection with the River du Moulin, another case in which the ministers have from time to time given incorrect information to this House, and in which the records of the departments have given an incorrect impression, and in which money has been voted and expended in a different way altogether from what parliament intended. An item came up in 1905 for an expenditure at St. Alphonse de Bagotville. This is the way the item was presented in the estimates :

St. Alphonse wharf—removal of rocks from approaches, $1,000.

Mr. Hyman, who was then Minister of Public Works, made this statement :

This is a large parish, and it is a small amount of money, $1,000 merely, to be spent for improving a channel.

The item passed on that recommendation. Next year the Minister of Finance had charge of the estimates, and he had an item like this in the estimates :

St. Alphonse de Bagotville, wharf repairs, $1,000.

And Mr. Fielding said:

This is to build piers in connection with the repairs to the wharf and to remove boulders from the approaches to the same. There is $1,000 in the main estimates and the total cost will be $2,000.

Evidently Mr. Fielding was under the same impression as Mr. Hyman. When the Auditor General's Report came out and showed how this money was spent this is the way the item appeared.

St. Alphonse de Bagotville, removal of rocks from approaches.

When the pay-rolls were brought down this is the way the pay-rolls read:

To remove rocks from approaches.

The explanation of Mr. Hyman and that of Mr. Fielding showed plainly that what they thought we were voting the money for was to remove the rocks from the channel and make it possible for the boats to get to the wharf. That would have been a perfectly legitimate federal expenditure. In several successive years this House was called upon to vote money for this purpose. How was that money spent? St. Alphonse de Bagotville is a town which lies at the southern end of Ha-Ha bay. The wharf has been built out into deep water, it is close up to the town of St. Alphonse de Bagotville and serves the purposes of the people of that town. I have been there and I know what I am talking about. There is a wharf to serve the purposes of the people in the town and they use it to get up the Saguenay and to keep in touch with Quebec and Tadousac. But on the other side of the bay half a mile from where the wharf is situated there is a ridge of land that runs down into the sea and on the far side of that ridge of land there is a little hamlet called Anse à Benjamin. The people who live over in that settlement were anxious to get a road built to the wharf. They had, for a number of years, been trying to raise money to build that road. They had put some of their own money into the road, but it was necessary for the road to go up a hill 250 feet high and go down the other side. They wanted a cliff road built which will be practically a level road from Anse à Benjamin to St. Alphonse de Bagotville. They got these thousands of dollars spent year after year in blasting the rock from this road which the people of the municipality should have built for themselves. It was charged as 'removal of rocks from approaches' and Mr. Fielding and Mr. Hyman thought it was to take out rocks in the channel to the wharf. The Auditor General's Report and the pay-roll conveyed the impression that it was to take out rocks from the channel. As a matter of fact it was to build a road to a wharf that we had no right to build, it was not a proper federal expenditure, but it was an expenditure which was undertaken by the people themselves, and they, having been able to get the member interested and having got the local engineer to send in a favourable report, it was built with federal money. I have photographs of it and I will be glad to send them over to the minister. He will see where the road is blasted out of the rock although this expenditure is charged to the removal of rocks from approaches.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend know that at St. Alphonse de Bagotville there are no rocks in the channel, that the water is very deep and that it is a place to which ocean vessels can come? I am surprised that my hon. friend should have misunderstood what the vote was for. He must have known that it was to remove rocks and make an approach to the wharf by the land.

Mr. AMES. The minister says 'to be spent for improving the channel.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, Mr. Hyman was evidently misinformed. He is not the first man who has been misinformed.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I am simply surprised to see the minister get up and attempt to justify this expenditure. We voted that money for the purpose of improving navigation and yet, according to the statement of my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), it has been expended for the building of a road. I would like my hon. friend to send those photos over to the minister and ask him to justify

the statement he made to the House when he asked us to vote this money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can understand that on some occasions the minister might be misinformed, and I know that since I have been minister sometimes some items go through very quickly. Hon. members sometimes are not as careful about millions as at other times they are about a fifty cent piece.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. We took the minister's statement as being true but we were evidently misled by him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Evidently if the minister made that statement he was under an erroneous impression, but there was nothing in the item itself which would lead to the impression that it was to dredge out the channel because it says that it was to clear out rocks from the approach to the public wharf. It is not at all an improper expenditure to make a road leading up to a public wharf for the accommodation of the public. That has been done very frequently. The department has always made it a practice to buy the right of way to a public wharf and to improve it. There are several cases which have come under my own supervision in which I have given directions as to the approaches to public wharfs. Otherwise the wharf would be of no use. If you build a wharf you must reasonably provide an approach to it so that the public can use it. I do think that my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) ought not to be too critical with regard to an expenditure like this which was undertaken to make an approach to a wharf to give people free access to such transportation facilities as they have. They have no railways there. People in other parts of the Dominion enjoy the convenience of railways. When they go to the railway to take the train, they have a station and they can go into the waiting room and be comfortable, but in this particular locality the people, in winter time, are completely shut out from the larger cities and in the summer time they have to depend entirely upon steamers to get their produce to market, and to go to the cities of Quebec and Montreal and other places. It was a small expenditure of $2,000.

Mr. AMES. Nearly $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The people of that place ought to have some accommodation and I do not think this expenditure is out of the way. I am sure that my hon. friend will not suggest for a single moment that either Mr. Hyman or Mr. Fielding intended to make a mis-statement to the committee because if they had asked for that vote for clearing out a roadway the committee would have granted the appropriation just as readily as though they had thought it was for another purpose.

Mr. G. TAYLOR.

Mr. AMES. I do not say that either Mr. Fielding or Mr. Hyman deceived parliament, but I do say that both of them were deceived by the representations that were made to them and I do say that parliament was deceived by the representations made to them. I admit that it is not a very large sum but the question is one of principle. We are deliberately being deceived in reference to these different expenditures. In this particular case, if the minister had come to us, laid down a plan and said that this money was to be expended in building a road three-quarters of a mile away from the wharf, where the wharf was right opposite a thriving town and thoroughly accessible to the right of way I doubt if the committee would have sanctioned it, especially as there was no more excuse for building that road three-quarters of a mile away than there was for building any other road in the county of Chicoutimi. If the minister had said: I want to build a road along the opposite side of the bay in order to connect the two hamlets do you suppose that parliament would have agreed to it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was it not to enable the hamlet to get to the wharf?

Mr. AMES. It was to enable the hamlet to get to the town. Where ninety people go to the town ten people go to the wharf. It was purely to enable the people to get from the federal government what they should have done for themselves. If you had asked this House to vote that money for that purpose I guarantee you would not have got it. With that photograph in his hand, do I understand that the minister says blandly that we would have done that work for these people if they wanted it? Of course, if the minister establishes that principle then we can have no confidence whatever in the votes he proposes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. After looking at that rocky shore and looking at the approach to that wharf there I say that I believe parliament would have granted this appropriation. Look at the rock-bound shore; you would not want the people to climb down the rocks, you would say at once: Give them a road to the wharf. These photographs afford the strongest argument for that roadway.

Mr. GIRARD. I do not remember what explanations were given to the House when this appropriation was first asked, but I do know that petitions for this work were sent to me to be presented to the government. I can tell the hon. gentleman that this approach was made to get to the wharf and not to get to the town. I live in that district and I know the conditions well, and as my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) has been there once or twice in his life he no

doubt has noticed that just in front of the St. Alphonse wharf the water is about 150 feet deep and surely there would be no necessity for removing boulders there. But there is an immense hill there which prevents the people getting to that wharf and the farmers of the vicinity instead of using the St. Alphonse wharf found it better to drive, many miles out of their way to the Chicoutimi wharf. Under those circumstances the government agreed to build an approach to the wharf.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Call it a road.

Mr. GIRARD. Call it what you like; it is an approach to the wharf. Let me ask my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) if it is worse to make this approach to the St. Alphonse wharf which was built, than to build three miles of a road as an approach to a wharf which did not exist at all as the Conservative government did.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In what year?

Mr. GIRARD. About twenty years ago. When Mr. Ouimet was Minister of Public Works he contracted for the construction of three miles of road to help the settlers in canton Taillon, and nobody growled in this House over that; no one came here and pretended to be very much scandalized. I am much surprised that what hon. gentlemen opposite advocate to-day differs so widely from their own practices when they were in power. The difference between this government and the Conservative government is that the Liberal government built an approach to a wharf at St. Alphonse where there is a wharf actually in existenec, and the Conservative government built an approach to a wharf at Taillon where there was no wharf at all. I understand that my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) is fond of taking photographs.

Mr. AMES. And I use them to good purpose.

Mr. GIRARD. I hope so, but I regret very much that the only place he seems to be in the photographing business is in the Chicoutimi district.

Mr. AMES. I have lots of others.

Mr. GIRARD. I believe if the hon. gentleman is honest he will tell us that he does not bring this matter up on his own initiative; he knows very well that somebody else is at the bottom of it, who I can tell him is not a friend of his although he may think he is. I register my protest against that. These people have not courage enough to authorize the hon. gentleman to give their names here when they come hypocritically attacking the government and myself and trying to make the House believe that nothing but crooked business is done in my district, and that the government is always wrong when it does anything for my constituents. I am glad the hon. gentleman declared that he had nothing personal against me.

Mr. AMES. Nothing personal against you at all.

Mr. GIRARD. I want the hon. gentleman to understand that he is the instrument of some one who has personal malice against me, and I would remind him that of all those employed by the government on that work the only name to be selected was that of my son. How did my hon. friend get on to that unless some one pointed it out to him? Does not that show personal malice? I know very well that the hon. gentleman never himself knew that L. P. Girard was my son, but I know that Mr. Lapointe came here to give him the information to try to make trouble for me. I invite the hon. gentleman to inquire about Mr. Lapointe. I know what kind of a man he is, and I know he is making all that trouble because he has now suits in the courts against him because during the election he attacked the government and he attacked myself and he attacked the employees of the government and called us all robbers. He now has got himself into a corner and he wants to try and save his own skin by attacking me. I thought my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) was so high that he would not descend so low as to bring such matters before the House.

Ste. Anne des Monts, harbour improvements at mouth of Grande rivière, Ste. Anne, $2,500.

Mr. PRICE. What is the explanation of this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to construct certain works at this point and if the object is accomplished it will make quite a safe and commodious boat harbour for small vessels in that part of the St. Lawrence. The total estimated cost is $17,750, and this I think will complete the work.

St. Fulgence wharf, $1,000.

Mr. AMES. How much more is going to be spent on this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete.

Mr. AMES. Does the minister state definitely that this will complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister states that just as definitely as one can relying upon thoroughly competent engineers; oh, yes, this will complete.

St. Jean des Chaillons wharf, including dredging, $3,500.

Mr. AMES. When was that work commenced ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About eight or ten months ago.

Mr. AMES. That is, it began about June ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. AMES. When was it discontinued ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make further provision for the work which includes dredging in front of the wharf to clear away the spoil material removed from the St. Lawrence ship channel, apparently dumped there through the carelessness of those operating the dredges. A depth of only ten feet of water has been left at a distance of 85 feet north of the new structure, where there was a depth of over 16 feet. We are also prolonging the side wharfing commencing at the foot of the cliff, and constructing on its slope a retaining wall of open-face cedar crib-work to prevent the earth and trees from sliding into the river, and obstructing the present roadway leading down to the wharf.

Mr. AMES. The minister has not answered my question. He says the work began ten months ago. When did it cease ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can tell the hon. member (Mr. Ames) the work that has been done, but I cannot tell the exact date when it was discontinued. I suppose it was discontinued at the close of the season. The work done during eight months included building about 110,000 feet of open-face cribwork of which 160 feet in length of side of the wharf averaging 6 feet high, 30 to 33 feet wide on 137 feet and 18 to 20 feet on 23 feet. Of the protection wall there was built 99 feet in length by 12 feet in height, and partly filled up with stone ballast to secure its stability. To overcome the steep elevation of the hill, ascending towards the public highway, a crib of open-faced work was erected on the east end of the wharf, its dimensions at base being 29 x 33 feet rising up to 29 feet with 2½ feet batter on side, giving it a 24 foot square platform on top, extending and working backwards into the cliff as it worked upwards. A trestle roadway of 76 feet by 24 at platform and 44 at upper end is to connect with road on hilltop.

Mr. AMES. What I want to know, if the minister can tell me is, when this work commenced, and when it ceased. Here is a case where the county is not getting justice, if my information is correct. Instead of opposing this work, I am asking that it be gone on with in earnest. If my information is correct, this work was commenced about a week before the provincial general election—that is it was commenced on the 1st of June. And, as soon as the elections were over, say on the 10th of June, the work was discontinued. Again it was taken up a short time before the Dominion elections in October, and when they were over it was again discontinued. The work should be taken up and finished, instead of being gone on with only when there happens to be an election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think, perhaps, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) has in mind the work on the roadway. During the harvest season it is hard to get labouring people to leave their farms, but later in the season they could easily go on with this work. It happened, perhaps unfortunately, that the elections came on shortly after harvest, when the men could leave their farms without disadvantage. But I think that what the hon. gentleman says would not apply to what might be called the wharf work, which I think, went on pretty continuously. The hon. gentleman, then, agrees with me that it is a very necessary work, does he not?

Mr. AMES. The hon minister (Mr. Pugsley) pays the climate of Quebec a great compliment when he suggests that the harvest season commences on June 10, and that it was necessary to take the men off the work on the roadway two days after the election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was speaking of the harvest in August and September.

Mr. AMES. The minister had better try to get another excuse; this one is very thin.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Strange to say, at this moment, I cannot do better than that.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Perhaps the hon. minister will bring down the pay-sheets when he brings the other information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will bring everything; I will get an ox cart and bring everything down.

Mr. AMES. Here is a case, where again, you are playing with a public work, taking it up when a provincial or federal election comes on, doing a little work, and then dismissing the men when the election is over. If the work is worth doing, do it; if it is not worth doing, do not make a pretense of doing it merely because an election is coming on.

St. Nicholas—repairs to wharf, &c., $2,850.

Mr. AMES. Is the St. Nicholas wharf leased, and if so, to whom, and at what price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no record of any lease.

Mr. AMES. In the Auditor General's Report the minister will see it stated that it has been leased at $25 a year. To whom?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. AMES. Did we build it with a view to leasing it to some one? If so, to whom?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As my hon. friend, perhaps, knows, my department does not col-

lect revenue for wharfs, but if we transfer to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, it collects tolls, or, it may perhaps give relief from tolls—I am not quite sure. If there were any lease, it would be a matter entirely in the Marine Department. I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. There was $3,000 voted last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, this is a revote of $2,850.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What was done with the $150?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a little work done.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. At election time ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was some planking done with that.

Mr. AMES. The question to my mind is whether we have built that wharf in order that it might be leased to private parties, and in that case whether the public still have rights to the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The public have complete rights on the wharf. It is against the policy of the government to give exclusive privileges to any one.

Mr. AMES. Was the expenditure incurred in order to lease it to some party at $25 per year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where does my hon. friend get that information that it is leased ?

Mr. AMES. In the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will look closer, he will see that that is simply the revenue derived from the steamboat company which, instead of paying tolls on goods landed at each trip, pays an annual charge. The wharf is open to all who wish to use it.

Sorel—deep water wharf, $86,000.

Mr. PRICE. Is that the wharf which turned over last summer ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the wharf which turned over was built some years ago. We are rebuilding the wharf but upon a different design, and after making very careful examination of the bed of the river, we are quite satisfied the wharf we are now building will stand. The sub-soil there is very shifty in its character, there is a good deal of quick sand, and having tested the foundation, we are building a different substructure altogether.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. TAYLOR. What business to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. We contemplated proceeding with the loan resolutions of the Grand Trunk Pacific, but as some information desired by hon. gentlemen opposite is not quite ready, we will postpone that matter until Tuesday. To-morrow the House will be moved into Committee of Supply, and the estimates taken up. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 19, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 110) respecting agricultural fertilizers. He said: The present Act has been found unworkable and ineffective as a protection to the purchaser of fertilizers. It is proposed to repeal the present Act and substitute this one. There are some very important changes but the Bill is along the lines of the existing Act. It is desired to give greater security to farmers in purchasing fertilizers. It requires that all manufacturers of fertilizers shall register and that they shall sell their products under registered numbers. It also provides that a guaranteed analysis shall be placed on every package of fertilizer sold and provides penalties for contraventions of the Act. A Bill was prepared last session, submitted to the Senate, brought to its second reading and circulated with a view to bringing it before the farmers and others interested in fertilizers. We have had a great many replies and criticisms of the proposed measure and they have been almost unanimously in favour of making a change. The present Bill therefore is in the form of a Bill introduced in the Senate last year with certain modifications and changes to meet the criticisms we have received.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Could not the minister insert a clause in this Bill or introduce another Bill making similar provision with reference to the sale of feed for stock ? I have had many complaints from farmers that when they purchased feed, seeds and other things which they did not purchase were found.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The question of an Act regulating the sale of food for stock has been under consideration since last session. Several delegations have visited Ottawa and had interviews with the Min-

ister of Agriculture and myself, and the question of preparing and submitting a Bill at the present session, something along the line of this Bill, is receiving consideration. I hope to come to a conclusion in a week or so with regard to it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order for the consideration of an amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 8) to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—Mr. Oliver.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The amendment proposed by the Senate is made at the suggestion of the department and is intended to meet a condition which has arisen by reason of the very large numbers of patents now being granted. Section 90 of the Act relates to the preparation and signing of patents. Provision is made that the patent shall be transmitted to the Secretary of State, by whom, or by the Under Secretary of State, it shall be countersigned. The number of patents has become so great that the signing of them becomes too great a tax upon the time of either the Secretary or the Under Secretary of State and the amendment prepared by the Senate and offered for the assent of the House provides that the patents may be countersigned either by the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State as at present, or by 'some other person thereunto specially authorized by the Governor in Council.' That is the whole amendment and its purpose.

Amendment concurred in.

SUPPLY—TWO CENT FARES ON RAILWAYS.

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

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I desire to bring to the attention of the House a letter which I received this morning as follows :

36 Craig Street West, Montreal.

Dear sir,—I want to ask you to help me to get my money refunded from the Grand Trunk Railway. I came from Toronto and left there Tuesday last. They sold me a second-class ticket and checked my luggage. No one said a word or stopped me getting on the 10.15 p.m. train, but when the conductor came round he demanded $3.35 from me or to make me leave the train. I paid under protest and send you the receipt. I know you are the man who is fighting this question and can get what is right for me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Sometimes we do get a little compliment outside of this House. The letter continues:

I have travelled by the same train, 10.15 p.m., from Toronto to Montreal, three times before and they have always taken my second-class ticket without a word. I am told that the company are bound to carry second-class passengers by that train. Will you put me right on this matter? Thanking you in anticipation.

Yours truly,

GEORGE MOORE.

The receipt is enclosed. My contention is, as I have often said in this House, that this man or any other person was entitled to travel for two cents a mile on that Grand Trunk train. His right to travel on a Grand Trunk train at that rate has been vindicated by the highest court in this realm. We had a judgment the other day from the Privy Council in England which declared that the Grand Trunk Railway Company was bound to give a penny a mile service at least once a day on its line from Toronto to Montreal. We know also that this has been confirmed by the Railway Commission of this country and by all the courts, and still the Grand Trunk compelled that man, when he endeavoured to travel for two cents a mile, to pay first class fare and threatened to eject him from the train if he did not pay it. I want to know who is looking after the public interest in this matter. I am getting rather tired of it; at least I am willing to continue the work but I would call upon the government, upon the Minister of Railways and Canals, or upon some official of this country to see that the public get what they are entitled to. For the last few days I have had to devote my time to preparing a case in order to bring another action before the Railway Commission so as to try and get this penny a mile service between Toronto and Montreal, or, in fact, to get it for all of the province of Quebec. According to my interpretations of the law, and according to the advice I get from eminent counsel, the people of the province of Quebec and certainly of Ontario up to Toronto are entitled to this penny a mile service. But instead of that this man is refused the right to travel at that rate. He is threatened with being put off the train and he is compelled to pay the additional money. The government, the Minister of Railways and Canals, and the Minister of Justice should be busy at this moment seeing that this man gets his rights.

Mr. FOSTER. Had they no second-class accommodation on that train?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am not in a position to say whether they had or not, but the man was entitled to travel at that rate. It makes every Canadian's blood boil with indignation at the thought that the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies carry all the travel that originates in the United States across Canada for

two cents a mile or less, gladly accepting that fare, and at the same time threaten to eject a Canadian who demands similar treatment. How long will we stand that in this country? Yet, it is going on every day. I have investigated it, and I have had it proved time and time again that on travel which originates in Michigan or New York state, the same being true at the Soo and on the Manitoba border, it is carried for two cents a mile while a Canadian must pay three cents and he is not even given second class or third class accommodation. The conductor holds him up and says: If you do not pay this additional sum we will stop the train and put you off in the wilderness. They have done it. The case that we won in the Privy Council arose out of stoping a train and putting a reporter off because he would not pay the additional sum. I am not here to antagonize the railways of this country; I am not here to say or do anything against the Grand Trunk. But, I am here to ask these railways in the first place, to carry out their charter obligations, and, in the next place, to treat Canadians as well as they treat Americans. It is not antagonizing the railways. It is not making an attack upon their credit or their capital ; but my contention is that they are bound to do this and that if they would agree to do it they would make more money and the people would appreciate it. At this very moment this same Grand Trunk Railway Company is a suppliant to parliament, asking this country to come to its relief in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and we have already been told that it is to get relief. If the managers of that road are coming to parliament asking for relief is not this the time to put it up to them and say: You are not going to get any help until you carry out your charter obligations and until you agree to give as good treatment to Canadians as you give to people across the line. I know that Mr. Hays and some of his newspaper friends in this country say that I am making an unjust attack on the road and that the Canadian roads cannot live if they carry people at two cents a mile. It has been proved in the United States, as it has been proved wherever it has been tried, that cheap railway travel increases the revenue of the railways. I am prepared to stand here and prove that such is the case and that these roads are not going to be hurt. The attitude of Mr. Hays and of the railway companies is to give as little service as possible and to go at the public with a club. My contention is that they will make more money if they give a better and cheaper service. The people will spend as much money on railway travel but they will get a better service and there will be a better understanding between the railways and the public. I hope that I will have the assistance of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Railways in trying to get better treatment accorded to the Canadian travelling public and that no Canadian in future will be ejected from a train because he is asking for his rights and for equality of treatment.

Now, I want to pass to the question I raised the other day in this House with regard to the capitalization of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I then told this House that the capitalization of railway companies was an important matter, that it bore directly on the traffic charges and I said that that had been found to be the case in the United States, and that if we would wait a few days we would hear the deliverance from the incoming president on the subject. Almost the first paragraph of President Taft's inaugural address the other day at Washington was to the effect that the time had come when the capitalization of interstate railways had to be regulated, and that the people who used the railways had to be protected with regard to tariff rates through the regulation of the capitalization of these railway companies. They have found it desirable in the United States that somebody should exercise a scrutiny over proposed increases in the capital of railway companies. Yet, here in Canada we have allowed the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to increase their capital by an immense amount, to divide over $60,000,000 amongst the shareholders, thus putting an unnecessary tax, I contend, on the traffic of this country to the extent of whatever the earnings on $60,000,000 may be. I was told that we had no concern with the capitalization. I have proved that we have by the statement of the President of the United States and by the law in existence in the state of New York, and I am now going to show something else which follows from over-capitalization. If we in this country are to establish the idea that this cutting of melons is to be the rule who will invest anything in railway securities unless a melon goes with it? And, strange to say, that very thing is being demonstrated in our own day. If the Canadian Pacific Railway cuts a melon, if it becomes the rule to issue stock in that way and if all the shareholders have the prospect of becoming—shall I say—millionaires, it will continue to do that business and nobody will buy any railway security that has not a bonus or a melon with it. What has happened? The Canadian Pacific Railway can sell all the stock they wish as long as there is a bonus or a melon to cut. The Grand Trunk cannot sell a dollar's worth of stock and they are to-day coming to this country for relief. If they had a melon to cut they would get their money, investors would take up their stock, but what the investor looks for is a security that has a melon attached to it and the Grand

Trunk Pacific cannot sell one of their securities. This man of melons, this man who is making this new class of melonaires, Sir Thos. Shaughnessy, is able to come to the relief of the government and buy some of these Grand Trunk securities that cannot be sold. That is the position of things in this country with regard to railway securities. It is high time that there was a change and that the government undertook to scrutinize all these issues of stock. The government ought to confine the Canadian Pacific Railway to an issue of 4 per cent bonds. Then I was told by the Minister of Justice that instead of finding out what was the actual investment in the Canadian Pacific Railway as provided for by the charter, the minister had agreed to hang up for an indefinite period the ascertainment of what the actual cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway was. In other words, the Canadian Pacific Railway having been sentenced to be hanged on a certain date, as long as it was pampered and allowed to issue melons it would not ask to be hanged. That is the position in regard to the regulation of its rates as we are entitled to have them regulated under the original agreement.

Then, I want to tell the Minister of Finance how far this bonus business has got to in this country. You cannot issue hardly a security of any kind in Canada unless there is a bonus of some kind with it, and we find our Canadian banks and some of the Canadian insurance companies parties to a new kind of what I consider dangerous financing in this country. They are raising money every day for the development of electrical industries in South America, Central America and Mexico, and all these securities are put on the market largely with the assistance of Canadian financing institutions, and the proposition is in the shape of bonds and with the bonds there goes bonus stock so that you buy a bond for $1,000 and you get $1,000 of bonus stock. That kind of financing is producing a bad effect in this country and it is getting so that people will buy no security unless a bonus of stock goes with it. And while I say Canadian capitalists are free to invest in any way they like, I do not quite think that the Canadian banks and the Canadian insurance companies with the savings of the Canadian people ought to be floating propositions for the development of foreign industries. We have enough industries at home to develop and enough necessity to keep our money here. I want to see the Grand Trunk Pacific built, and if there is Canadian money I would like to see it put in that enterprise. But you will never get investments of that kind taken by the Canadians if this practice of issuing bonus stock is continued. There was a gentleman defending the insurance companies the other day and he said he regarded the government proposal to limit these companies so that they should not indulge in this purchase of bonds along with which went bonus stock, but I say the legislation in that direction is right and that the practice has got to be stopped in this country so far as public action can stop it. We have got to tell the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that never again will they be allowed to cut a melon and to issue to their shareholders at par a security that is worth $170 and soon will be worth $200. We have got to stop that once and for all, and in the name of the Canadian people I tell the government here to-day that that must never occur again, and later on I intend to test the feeling of the House on that very proposition. I want to tell the House here to-day that we must stop this financing of foreign corporations with the savings of the Canadian people on this basis of issuing bonus stock with bond securities. It is not in the interest of the Canadian people. Once we establish that habit in this country of distributing bonuses of one kind or another with public securities, then we will have to give bonuses with all our securities and the first thing we know when this government goes on the London market to get a security issued it will be asked: What bonus are you going to give us; can't you give us some kind of common stock that some day will be of some use to us, or cannot we get some kind of rights? So, the thing is going on and it is time it was stopped and it must be stopped. I am availing myself of this occasion when the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway is here before us to-day asking for favours ; the Canadian Pacific Railway is before us asking for an increase of its capital stock and the Grand Trunk Pacific is here as applicants for assistance. I say now is the time to compel these great corporations to treat the people of this country fairly, and to give us a 2-cent passenger rate, as they give to the American travel on their roads. Again I say that the Canadian Pacific Railway financing of this kind must be stopped, and the way to stop it is to tell them not only that they must come under the general Act under the control of the Railway Commission, but that they must use the funds they now have in their treasury, that they must sell their lands, and abandon that exemption clause which protects them in the west. All these privileges can be wiped away when they come here as suppliants, and some kind of concession can be got from them in this respect. Later on I intend to test the feeling of the House on this question. I have now got my facts fairly well before the House and I leave these facts with the House, and this letter which I have read from a common ordinary Canadian traveller on the Grand Trunk Railway, who was threatened with ejectment because he would not pay something he was not

entitled to pay, I commend to the consideration of the Minister of Railways and I hope he will compel the Grand Trunk Railway Company to treat that Canadian as he ought to have been treated and compel them to return to him the three dollars and odd cents which he was forced to pay.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). I will detain the House but for a moment. The question of the Canadian Pacific Railway issue of stock has already been discussed and I will not further discuss it now. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) tells us, and rightly, that there was something in President Taft's address in reference to the issuing of stock. I think his statement was fairly general on that point.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Very.

Mr. GRAHAM. President Taft carefully kept away from any detail; he was not as courageous as my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean). What he will do or what he will not do nobody on earth can know from reading his address.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I'll bet you what he will do.

Mr. GRAHAM. As the hon. gentleman told us what President Taft was going to say perhaps he can tell us now what he is going to do. With that true newspaper instinct of his he had a scoop on the rest of us as to the contents of the address a day in advance, although if I were actively in the business now as I used to be perhaps I would be as fortunate as he was. However, the two cent rate matter was the gist of the hon. gentleman's remarks. I do not know the particulars of his complaint except that as he tells us a man got on the fast train of the Grand Trunk and his second-class ticket was not honored. Well, as I understand it, the judgment of the Privy Council only provides for one train a day between Montreal and Toronto at the two cent rate.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Was it there?

Mr. GRAHAM. The judgment of the courts would not allow the man to select the fastest train for his two cent ticket and no railway in the world would give him a two cent rate on its fastest train. This train no doubt was selected for the purpose of showing that the road would not give him a second-class fare, but that train I understand does not carry a second-class car at all; it is one of the very fastest trains on the Grand Trunk.

Mr. SPROULE. I went up on that train the day before yesterday and a lady sitting on a seat in front of me had a second-class ticket was sent out to the second-class car.

Mr. GRAHAM. This occurred on the night train going east?

Mr. SPROULE. My experience was on the fast train going from Montreal west.

Mr. GRAHAM. This occurred on the night train which carried the sleepers, and there was a train on the Grand Trunk which travelled in the same direction a short time before it and on which the second-class ticket would have been honoured. The fast train only carries the sleepers and the first-class car. It is very questionable to my mind whether the gentleman who wrote that letter had any grievance at all. It is questionable whether if the law were enforced to-day that gentleman would have any cause of complaint because the law only requires the Grand Trunk to put on one train per day for the accommodation of second-class passengers and surely they can run as many other trains as they like without a second-class car and not violate their charter. However, the question of a two cent rate is a very large one. My hon. friend will have noticed that within the last few days one of the states he quoted as having a two cent rate has had that law declared unconstitutional simply because the railways cannot carry people at two cents a mile and live. We forget often that the railways in this country are of as much importance to the country as this House itself is; the country cannot prosper without the railways; we are partners in the railways and while I believe in making them live up to their contracts and give the people a good service at a minimum price, we must not run away with the idea that every time we attack a railway we are doing something for the country, while the fact is that we may be injuring the country in pursuing such a course. Perhaps I should not say so, but at the present moment I do not believe that the railways of Canada run through a population sufficiently dense and affording sufficient traffic to give the people a two cent rate with any kind of living profit to the railways. I believe that is the situation at the present time, and if parliament were asked to pass a law now to compel the railway companies to give a two cent rate I do not believe the House would consent to it. While I agree that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has a perfect right to adhere to his idea with regard to a two cent passenger rate, I am inclined at present to take the other view. We cannot compare Canada with the United States or with Great Britain in this respect. In Canada the rate for transportation cannot be governed by the density of population. Canada is a sparsely settled country, as long as the United States, with seven millions of population to feed railways extending from one end of the country to the other, while the United States has over eighty millions of population. It is out of the question, therefore, to expect as low a rate in Canada as there is in the United States. I do not know that I have anything

more to say. After all, if we compelled the Grand Trunk to adhere to what my hon. friend calls the terms of its charter and to the judgment recently given, I doubt if the gentleman who wrote that letter would have any claim at all.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). When a railway like the Grand Trunk has some trains on which it honours second-class tickets, is it not obliged to point that out by way of advertisement? A traveller may know generally that there is a two-cent fare on the railway, but he may get on the wrong train inadvertently. Is there not a duty on the railway to guard travellers against misapprehension of that kind?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that on every time-table, including those posted on the walls of the stations, there are particulars that enable any one to glean that information; but at the city of Toronto the arrangements are so imperfect, too imperfect for a large city, that people are liable to get on the wrong train. I hold with my hon. friend that the railway should have a regulation to prevent people getting on the wrong train, such as there is at Chicago and elsewhere.

Mr. FOSTER. When a ticket agent sells a second-class ticket, he should point out to the purchaser what the arrangements are.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The minister has missed my point, which is that there were Americans travelling at two cents a mile on the same train on which Canadians were given this unfair treatment.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know that we have any proof of that.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have, on every train.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is this to be remembered in regard to railway travelling, that the rates are governed to a certain extent by the place where the traffic originates. That is true of passenger rates as well as freight rates. Traffic originating in the United States has to compete with the rates prevailing in the United States, and it can be sent either by the American route or by the Canadian route. The railways have to give these rates to comply with the laws of the United States. If they had any traffic originating in Canada, they would have in the same way to comply with the laws of Canada. This arrangement is perfectly feasible, and if brought before the Board of Railway Commissioners to-morrow, they would deal with it just as they deal with this proposition, and my hon. friend gets the benefit. A place like the city of Toronto gets a distributing rate which is not given to other places, and that is what enables the city of Toronto to become a wholesale centre. If my hon. friend's idea were carried to its logical conclusion, that distributing rate would have to be abolished, and our larger cities would not be the wholesale centres they are at the present time. To nibble at the shell of the traffic problem gives one only a little information; but railway tariffs are based on scientific principles. You cannot take an isolated case and make a system out of it. You have to go through all the tariffs and ascertain the principles on which they are based, and then form your conclusion.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia). May I ask the hon minister a question? When the Canadian Pacific Railway Company disposes of $50,000,000 of stock, for what authority has been given by order in council, and distribute that stock among their own shareholders at par, which will be practically dividing $50,000,000 among their shareholders, as the stock is worth intrinsically $200, will they be in a position to say to the Railway Commission, we will no longer allow you to fix our rates, and we want this lawsuit brought to a conclusion?

Mr. GRAHAM. I suppose they are able to force this law-suit to a conclusion at the present time, but the Canadian Pacific Railway will never do it. There is no question about their being in that position, and I see no great benefit to be derived to the people of Canada in having it pushed to a conclusion, so long as they do as at present, allow the rates to be governed by the Railway Commission. As I say, I think there is nothing to hinder them asking the case to be pushed to a conclusion, or the government doing the same thing.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). I only arose to call the attention of the hon. minister to the case in hand, to which his attention was particularly called, and to remark that he had apparently overlooked the salient feature of that letter. The man applied for a ticket and checked his baggage for the 10.15 train, and when he did that, one would naturally think that he should have been made aware of the fact that he could not travel on that train on that ticket. A second opportunity is afforded when he comes to check his baggage. He must present his ticket, and when he did he should have been told that he could not have his baggage checked by that train. But they allowed him to purchase his ticket and check his baggage, and when he got on the train they put him off, although he made three previous trips under the same circumstances.

Mr. GRAHAM. He knew better, then.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Intercolonial Railway—cut-off line at Moncton, N.B., $50,000.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). This is an item I want to explain, because this small expropriation does not really cover what is meant. This line will cost about $357,000. It will be two and a half miles and double-tracked. The idea of this is to save running the heavy freight through the city where there are high grades.

Mr. FOSTER. What are you going to get by it?

Mr. GRAHAM. We will reduce the distance quite a large extent and get rid of a very heavy grade and actually make a grade of five-tenths of one per cent that will save our going through the city with the heavy traffic.

Mr. J. HAGGART. How did you get along before ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Our shops are moved west of that city quite a distance. Before they were in the city. We are going to cut off a loop practically, and the Grand Trunk Pacific will connect with the Intercolonial just at that point.

Mr. J. HAGGART. This seems a large expenditure for something never wanted before. It is estimated to cost $350,000, but before completed it will cost half a million dollars, if the usual record on the Intercolonial Railway is not departed from.

Mr. GRAHAM. Our engineer thinks it is absolutely necessary and we will save on the haul as well as on the distance.

Mr. FOSTER. When was it begun?

Mr. GRAHAM. It has not been begun. It has always been the intention in the laying out of the yard.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. $350,000 is a large amount for two and a half miles of railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a double-tracked line.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How much cutting and filling in to make it cost so much ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have the items here. 41·2 acres of land, right of way; 17 acres clearing right of way; 3 acres grubbing; 1,000 cubic yards solid rock excavation; 30,000 loose rock; 16,000 ordinary excavation; 200,000 earth excavation; 1,800 yards standard fence; 24 gates; 28 cattle guards; 30,000 lbs. of rails for culverts; 854,000 lbs. of steel trussel at Hall's Creek; one under crossing at north street; 5 miles track laid.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What do you estimate the cost of the land for right of way?

Mr. GRAHAM. $50,000.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. If that is intended to be used as a marshalling track, you will require more than two tracks.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not really a yard. We have an extension yard outside of this. We have constructed a new yard altogether and one shop west of the city. This will start where the Grand Trunk Pacific reaches our tracks and will not run through the city proper. We will escape the trade going down the city.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. If you are to have 28 cattle guards, that means 14 street crossings on 2½ miles of track.

Mr. GRAHAM. There are 2 for each street, and then there are double tracks, which will make 7 streets all told and one viaduct.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the land been yet secured?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the line through which this road is to run been decided ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It has practically.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. gentleman is in this position. He has laid down his railway tracks and has not taken any opportunity to secure the land. How does he propose to get the land now?—by expropriation?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have really two lines surveyed, and we propose not to be tied up to either. We are getting a man to make an estimate and get offers from these people. If we do not get a fair price, we will expropriate the land.

Mr. FOSTER. But you make the whole matter public.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was difficult not to do that, seeing that we had located our shops there.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had land transactions in Moncton before now. The minister was urged, I think by the present deputy minister, though I am not sure, both with reference to Moncton and Halifax land, that it would be better not to let a word get out concerning the government's intentions until they had options on the land. That was the whole argument, in fact, that, if the thing were known, the government would put itself in the hands of the land owners, and that the necessary course was to secure options in advance. Now, the department, with a different minister, but, I think, with the same deputy, thinks it well to come to parliament and advertise the matter of an expenditure of $354,000, although it is tied up within a very small radius of land. I cannot see the consistency of these two situations in the one department. Unless you are going to

expropriate in any event, it would seem not very wise to advertise the whole thing in this manner. We remember that in the matter of the purchase of the sand lands at Kentville for military purposes, we were told that it was necessary to get hold of these lands before it became known to the public that the department wanted them, or they would have to pay through the nose for them. Is this a new diplomacy that the Minister of Railways and Canals is introducing in the management of his department? I would like to see how he works it out.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will tell my hon. friend, and he will see it in a moment. The purchase of the sand lands, or even the purchase of a building site in Halifax, was a different case. The government could buy in one place or in another. But, in the case now before us, the range of choice is very little, for the railway has to go through from one point to the other.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister must go back further than that in order to make it clear. It must have been known several years ago that these shops were to be erected, and it must have been foreseen that, at some time, you would need more land there. Why did not the government, before the shops were built, take measures to secure the necessary land, and so apply the principle which has been so often advocated before, that of securing control before the public knowledge of the government's intentions makes the land immensely valuable? The minister can do what he likes, but, in this case, he will pay a great deal more for the land than he would have had to pay had he gone at it in a business-like way. Even an expropriation court will give the owners a larger award now than it would have given before.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. This line was not contemplated when the shops were built?

Mr. GRAHAM. My deputy tells me that part of the surveys were made as long ago as two years. It has always been his idea to have this line connected in this way since the building of the new shops. And the building of the new shops was rendered necessary by the burning of the old ones.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I understand that the cut-off is 2½ miles. What is the length of the existing line?

Mr. GRAHAM. Nearly a mile longer.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. And what is the grade? What is the ton-mile saving over that piece of road?

Mr. GRAHAM. The grades will be reduced about one-half.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How many cars can you take over that grade now with a hundred-ton locomotive such as you ordinarily handle freight with?

Mr. GRAHAM. The difference would be as between 1,000 tons and 1,800 tons.

Mr. LALOR. Is this line to be used jointly by the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental?

Mr. GRAHAM. We expect that the terminals with which this connects will be used by the Grand Trunk as their Moncton terminals or, at least, as a portion of them; and as the freight starts east from there, it will use the double track with the lesser grade. It will be part of the eastern line from our shops.

Mr. LALOR. Is the minister charging the whole of this amount to capital account of the Intercolonial or dividing it between the two lines?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is all ours. Should we make an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Pacific, they would pay for whatever rights they secured.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this improvement necessary for the traffic of the Intercolonial as it is at present?

Mr. GRAHAM. It could be got along without, but as we are doing the work we thought that we might as well make a complete job of it, instead of being compelled to go back and finish it. We are building our shops and getting them in splendid shape. The whole work will take us two or three years, as the committee will see by the amount asked for in this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it not strike the minister that, particularly this year, this is a pretty large expenditure unless it is really necessary? As I understand it, it is not really necessary for the traffic of the Intercolonial, but will only become necessary because the Grand Trunk Pacific is going there and it is believed you will want this cut-off when you get access to the traffic that you expect you will have when that road enters Moncton. The $350,000, which I suppose will run to nearly half a million before it is through, is a very large expenditure for a cut-off of 2½ miles. The question would be, I would think, whether it is so necessary that it should be gone on with at once. You are making large expenditures at Moncton, I think the information was it would take $500,000 more to finish the shops. These shops of course would not be necessary simply for the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, yes they are.

Mr. FOSTER. You are making them more expensive simply because you are looking to joint interests by the Grand

Trunk Pacific and the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. The longer we leave this the more expensive the land will become. The moment the Grand Trunk Pacific gets to Moncton the city as a railway centre will increase in size.

Mr. S. SHARPE. What is the estimated cost of cattle-guards and is there a uniform pattern?

Mr. GRAHAM. The estimate here is $25 each. They are a steel cattle-guard which we get from the Fairbanks Company. We use this kind in anything new we put in.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not a very heavy sum. What is it that will cost so much?

Mr. GRAHAM. Here is a filling, 400,000 cubic yards, that will cost $80,000. Then we have a trestle, 854,000 pounds of steel trestle, that will cost $38,430. Eighty-pound rails and fastenings will cost $21,000.

Mr. LENNOX. In connection with cattle-guards, the other day we got a return as to the number of protected crossings in Canada. It is stated that there were 15,000 crossings in Canada of which 3,115 were protected, but we could not get particulars as to how they were protected. It now transpires that there has been a great mistake in that matter. The Grand Trunk Railway mistook protection for the people for cattle-guards and in reply to the question sent to them stated that they had 2,888 protected crossings, but this included all the cattle-guards on their line. They have only a couple of hundred protected crossings, and instead of 3,115 we have probably not 500 protected crossings in Canada. I hope the minister will amend his Bill because the cattle-guards do not serve the purpose of protecting the public in the way intended by the legislation before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is making inquiry and looking after this land purchase?

Mr. GRAHAM. The deputy has been negotiating himself for the purchase of this land. Some of the land belongs to the Moncton Land Company and some to Humphries. It is mostly vacant land.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. One hundred dollars a lot should be a good price for the land.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so, some will run a little higher and some a little lower.

Original construction, $800.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that?

Mr. GRAHAM. Every year little claims come up for damages on account of original construction that have not been presented or that have been overlooked. We generally have a small appropriation for that.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me this is worse than the United States pensions.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is something on the same line I admit. There are some peculiar claims. Sometimes heirs return or something of that kind occurs. We carried last year $1,000 and paid out $634.84 on that account.

Mr. TURRIFF. Before leaving the branch lines, I would like to discuss for a few moments the general question of the acquisitions of branch lines by the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. How can we do that in Committee of Supply on an individual item? I found the very same difficulty. I did not get off what I wanted to get off the other night, but I do not see how it is possible for me to get it off on individual items. I did not know that the minister was going into Supply this afternoon or before he had gone in I would have discussed with him some points. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) had better take some other opportunity. If we are all going to take up these general questions of policy and discuss them on individual items it will be unsatisfactory, and I do not see how we would get through with the estimates. I would like the minister to let me know the next time he is going into Supply, and then I will be prepared to take up some of these other questions.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have a general one held over—the Trent canal.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am quite prepared either to go on now for fifteen minutes or wait for a further occasion. The other night, when the matter was discussed generally, it was passed around that the minister would adjourn the debate, and I took it for granted that the question would not come up again, or that if it did come up again we would all have an opportunity of placing our views before the House. The particular reason for wishing to place my views before the House is that on that occasion all the members who spoke favoured the taking over of the branch lines, and I thought that if the matter did not come up again the government would likely come to the conclusion that in so far as members on this side of the House were concerned, they were all in favour of the proposition of additional branch lines in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. I was under the impression that possibly we could discuss it on these estimates, but if not we can discuss it on another occasion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would not like to refuse any discussion on this question of branch lines on any particular vote, but I have ascertained that the question the hon. gentleman wishes to refer to is still on the Order Paper, and may come up

again. A long discussion on branch lines and their merits would not be in order at this moment, especially as it is still on the Order Paper, although the question might be referred to.

Mr. TURRIFF. If we had the assurance that we would have an opportunity of discussing it again on the resumption of the adjourned debate that would be quite satisfactory, although, in adjourning the debate, the minister took the opportunity of saying that he would refer to the policy of the government on branch lines when he made his statement in connection with the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. So he did to a certain extent.

Mr. TURRIFF. As long as I have the opportunity of discussing it later on that is all I want.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be better business to take up these matters when the minister next goes into Supply if he will be good enough to inform us when he next proposes to move the House into committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. All right.

Mr. BLACK. I would like to ask the minister why an examination was not made of the Dominion Atlantic Railway at the time the other branches were examined?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Dominion Atlantic is in a somewhat different position from some of the other roads. I did not know that they had neglected to give us a report on that until my attention was drawn to it. It seems that the commissioners had some little difficulty with the Dominion Atlantic as to their transportation and that instead of facilitating them they put everything in the way of getting a report on the Dominion Atlantic. However, we have the sworn returns of the road every year, and have a pretty good idea of its value, its earnings, and that kind of thing. It is in a different position from some of the other lines because the Dominion Atlantic does not want to lease or sell and the other lines practically all do.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But the people living along that road may want it.

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be a question how far you could go in expropriating a railway that did not want to sell or lease.

Mr. BLACK. I do not think that it is correct to say that the Dominion Atlantic people do not want to sell. There are too many shrewd business men in the company in London to say openly that they want to sell it. They prefer to hold off and be in a position to make the best bargain they can. I was talking to the manager of that road and he said in one breath that they would not sell and in the next that anybody who bought the road must buy the steamers also. It has been in the air for the last five or six years that the road is for sale and that other companies have been after it. If the road were in the hands of anybody who would give encouragement to manufacturers and industries located upon it, it would pay more than it does now. The road is being run, not to the advantage of the country, of the farmers or of the manufacturers, but it is being run in order to skim all it can out of the country, being owned by a company which is out of Canada and which has no interest in it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is that the Evangeline route?

Mr. BLACK. That is the Evangeline route. I have received a letter from a manufacturer in one of the towns there complaining that the policy of the road is one of obstruction instead of assistance in the work of developing their trade. They are in continual trouble.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How much does that road pay?

Mr. BLACK. The earnings over operating expenses are $280,586.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How many miles?

Mr. BLACK. Counting the branches and sidings, 298 miles. I think the straight run is about 225 miles from Yarmouth to Halifax.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Who is the manager of the road?

Mr. BLACK. The local manager is Mr. Percy Gifkins. The road is owned in London.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Do you not think it would be a good scheme to sell the Intercolonial Railway to that road or buy that manager?

Mr. BLACK. I think it would be a good thing to buy that manager.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This Dominion Atlantic Railway passes through my county and I think it is only fair to the corporation to say that it is a road owned by private individuals and is not owned by the government and run, as the Intercolonial is, for the purpose of carrying out the scheme of confederation or of promoting trade between the western and eastern parts of the Dominion, one of the objects for which the Intercolonial Railway was originally conceived and constructed. This railway is owned by private individuals. It must be run in such a way as to pay running expenses and something more or go into insolvency. It had its difficulties in its early years and more than once was on

the verge of insolvency, but I think that during the last 15 or 20 years it has paid running expenses and possibly some dividends. I am not prepared to say that the rates are higher than they ought to be, but I do know that the rates are higher than the rates on the Intercolonial Railway. And, I do know that the people in western Nova Scotia have complained—in fact in former years I brought this matter to the attention of the House on several occasions—that they were placed at an unfair disadvantage in the city of Halifax their principal market, as compared with their friends in eastern Nova Scotia through whose counties the Intercolonial Railway runs. I do not intend to carry this discussion further, but I think it is only fair to the Dominion Atlantic Railway and its management to say that they are operating a railroad owned by private individuals and built with private money. I do not think it is fair to charge them with levying too high rates. Their rates are controlled by the scale of rates adopted for all company owned railways, and they are subject to the control of the Railway Commission. If the rates are unduly high it is very easy for any one to make a complaint to the Commission and to have them adjusted. As to the taking over of this road and the policy of acquiring the branch lines which are feeders of the Intercolonial, should that policy ever be adopted I think there would be no very great difficulty in this case, because if I remember correctly in the original charter under which this road was constructed there is a provision by which the government can take it over at a price to be fixed by certain judges who are named in the charter for that purpose.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Do I understand the Minister of Militia to say that the government-owned road treats the public better than this private-owned road ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Well, I am glad to have that on record.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is a fact, and we have a deficit on the Intercolonial Railway as a result.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. You would not think of going back to private ownership later on.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No; it does not go through my county.

Mr. BLACK. I had a letter from the chairman of the cotton company in the town in which I reside, and he gives me the schedule of rates paid by their company on the Dominion Atlantic Railway and on the Intercolonial Railway, and the last clause of his letter states that it will be seen by the schedule that his company is paying six times as much for their cotton goods on the Dominion Atlantic Railway as on the Intercolonial Railway. Furthermore, I think I am right in saying that whatever financial difficulty the Dominion Atlantic road has had in years past was not caused by the running of their railroad, but that the loss was made in purchasing steamers and attempting and succeeding in running a rival steamship off the route between Yarmouth and Boston. There was a local steamship line owned by the Eastern Steamship Company which had been in successful operation, and it came into the minds of the London management of that railway that they wanted to compete on that route, and they bought steamers and cut rates and finally ran the local steamship company off. In the end they bought the local company's steamers and then found they had too many boats on their hands. I think that is about the only loss the Dominion Atlantic has made. I believe that the steamship route does not pay yet, and so it cuts down the large profits which are made on the railway itself. But, that the railroad is a paying concern there is no doubt, and that it could be made still more paying there is also no doubt. It could be made mutually to the advantage of the Intercolonial Railway and to the people along the road, because it runs through one of the richest fruit and farming countries in Canada. A country well suited for manufactures and a country that must prosper. But the industries along that road are hampered by the penny wise and pound foolish management.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Black) that the time to which I allude was long prior to this company owning any steamer.

Mr. BLACK. They only owned a piece of the road then.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As I remember they had some difficulties five or six years after they commenced to operate, and I think the company's road was opened about 39 years ago. The difficulties have not resulted since the steamships have been owned by the railroad. This Evangeline route affords a continuous line from Halifax to Boston and incidentally to St. John and to Montreal via St. John. It is absolutely necessary they should have lines of steamships. It is operating very successfully several steamships from Yarmouth to Boston, one to New York, and one or two across the Bay of Fundy from Digby to St. John. It would be a great deprivation to the public if these steamships were not operated and it is not fair to charge up to the steamship lines any loss that may be made on the operation of the system. It would be very difficult to separate the steamships from the rest of the system. It is a through line partly by

steamship and partly by railway from Halifax to Boston on the one hand, and from Halifax to Montreal via St. John and the Bay of Fundy on the other. I have added these further remarks so that the situation of the line may be fairly understood.

Strengthening bridges, $70,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Last year we had a vote of $190,000 to do this work and we spent $120,000; this $70,000 is a revote.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Is this a renewal of the old bridges?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is practically putting in new bridges. These bridges were all old and we are putting in steel bridges in most of the places.

Mr. J. HAGGART. You are charging the whole cost to capital account?

Mr. GRAHAM. Where a new work is constructed we deduct the value of the old work and charge to capital the difference between the old and the new.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What deduction has been made for the value of the old work ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It would take quite a long while to get that information. Some of the old bridges have been sold and we give credit for them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the minister takes a short cut by valuing the old work at nothing?

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, no.

Mr. J. HAGGART. He does not intend to make any deduction because he is charging the whole vote to capital account.

Mr. FOSTER. This is important as it involves the whole principle as to what it is proper to charge to capital account in the administration of a railroad in reference to which you are keeping current and capital account and have to make your reports to the country. Is the minister adopting the same principle that the great railways in the United States adopt? When they strengthen bridges they have a well defined policy and they are kept closely to it not only by their innate sense of what is proper and right in the interest of the road itself, but because their system of bookeeping and publicity forces them to accuracy and consistency in this matter. When the minister wants to strengthen any of the bridges or to do some similar work on the road, is he following the same lines of division as the great American railways?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it will be found that the policy adopted on the Intercolonial Railway in regard to the distribution of expenditure in the different accounts is the same as that adopted by all railways. When an old wooden bridge, such as those on the Canada Eastern branch, is replaced with an iron bridge that is absolutely new work, and is chargeable to capital.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these all on the Canada Eastern?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not at all, but the two largest items are.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose I put a concrete case. The Pennsylvania Railroad, on a portion of its line, may have a wooden bridge left. Every day the traffic goes over it, it carries the burden and does the work; but the company decides to replace it with a good modern structure, which will cost probably more than the old structure did, but will in the main do the same kind of service, but probably with greater safety. Do they always charge the difference between the value of the old and the cost of the new to capital, or charge it all to revenue ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am inclined to think that they charge it all to capital account.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister know that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am speaking from information given to my deputy. If it were an iron bridge of an ancient date which was being replaced with one of the modern style, they would sell the old bridge for what it would bring, and charge the difference between that and the cost of the new bridge to capital.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that theoretically that is so, but I am told that the practice more and more is to charge all betterments on an old line of railway to revenue; and I am not sure that under the rules of the commission that is not becoming to a certain extent a necessity.

Mr. GRAHAM. Every year hundreds of millions of dollars are expended on capital acount on old lines, for replacing bridges, improving grades and increasing rolling stock.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is perfectly right in saying that these railroads spend millions on capital account, but he has not traced out the details. If he does that, I believe he will find that these betterments are in a great measure not charged to capital but to revenue account. Of course, if they built an extension, or increased the quantity of rolling stock, these expenditures would be charged to capital account; but I am informed that a great deal of the renewal of rolling stock, even though the new is of greater capacity than the old, is not charged to capital, but to revenue, and that is becoming more and more the case.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is just what we do with a lot of our rolling stock. This year we have constructed a lot of rolling stock,

much heavier and larger than that which it replaces, out of revenue. The principle is that where you are putting in new rolling stock equal in carrying power to the old, you charge it to revenue; but where you are getting something new, that is charged to capital. The Pennsylvania Railroad has expended within a comparatively short time, between Philadelphia and New York, $200,000,000, all charged to capital acount; and that is not a new road, but an old road. By the returns I find that the railroad companies are sinners somewhat in this respect. When their revenues are buoyant, they stick to the line pretty closely; but when their revenue falls off, they charge to capital account what they formerly charged to revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not inclined to place implicit confidence in that. I want to show how easy it is to make an impression with nothing underlying it. My hon. friend has stated that the Pennsylvania Railroad spent of late between New York and Philadelphia about $200,000,000. What has that been spent on? On the great New York terminals in the neighbourhood of 42nd street, on tunnels, and on electrifying the system within fifty miles of New York city. That $200,000,000 has almost entirely gone into that kind of improvement. That is not taking a bit of a bridge on the Miramichi and replacing it and then putting that to capital account.

Mr. GRAHAM. I made no reference to terminals or tunnels.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister in his statement paraded the idea that they had bought rolling stock and charged it to capital. That is true of every road. Is it not true also that you have bought a mighty lot of rolling stock and charged it to capital?

Mr. GRAHAM. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. And that you have lame engines and acres of rolling stock standing along your whole road from one end to the other, which you should have repaired and charged to revenue but which are lying idle, and you have kept your road going by a large expenditure on rolling stock charged to capital account. Suppose you put an independent man on that Intercolonial Railway and have him take an inventory of every bit of damaged rolling stock and tote up what that would cost for repairs to be charged to revenue, you will have a different set of accounts from those brought down to us. Of course you have paid for rolling stock out of revenue, but I am inclined to think you have paid illegitimately for rolling stock out of capital rather than face the repairing of the old stock and deduct that from revenue. But with reference to the $200,000,000 expenditure on the Pennsylvania road charged to capital, you will find that the largest part was sunk in legitimate capital expenditure, comprising the almost unrivalled terminal facilities which that road has procured in New York.

Mr. GRAHAM. The amount I have stated would not cover the terminals or tunnels. It has spent an enormous amount getting rid of grade crossings and making viaducts, over-head tracks and levelling the road. It is the same old road and all these things have been charged to capital. Every railway in the world has to spend a certain amount each year and charge it to capital account. As to disabled cars, last year I had the matter looked up and got a percentage made which I gave to the House. According to that, the percentage of disabled rolling stock was slightly less on the Intercolonial Railway than on the Grand Trunk Railway. Every railway has a certain percentage of rolling stock disabled, and ours was a little less than the Grand Trunk Railway a year ago. To-day I state unreservedly that the Intercolonial Railway has not a greater percentage of disabled rolling stock than the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. I shall not discuss again the question of charging to capital, because in my view there should be no capital account whatever on the road. Here is a road which had an excellent bridge at Miramichi, an iron bridge, which lasted 30 years. When it became nearly worn out, we took it down and transferred a portion to the Prince Edward Island Railway. And the new one we substituted is charged to capital account. Let me mention another thing. We took over the Canada Eastern road in New Brunswick at a cost of some $800,000. And we had the assurance from the minister of that day that the road was in perfect order and could be run a number of years without any expenditure on repairs. Yet within three years we have spent on that road the full amount of its cost. And to-day the minister asks us for a large sum to replace two bridges upon that road. These bridges were perfectly good two years ago, when we were buying that road at a large price, but to-day they are useless and must be renewed. Such statements as that tend to throw discredit on all statements made with regard to that road. We paid some $800,000 for that Canada Eastern Railway. And then when we bought it, we had the report of the chief engineer that it was in excellent order and would not require repairs of any consequence for a number of years. Yet in a couple of years we have paid in repairs the entire cost of the road.

Improvements at Sackville, $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to complete a freight shed. The total expenditure at that station has been $84,515 on everything. In

1907 we expended $26,000; in 1907-8, $58,344; and last year $23,134, making a total of $107,649.

Mr. FOSTER. From what date do you count that expenditure?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Intercolonial keeps a record of the money expended on capital account at any station since the beginning of the road.

Mr. WRIGHT. How large a place is Sackville ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I understand it has a population of about 2,000 or 2,500. It is a university town.

Mr. LOGGIE. It is the junction point of the road that runs through to Cape Tormentine.

Mr. FOSTER. The backbone of the country, I fancy, is the farming industry.

To increase accommodation at Halifax, $180,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This has been a very large work, as my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows. It includes the Water street yards and the new shops. There has been expended at Halifax by the Intercolonial on capital account, since the road first ran to Halifax, $4,155,000. This amount includes the new terminals. Last year we had a large amount voted—$500,000. The present vote of $180,000 is to be spent in this way:

Tracks, ballast, ties, west side Water street..	$20,000
Heating and piping building (Kempt yard)	5,000
Boilers for power plant..	15,000
Double tracking cotton factory branch, grading and subway, and grading new yard..	40,000
Land and legal expenses, right of way cotton factory branch..	7,000
Tracks, ballast, ties..	15,000
Engine house..	50,000
Rails and fastenings and ties for engine house..	6,000
Tracks, Richmond yard..	2,000
Water supply..	5,000
Land at Richmond..	10,000
Electric lighting..	5,000

Mr. FOSTER. How many men are expected to be employed in the machine shop there?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not many. This is only for ordinary road repairs to engines that come in.

Mr. FOSTER. On engines used all the way from Sydney to Halifax?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, we also do repairs for the Dominion Atlantic and the Halifax and South Western. Our larger shops are of course, at Moncton.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this mean a duplication of your shops at Moncton?

Mr. GRAHAM. It means the same shops on a very small scale. Such shops are at the end of every division of a railway to carry on what are known as light repairs. For heavier repairs, such as remodelling or remaking the locomotives are taken to the central shops at Moncton.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you a similar shop at Sydney?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, our shops are at Rivière du Loup, Halifax and Moncton.

Mr. FOSTER. None at St. John?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have a roundhouse at St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. Were these works done under contract after tenders publicly called for?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, every one of them. I have here a list of the prices.

Mr. FOSTER There is nothing done there by day's labour?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, this is all by tender and contract.

Diversion of line, Sydney Mines to River George, $50,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Last year, we had an item in the estimates for this, and some work was done, but not a great deal. I think I announced to the House that we would go on with the work this year, but, owing to the conditions we have found we have decided that we will merely do as we are doing at Moncton—get the right of way as far as we can and not proceed with a great deal of the work this year.

Mr. FOSTER. You had the surveys last time?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the surveys are made.

Mr. MADDIN. Were the surveys completed from River George by Little Bras d'Or to Sydney Mines last fall?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. MADDIN. What was the cost, $3,500?

Mr. GRAHAM. About $3,600, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. When were the surveys carried on?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think they were begun immediately after the House rose last year.

Mr. MADDIN. And carried on until when?

Mr. GRAHAM. Until the work of survey was completed, I think.

Mr. MADDIN. When was that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not remember the date when the survey was completed. They did not stop work until it was completed, and started it as soon as I could get an engineer after the session closed, and he continued the work until it was completed.

Mr. MADDIN. What is the estimated cost of the line to Sydney and River George?

Mr. GRAHAM. $394,135. It is 8¾ miles.

Mr. MADDIN. When is it proposed to go on with the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. I had hoped and fully intended to go on this year, but owing to the conditions that have arisen it has been deferred.

Mr. MADDIN. What are the conditions that will interfere with the carrying out of the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. The financial conditions.

Mr. MADDIN. Are the financial conditions any worse now than when the House rose last fall?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not like to make a statement as a member of the government on that point. Every one who has discussed pro and con the financial position of the world will, I think, approve of the conclusion come to by the government that for this year it would be advisable not to proceed with these larger works or to undertake any new ones. This would involve a large expenditure of money.

Mr. FOSTER. Not more than the Moncton cut off.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Moncton cut off calls for only $50,000 this year. We are treating them both in the same way. At Moncton we are asking for $50,000 only instead of $374,000, and in this case we are taking a vote to go on, as far as we can, with the right of way. I can asure my hon. friend there is no other consideration in view in connection with this.

Mr. MADDIN. Was not the necessity of this work impressed on the government to overcome some heavy grades there?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. MADDIN. Is there not a great deal of heavy freight to be handled from that end of the island?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, a great deal of freight.

Mr. MADDIN. Is it not important that these grades should be overcome as soon as possible? Are they not more important than the cut off at Moncton?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are treating this in the same way. They both cut off grades, and my hon. friend is mistaken if he thinks I am treating them differently.

Mr. MADDIN. I thought one more important than the other.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, the one is not being held back on account of the other, and I am as much disappointed as my hon. friend that this is not going on this year.

Mr. MADDIN. Can the minister give any assurance that this will be done next year?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not like to say absolutely. I am not a good promiser, I like to do as I say. I assure my hon. friend that this is one of the first works that will be done as soon as the conditions will warrant such expenditures.

Mr FOSTER. There is not much activity there now, but there was a lot last October. I happened to be down there and went out one beautiful afternoon to enjoy a drive, and we had to keep a look-out at the masthead for fear of running over these numerous stakes. We called at one store where there was one set of stakes in front and another at the back door; the proprietor was staked before and behind. We were in dire peril of destroying government works and being taken up therefor.

Mr. GRAHAM. You escaped pretty well.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This is not at all a new question and it is entirely wrong to suppose it was gotten up for election purposes last fall, although it happened to be prominently before the people, I suppose, at that time. Twenty-two years ago, when the road was located in Cape Breton the island was not as important as it is to-day, the traffic was not so large and the prospects not so bright as they are now. The road was laid out 22 years ago and the best grade and the best route were not selected. The Liberals of the county of Cape Breton and their leaders always contended that the route was wrong, particularly between George's river and Sydney. A short cut was taken between Leitches creek and George's river, over a mountain where there are high grades on both sides. It was always contended by those in opposition in 1887 that the road should have followed the shore as is proposed now, and come down to the town of Sydney Mines, which is an important town of 7,000 or 8,000, putting that town upon the main line, then continuing the line to North Sydney, where the hon. member was tumbling over the stakes, putting it also on the main line and then running on to Sydney. That would have been the proper

course and would have given the level line that you must now, at great expense, obtain in order to handle the traffic. Delegation after delegtion came to Ottawa during Conservative and Liberal rule to have this matter rectified. At last the present Minister of Railways and Canals was persuaded that the change was necessary and that in order to handle the traffic we must have a better route than we have had. It is now found necessary to make that diversion from George's river around by Sydney Mines and thence to North Sydney and to Sydney on the best available route. I think the item is not well worded, diversion of lines Sydney Mines and River George. I understand this to mean a diversion of the line from George's river to Sydney Mines thence using the present line to North Sydney and continuing to Leitches creek to make the proper connection with the Intercolonial which is the intention and is a longer distance than was mentioned by the minister in answering the member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin?. The distance from George's river to Sydney Mines would be 8½ miles, and there is the further distance from North Sydney to Leitches creek which would be two or three or four miles more. I must express my own particular desire that this work should be proceeded with as rapidly as possible. It will be of great advantage to the two towns and to the road itself. I think the deputy minister and the minister know that the train load that can be hauled over this heavy grade from Leitches creek across this high hill to George's river now is not more than one half the train load that could be carried all the way from Sydney to Point Tupper if this diversion was completed. I trust therefore that every effort will be put forth at as early a date as possible to have this road completed and this advantage given to the people of North Sydney and Sydney Mines, as well as to the management of the road. Talking of freight, the smaller of the two great companies down there paid to this road last year the handsome sum of $250,000 in cash for freights. Therefore it will be understood that to give proper accommodation to such a customer as the Nova Scotia Steel Company is itself important if there were no other important customer at that particular place. What applies to it I would say, although I have not the figures, would apply with equal force to the Dominion Steel and the Dominion Coal Companies. There are customers of the road that will all be accommodated by the completion of this diversion of the line. I am disappointed that the work is not being proceeded with this year. Of course, I must accept the explanation of the minister that he is not in a position to go on with it now. I hope that my impression and belief are true that the matter will be taken up and that steps will be taken this year to obtain the right of way and to fix the line where it should be and where it is going to be and that as soon as possible the road will be constructed along the line that will be agreed upon.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. They will keep it for the next election.

Mr. McKENZIE. My hon. friend says something about the next election. It is a long time away and the hon. whip, who is getting to be an old man, should be thinking more about the world beyond than about the next election. I am sorry that such frivolous things should bother him so much and that he should forget better things.

Mr. FOSTER. You must be qualifying for a divinity student.

Mr. McKENZIE. There is so little divinity on the opposition benches that I think it would be well for them to borrow some from this side.

Mr. FOSTER. You look a good deal like a bishop.

Mr. McKENZIE. There are a great many things that I would like to point out in reference to this matter, but I think the minister understands the necessity of carrying out this work, having taken the very important step that he did take, and I hope it will be followed up to completion as speedily as possible.

Mr. MADDIN. My hon. friend from Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) has pointed out that this question of diverting the line has been agitated by members of his party in that part of the country for the past twenty years and that it is a mistake to imagine that it was to meet any political exigency that an item was put in the estimates last year to provide for this work. I would like to point out that it was very significant that, although members of the hon. gentleman's party had been sending delegations and praying this government to divert the line, as it is proposed to divert it at the present time, during the years of boasted progress, prosperity and overflowing treasury that this country is alleged to have enjoyed, the government did not undertake to make this diversion until on the eve of the election last fall when their resources were very much inferior to what they are to-day. I think the fact that the government now say that they are unable to carry on this undertaking would indicate that there is something to found the suspicion upon that the sum of $25,000 which was put in the estimates last year for this proposed line was to meet some political exigency. The fact that the hon. member is satisfied

with the explanation and that he believes that the work will be completed is not a very satisfactory guarantee looking towards the future. I may say to the committee that the surveyed lines of railway have intersected that county to such an extent that a plan of the county looks like a cobweb. One particular line of railway has served, within my recollection, no less than seven elections. I do not know how many this one is calculated to serve. I think it was not asking the minister too much to say that he would undertake to have this much-needed railway constructed during the next fiscal year. With regard to the friends of the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria having always held that this road was built on the wrong line, that was certainly a matter of opinion and the election was run in that county on the question of two certain routes. The railway was built, as the result of the election issue, by way of the route that it follows at the present time. The route which is in operation now was quite competent to carry the freight at that time. The town of Sydney Mines, as the hon. gentleman points out, has a population of perhaps 7,000 or 8,000. It has grown from a small mining village with a population of only 2,000 or 2,400. The works of the Dominion Coal Company were not then in existence, although some of the older pits were in operation under previous owners. The road, when built, was built to suit conditions as they existed, but it is a well known fact that in the last nine years conditions have arisen there that have called for an alteration of its route and, when the hon .gentleman says that his party have always urged upon the government the alteration of the route, it has to be borne in mind that the opinion in regard to the alteration of the route is shared by all parties in that country regardless of political affiliations.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am sorry that the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) thinks it necessary to import severe party politics into this question. If he wants to go into the history of the building of that road in Cape Breton county and if he wants to know something about whether it was ever known politically or not, I would say to him that if he had lived in Cape Breton county at the time this road was surveyed he would know that men were up to their waists in snow banks cutting the trees out of the right of way on the verge of the election of 1887. He would know that a few of our strong Liberals in Cape Breton county had been switched over from Liberalism to Toryism by giving them large contracts for clearing away the woods in the midst of the election of 1887. No influences of this kind have been used in our day and nothing was said about the building of this road last summer to influence any individual or any set of individuals. The hon. gentleman is too young a man to know much about the political history of the county of Cape Breton, but if he knows anything about conflicting routes in that county he ought to know better than to suppose that there was any conflict between the George's river and Sydney Mines route, and that across the hill from George's river to Leitches creek. The two routes were the southern route via St. Peter's and the central route.

Mr. MADDIN. I did not say that the route proposed to be diverted and the present route were in dispute at that time.

Mr. McKENZIE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the election of 1887 settled the difficulty.

Mr. MADDIN. Not as between these two proposed routes—certainly not.

Mr. McKENZIE. My hon. friend gave me a wrong impression then when he said that the election of 1887 settled the question as between the route from Georges river to Leitches creek and the proposed one.

Mr. MADDIN. It did not.

Mr. McKENZIE. They were canvassing this change for election purposes. My hon. friend is quite aware that in 1895—I think it was—when the right hon. Sir Charles Tupper was running an election in our county, he made it a part of his platform and he laid it down as the policy of his government to build this road from Georges river to Sydney Mines. It has been continuously agitated ever since that time in the county. It so happens that the hon. gentleman who is now occupying the position of Minister of Railways and Canals was the first Liberal Minister of Railways who had the courage and enterprise to declare the expediency of this work being undertaken and completed. But the hon. gentleman for Cape Breton must not say the Liberal party did not do anything towards accomplishing this purpose. The hon. member well knows, if he wishes to give the present government the credit for it, that this government extended the line from North Sydney to Sydney Mines; that it has given Sydney Mines the benefit of railway connection, that it has given North Sydney the benefit of that continuous connection. I can tell the hon. member (Mr. Maddin) that his predecessors in the representation of the county of Cape Breton sat quietly in this House and supported the Conservative government in a proposal to build a road in the county of Cape Breton that clean shut off the two important towns of Sydney Mines and North Sydney. My hon. friend (Mr. Maddin) speaks of Sydney Mines in these days as an insignificant

little village by the wayside. Well, it was just as important as the town of Sydney. The town of Sydney Mines and North Sydney were much upon a par. North Sydney was larger at that time than Sydney, and without saying anything disparaging to the town of Sydney which was the capital, Sydney Mines was just as important as either of the other two. North Sydney and the town of Sydney were incorporated about the same time, and the fact that Sydney Mines was not incorporated did not make it any smaller or any less important. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maddin) wishes to discuss the history of both political parties in respect to railways in the county of Cape Breton, what he has to confront is that the members who then supported the Tory government in this House were perfectly satisfied to get this road any way at all before the Dominion elections of 1887, when they were trembling in the balance, and if it were not for this road and the impetus given their canvass they never would have been returned. They cared not where the road went once it passed the Grand Narrows. Once it came to the door of the man who was then supporting the government, once it brought grist to his mill they cared not how it got to Sydney. And the hon. member who sat with this gentleman at that time agreed that it did not make very much difference whether North Sydney or Sydney Mines were left out in the cold or not. They had no railway accommodation; we got a section of the road built into North Sydney for which we undertook to pay for all the right of way ourselves. That is the history of his friends in regard to getting railway accommodation to North Sydney and Sydney Mines. But as soon as the Liberal government came in we got better treatment. Up to the time the Liberal government came to power the railway was left out in the woods with no communication with the shore or with tidal waters at all. The Liberal government extended it to the shore, gave us a first-class wharf, gave us communication with Newfoundland, and we have now a steamer running between North Sydney and Newfoundland which is a great feeder to this railroad and which is of course a benefit to the people of Newfoundland and to the people of North Sydney and the country generally. This government gave us further an extension of the railway to Sydney Mines which of course is very beneficial to that town. The road from North Sydney to Sydney Mines was built with a view of its extension to George's River and ultimately with a view to the completion of that road in the place where it was intended from the first and where it should have been. Now, Sir, that piece that is built between North Sydney and Sydney Mines will not be lost because it is part of the main line and will link on to it.

My hon. friend (Mr. Maddin) has said that the Liberal government has done nothing during the last twelve years to establish this line of railway. Well, we have done that much, that we have built into North Sydney and Sydney Mines, and that part is completed and the right of way and everything belonging to it is the property of the government. The Liberal government and the supporters of the Liberal government have nothing to be afraid of in comparing their history with the history of the Conservatives, and of my hon. friend's predecessors with regard to this matter. I had no desire to introduce any politics into the question; I had no desire to treat it in any other way but as a question affecting the whole of the people and which is of great importance to them, but if my hon. friend wishes to launch into political criticism, or if he wants to make any political capital out of it, then, if the hon. gentleman chooses upon the floor of this House to cross swords with me as to the political history of the two parties in this matter he shall always find me ready to meet him.

Mr. MADDIN. I do not know that it is very good taste on the part of the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) to throw down the gauntlet and then take it up in Committee of Supply. I do not think it is a thing upon which he can compliment himself very much when he says that I have not lived long enough in the county of Cape Breton to be as familiar with its railroad history as he is. I can tell the hon. gentleman I have lived long enough in that county to be as familiar with the best railway routes as he is, and I am prepared to enter into a competitive examination at any time before the Minister of Justice in order to satisfy him that I am just as familiar with the railway history of the county of Cape Breton as he is. The hon. gentleman refers to the great things that have been done by the Liberal party for railway development in the county of Cape Breton, and in enumerating all these great things he points to the extension of the railway from Sydney to Sydney Mines. Why Sir, do you know that in the county of Cape Breton every mile of railway in that county owes its existence to the Conservative government with the exception of this two and a half miles from North Sydney to Sydney Mines? If the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) wants to boast about the records of the Liberal government in connection with that insignificant piece of railway it will redound very little to his credit or to the credit of the Liberal party. And further, when the House learns that it took five years from the time it was undertaken until its completion, and that it cost the people of this country no less than $58,000 per mile, running as it does parallel with the Nova Scotia Coal and Steel Company's road and partly on the same roadbed, the House will see

that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) has not much room for boasting. When the hon. gentleman talks about the great benefits the people of Cape Breton county have derived from this government in the matter of railway facilities, I wish to say that they have had to be content with what was handed to them on the eve of the last election. There has never been even an election for municipal councillors that the Liberal party in that county have not proposed some railway scheme or another. It was not an unusual thing in connection with the last election to find a man and a boy bailing water out of a post hole four or five feet deep at high water mark and having to go back into the Bras d'Or lake.

Mr. FOSTER. And charging it up to capital?

Mr. GRAHAM. That looks like watering stock.

Mr. MADDIN. Surely that would compare with the condition of affairs in 1887 when men stood to their waists in snow chopping down trees, as depicted by the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie). However, I submit that two wrongs do not make a right, and if the hon. member wants to point out that in 1887 the Conservative party engaged men in midwinter to make a survey of a line; if that was wrong it should not be a justification in the year 1908 for the Liberal government putting in the estimates a sum of money which they did not intend to spend and did not spend, and having a survey made and stakes put down at every other man's front door or back door for a proposed line of railway, all of which took place between the time intervening after the prorogation of parliament in July and the elections on the 26th of October, and all of which is too significant to require any comment. The hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) may be quite content with the hope that now that the survey is made this railway will be completed, but the industries of the county are not content that it should rest in that manner. This extension is so absolutely essential to move the heavy trains from the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, from the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, and from the Dominion Coal Company, that it is important the work should be undertaken at once. I have no doubt that the hon. member will be quite content that a sum be put in the estimates and that the scheme will be delayed from time to time, so as to help Mr. Murray in the local elections in the course of a couple of years, and may be to help the hon. gentleman himself when he comes before his constituents at the next general election. But that method of carrying on public works does not meet with the approval of the people of the country. It is not calculated to serve the industrial centres in that part of the country, and I would urge upon the minister the desirability of having this grade changed at as early a date as possible.

Diversion of line at Chatham and branch to wharf, $36,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is this?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is an item which we had in the estimates last year. I expected this year to proceed actively with the work, but the conditions were not favourable. I am asking for a revote for the purpose of getting the right of way as far as possible. That is what I had in mind in asking Mr. Henry Reid to go down and negotiate for the land; but he would not accept the position, and we shall have to get some one else.

Locomotive and car shops with equipment and new freight yard at Moncton, $400,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. The total cost of these, with the line, is estimated at about $2,000,000. The total amount expended has been $1,351,446.76. In addition to this vote, we are asking for another amount, which will make for machinery about $500,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How are they off for machinery there now?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think about $100,000 will finish the machinery.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does the minister buy that?

Mr. GRAHAM. We buy it in practically all cases by tender, and nearly all from Canadian manufacturers.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has charge of machinery.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. J. R. Joughins is our superintendent of motive power.

Mr. FOSTER. Is a certain amount of it bought in the United States?

Mr. GRAHAM. Necessarily and occasionally, some machinery which we cannot get in Canada. But we make it a point to buy everything practicable in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister give bona fide public notice in these matters?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. We send specifications to every manufacturer of these goods in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Open competition and tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. Absolutely.

Mr. FOSTER. Is all this paid for out of capital?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose you have a station house at Sussex which is sufficient

for the business and some night it burns down and you build a new station house in the place of it, do you charge the new station to capital?

Mr. GRAHAM. It would depend on circumstances. It would depend somewhat on the question of the new style of station we put up. The Canadian Pacific Railway built their Angus shops at Montreal and equipped them out of capital. Conditions vary so much that the railway companies do not stick to one absolute line. These shops at Moncton are absolutely new. The old shops are still there, except the portion that was burned. We had an offer to lease them, but it was so small that I would not accept it.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that the answer the minister would have given is that the new station at Sussex would be charged to revenue?

Mr. GRAHAM. Several of the smaller stations have been replaced out of capital.

Mr. FOSTER. When you replace the old shops with new ones, which are a great deal better than the old, would it not be fair to charge some portion of the cost to revenue?

Mr. GRAHAM. The old shops were repaired out of revenue. We spent on them about $56,000 out of revenue. Even if a fire had not occurred, these buildings would have had to be reconstructed. During the last year or two we have been working there under great disadvantages. We hope to cheapen the cost of our productions by having the new shops.

To increase water supply, $74,700.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are endeavouring to improve our water supply at many points along the line, in some cases making a new supply. I have a long list of the places.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a special contractor who gets the most of these?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. Take the water supply at Little Metis, tenders were asked by posters and four were received and the contract given to the lowest, Mr. McManus. At St. Charles Junction, also four tenders were received, and Mr. McManus was again the lowest.

To increase accommodation and facilities along the line, $133,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for a large number of expenditures. Altogether we have expended at different times, since the Intercolonial Railway was constructed, along the line, $539,809. These expenses comprise new Windsor Freight Office, $82,000; Upper Dorchester Sidings, Marieville Freight Sheds and additional sidings, additional sidings at Boiestown, electric semaphore at Petit Rocher, station and platform at Little Metis, and other items of like character.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there no station at Little Metis before ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The old building was worth but $1,200 or $1,300 and was practically no station at all, and the tourist traffic demands a decent station. Then there is $7,000 at Princess Pier for additional siding accommodation and track scale; $6,000 for a crossing siding at St. Pacôme, and 35 miles of track fencing, not previously fenced, $23,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Any buckets or tin pails?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, none in this list.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to call attention to a specific case in North Cape Breton, that at Christmas Island. That is a very important country centre at which some very important people live, and it has no station at all. We had a small building there, but it was burnt down a year or a year and a half ago, and I would not care to describe the condition to-day. I hope that out of this general vote provision will be made for a station house, properly equipped and commensurate with the amount of business transacted. It is one of the most important country districts in North Cape Breton. We do not look for anything very expensive, but ought to have a presentable wooden structure which will meet the requirement.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will consider that matter very fully.

Improvements at Ste. Rosalie, $55,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is entirely a revote. It is a junction of the Grand Trunk Railway east of Montreal. We are putting up a round house and making an accumulating yard where we have to gather our freight and our trains.

Mr. FOSTER. How far from Montreal?

Mr. GRAHAM. Thirty-six miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that on the leased line?

Mr. GRAHAM. At the junction of the leased line and our own.

Mr. FOSTER. The lease provides that we are to participate in their terminals and improvements, I understand ?

Mr. GRAHAM. At Montreal, but they have none at Ste. Rosalie.

Mr. FOSTER. Could not this assembling be done at Montreal?

Mr. GRAHAM. On the Grand Trunk branch from Ste. Rosalie into Montreal we carry big trains. One engine from Ste. Rosalie hauls nearly equal to two trains. We have all these cars to re-arrange. We interchange with the Canadian Pacific Railway as well. Therefore, we must have large yards to handle the cars. The Grand Trunk are not under obligation to give us terminal accommodation there.

Mr. FOSTER. Do they give us in Montreal all that we expected to get?

Mr. GRAHAM. We use their terminals in Montreal. They think we utilize them too much, but we think we do only what we have a right to.

Improvements at Drummondville, $5,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to provide additional yard accommodation. The whole amount is a revote; we did not get that extended last year. I am surprised that, in the face of an election, we were so moderate.

Mr. FOSTER. It was hung up there all the time.

Engine-house, machine shops, &c., at Rivière du Loup, $158,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for the machine shop at Rivière du Loup that I spoke of a little while ago. It is something along the line of the Halifax shops, designed to carry on light repairs.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these shops at all equal to those at Halifax?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not so large as at Halifax. This is more for locomotives; the car repairs are made more in the Halifax shops.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been expended there?

Mr. GRAHAM. Altogether, since there was a railway, $329,580.81.

Mr. FOSTER. How many men have you there?

Mr. GRAHAM. About 150 employed there now.

Mr. FOSTER. How many at Halifax, when you were in full swing, but with no election on?

Mr. GRAHAM. I don't think it would vary much—about the same number as at Rivière du Loup.

At six o'clock Mr. Speaker took the Chair.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be taken up after eight o'clock?

Mr. FIELDING. Of course, there will be Private Bills for the first hour, and then my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) will continue, to be followed, should he finish, by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley).

Mr. FOSTER. We shall not be able to go on with the item with reference to the Intercolonial, collection of revenue. We shall have to have our discussion on that. Could we take some part of it, or is it in one lump sum.

Mr. GRAHAM. In a lump sum.

Mr. FOSTER. We want a discussion on going into supply on that. We could finish the capital votes to-night, I suppose. Before Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair, I desire to say just a word with regard to the proposed work of Tuesday. Certain information was asked for by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), and the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) has said that it would be supplied. But the Finance Minister will see that we ought to have it printed, and in time so that we may have an opportunity to study it. Does the hon. minister think he can have that information printed for us in good time for Tuesday?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (minister of Finance). I should hope to give the information on Tuesday. The bulk of it does not require much time to digest. The essential elements are simple.

Mr. FOSTER. We can talk it over on Monday. But the minister had better keep it in mind. This is a very important question, and we should be placed in a position to discuss it intelligently.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. As soon as mention was made of the matter, I put it in hand and an officer was sent to Montreal to expedite, as much as possible, getting the information concerning the company's affairs.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

MR. THOS. L. SMITH.

Mr. BICKERDIKE moved the third reading of Bill (No. 71) respecting a patent of Thos. L. Smith.

Mr. PERLEY. The gentleman who objected to the passage of this Bill the other evening simply wished to know whether the Minister of Agriculture had had it under his notice and was satisfied to have it go through.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sorry the minister is not here. If no objection has been taken

to the Bill the assumption would be that it has received his approval, but I have not spoken with him concerning it.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 66) respecting the Abitibi and Hudson Bay Railway Company—Mr. Geo. Gordon.

Bill (No. 67) respecting the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Athabaska Railway Company—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Bill (No. 70) respecting the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company—Mr. Nesbitt.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Improvements at Campbellton, $64,500.

Mr. PERLEY. Will the minister please explain this?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for continuing the improvements that we have been carrying on at Campbellton. This is for the extension of the water supply, additional accommodation for baggage and express, oil house, six stall section of new engine house, turn table, enlarging station, ice house, &c. There was an expenditure last year of $8,887.78. Tenders were asked for by posters.

Mr. PERLEY. As the vote is very much larger this year than last, are some of these new works that you are undertaking?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a continuation of works that were undertaken last year. They are not new.

Improvements at Point Tupper, $4,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for a brick building, for transfer bridge, engine house, to raise reservoir and a few other minor things.

To provide a subway crossing at Eastville, berts, about two miles north of Londonderry station, $5,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to remove a level crossing.

To provide a subway crossing at Eastville, about one mile south of Londonderry station, $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a dangerous crossing in a very deep cut. There have been some accidents and we have decided to remove the crossing.

Mr. FIELDING.

Rolling stock, $170,550.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to provide a commissary car, to equip 500 platform cars with racks for carrying pulpwood, to increase the size of steam heating pipes in passenger cars, to equip cars with new gas light apparatus and several other contingencies.

New machinery for locomotive and car shops, $95,800.

Mr. GRAHAM. This was explained pretty well before we adjourned for dinner in connection with the several works at the Moncton shops.

Prince Edward Island Railway—branch line, Harmony to Elmira, $50,000.

Mr. FRASER. I wish to ask the minister if it is the intention of the government to build that railway the present year. I had some questions on the Order Paper some time ago, and I regret to say that the answers were not quite clear. One question was this:

Is it the intention of the government to begin the construction of the road during the present year?

The answer is as follows:

It is the intention to begin the work.

Does that mean that the government is going to start the construction of the road this present year?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have asked for tenders and to assure my hon. friend that we mean to go right on with it we have asked the people submitting the lowest tender whether, if we accept their tender, they will agree to proceed as far as this appropriation will allow them this year, on the understanding that we will provide for some more expenditure during the following year. We are awaiting their reply. We expect to let the contract shortly. We intend to proceed with the work just as soon as the conditions will allow us to.

Mr. FRASER. The contract has not been let then?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is just in the condition I have described. We have the tenders and the lowest tender will be accepted if they will agree, as I have suggested, to be content with this expenditure this year, in the hope that we may be able to proceed more rapidly with the work next year. I am asking them to accept the contract on that understanding.

Mr. FRASER. The minister is well aware that this is only a very short piece of road and it seems like making two bites of a cherry to extend the construction over two years. The road is only ten miles in length.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is estimated to cost $380,000.

Mr. FRASER. The lowest tender is not quite as high as that, I understand.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not the lowest tender with me. I would not care to make it public until it is accepted.

Mr. FRASER. Is it the intention to build the road on the line surveyed? This road has been used as a political football.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not think that.

Mr. FRASER. It is very hard to be responsible for what the minister may think on these matters. I would not like to hold myself responsible for his thoughts.

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be a dangerous experiment.

Mr. FRASER. The first survey that I remember was started in 1904, just as the elections were going on, and it ran from Souris in a different direction from the route according to the last survey. The survey in 1904 was run in the direction of Souris, and although that survey cost three or four thousand dollars, when the elections were over no effort was made to build the line and the whole thing was hung up until the general elections were approaching last year. Then, they ran a survey out to Harmony six miles within the previous survey, and just before the elections tenders were called to be opened on the 31st of October, five days after the elections. Why, the woods were full of people running surveys.

Mr. GRAHAM. It did not seem to do any good in your county.

Mr. FRASER. Well, you can fool all the people some of the time and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time, and as you could not fool them they elected me. The people were tired and sick of this surveying business. In my county during the last two elections there were surveys made for five or six branch lines of railways and no wonder there is a deficit on the Prince Edward Railway when you are wasting thousands of dollars in fruitless surveys like this. In one of the leading Liberal papers in my constituency published on the 16th of March I find this statement:

> The contract for building the Elmira branch will shortly be let and the work is expected to start on the 1st of June.

I ask the Minister of Railways is there any foundation for that report?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not responsible for what every newspaper publishes, but I have stated clearly and distinctly what is to be done, and I cannot make it clearer if I should repeat my statement.

Mr. FRASER. Then, if the tenderers are not satisfied to take the contract with the conditions stated the contract will not be let. Is that your answer?

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman will not get me to make any statement along the lines he suggests. We are going to spend the amount of this appropriation on that branch this year, but not any more, owing to conditions which I have explained to the House, and which I think the financial world will say are justified under the circumstances. We intend to build this road from Elmira to Harmony and the fact that my hon. friend was elected will not change our intention one iota. We expect to build a good road there with all possible speed, but owing to present conditions we will not spend more than $50,000 on the work this year.

Mr. FRASER. I am pleased to hear the minister say that the road will be built.

Mr. GRAHAM. Don't stop the estimates then, and let us get a start.

Mr. FRASER. The minister says the estimate for this 10 miles is $300,000?

Mr. GRAHAM. $380,000.

Mr. FRASER. My memory is that it was stated it would cost about $200,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. $380,000 is the estimate, and I think the hon. gentleman will find it will cost that before we are done with it. I do not think a railway can be built for less than $38,000 a mile through that country.

Mr. FRASER. Is it the intention of the government to delay this until there is another election coming on.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is not serious in asking that. By the way, there possibly may be a by-election; has my hon. friend any fears about that?

Mr. FRASER. No one on either side of the House can say when these by-elections may come. We have heard complaints in this House about deficits on the Prince Edward Island Railway, but the minister knows very well that part of the waste takes place during election years, and that the deficit in an election year is always larger than in any other year.

Mr. GRAHAM. This year is an exception. I am happy to say the Prince Edward Island has done better this year.

Mr. FRASER. That may be, but the history of that railway is that for a month or two before the elections there are spare hands and extra hands employed along the railroad until they are almost as thick as potato bugs. I have a map here which

shows that there were five or six branch lines from Montague under survey last summer previous to the election, but not one mile of railroad has been built and there is not one dollar in the estimates to build it. Is it right to use the people's money in this way, sending a number of people out picknicking and chasing rabbits and partridges through the woods in the fall of the year, when you are pretending to make surveys.

Mr. McKENZIE. What about the tunnel?

Mr. FRASER. We will come to the tunnel later on and I hope you will not oppose it. I can tell the minister that if the government is going to build the road from Elmira to Harmony according to the last survey it is going to inconvenience the people from Elmira a great deal because they will have to travel by rail about five or six miles further than if the government had built the railway according to the survey of 1904 which came in on the old line and went through the village of Souris. That is the proper route on which to build the railway if ever it is built. Last year however, they changed the survey and took it out to the old line and you have to travel out to the old line about six miles before you come to the branch, and the people from Souris and east of Souris who will use this railway will have to pay extra freight and passenger rates on this additional six miles which they would not have to pay if the line was built as at first surveyed through the village of Souris and out east. This is one of the things that leads the people to believe that the government is not serious about building that road. Can the minister tell us why he changed the route, and instead of starting the railway from Souris, he started it from Harmony?

Mr. GRAHAM. This matter was left to the engineer to give us the most direct route, and I understand that he did. My hon. friend may be speaking for a particular section, but I understand from himself that this road runs through a section of country which it would not run through if it took the route he suggests, through a section which has already railway facilities.

Mr. FRASER. I do not think the minister understands the matter clearly. The old route runs almost east and west, but at Harmony it turns and runs almost directly south for a distance of five miles to the village of Souris. Then it runs in a northeasterly direction to Elmira. This route was surveyed in 1904, and it is the proper location. This time, instead of turning into the village of Souris the route stops at Harmony, and runs in an easterly direction to Elmira. The railway will not begin at Souris, but at a side station called Harmony. The people of all parts know that the proper location is the one surveyed in 1904, to give accommodation to the people of Souris and the public generally. I would ask the minister why he changed the location since?

Mr. GRAHAM. The minister made no change at all. He asked the engineer to survey the most direct route, and he did so. My hon. friend is speaking for Souris, of course, but Souris has already railway accommodation, and to run that line to Souris would be to give it a second line. This line is not continued to Souris, but when it reaches Harmony it goes straight on. I do not blame my hon. friend for urging the claims of Souris; that is natural; but we want to accommodate the most people, and from the railway standpoint, we regard the present route as the best.

Mr. FRASER Why was the survey made in 1904?

M. GRAHAM. I cannot speak as to that. I am speaking of what was done last year. I may say that the chief engineer is going to visit the ground before the road is constructed, and will report upon it himself.

Mr. WARBURTON. I know a good deal of this section of country, having spent a good many summers there, and I think the route chosen will be found to be the most direct. Personally I would like the road to go to Souris, but that would probably lengthen it. By bringing it to Harmony, and continuing it from there to Elmira, as is proposed, you get a direct and straight road; whereas if you turned to the south at Harmony to carry it to Souris, you would of course reach the harbour, but you would then run northward again and skip a certain portion of country in the centre. The northern shore, near the east point of Elmira, is a very fine part of the country. If you deflected the line to the south, you would neglect the northern and central portions of Kings county. The centre of Kings county is a very fine section, but it has not been very much developed. The woods are excellent and the soil exceedingly good. If it were made fairly accessible, it would be one of the most fertile sections of Prince Edward Island, which is saying a great deal. The line as proposed will be a very direct line to Elmira or East Point. The hon. member for Kings (Mr. Fraser) in criticising the surveys made last year on Prince Edward Island, spoke of some seven lines having been surveyed. I may say that that is a rather unfortunate number for Conservative members to refer to; because I remember that in 1896 the then leader of the Conservative government came to Prince Edward Island, and he used this mystical number of seven in promising branch railways to the people; but it happened that they did not place much confidence in his promises. Among the lines he promised

was this Elmira branch. Every time there was to be an election it was brought up. It was like the robins coming in spring; whenever you heard of the Elmira branch, you knew that an election was coming on. It became a proverb in Prince Edward Island. The same thing happened in Kings county with regard to the Murray Harbour branch, which used to be surveyed whenever an election was coming on; but as soon as the election was over the surveyors were called off. It became such a humbug that in 1896, the last time the Conservative government's surveyors came, the farmers pulled up their stakes and drove them off their places . I am glad to say that that road has been since built by the present government. Last year surveys were made where several short spurs were required. Our Conservative friends thought, or said they thought, that every one of these tidal surveys meant a railway which the present government was offering to the people in order to get their votes. One of these surveys was made in my own county, and I hope to see a railway built there before long. It is needed. I have been inquiring, and find that the surveys were completed. The plans and reports are not yet in, but I hope they soon will be. These surveys were made, the people were told at every public meeting, for the purpose of persuading them that they would all have a railway at their own doors. That was not the case. They were made for the purpose of ascertaining what would be the best route, and the best route would be selected, as will be done in the case of the Elmira branch. No doubt that is the reason so many trial surveys are made, but my hon. friend seems to think they were done for the purpose of influencing the election. Several of the branches are much needed, and no branch will be built. The Elmira branch will no doubt be constructed. It was proposed by the Conservatives some thirty years ago, but the only hope the people have of getting it is from the present government.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Have the engineers who were on these surveys made their reports ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, but I have not got them here. I will give them to my hon. friend.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I want to read a quotation from a letter I received from a friend of mine a few days ago. In that letter he says:

The great engine in their hands was however railway surveys. Survey parties were at work over nearly the half of Queens county. The place were dotted over with white tents, where so-called engineers with crews of 12 to 14 men were driving stakes through farmers' fields. The railway was of course going through their farms and liberal payments were to be made for the rights of way, and there would be abundance of work and good pay for everybody. Those were called trial surveys, and went to French River, New London, Stanley Bridge, Wheatley river, North and South Rustico, Stanhope, Bedford, Suffolk Covehead, Bedford. Also Valleyfield, Hackendale, Murray Harbour Road, Bellevue, Iona, Grand View, Lyndale, Fairville, &c.

The minister has the reports on all these routes and will, no doubt, as he promised, lay them on the table.

The Minister of Railways in the last of the session placed $10,000 in the supplementary estimates, and it was used solely to defeat us. The accompanying map may give some idea of the work. The reports of these engineers should be asked for.

Did the minister put $10,000 in the supplementary estimates of last year, and was that spent paying these tenting parties, which came out just a week or two before the elections and drove stakes and made surveys. My correspondent sends me maps of the lines of survey, and there are red lines in all directions covering every farm on the island.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will bring down the reports and a statement of the whole thing.

Mr. PERLEY. How much of last year's estimate of $30,000 was spent?

Mr. GRAHAM. $3,000.

Mr FRASER. What was that $3,000 for?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was paid for the survey.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Did that cover it?

Mr. GRAHAM. It covered the amount spent on this particular branch.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How much was spent on the island?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will give a statement of that.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Has the hon. gentleman the expenditure in connection with the Prince Edward Island survey ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I have not.

Mr. WARBURTON. A great many of those surveys were done since the election.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. No, they were called off the next week.

Mr. FRASER. Some time ago I put a question on the Order Paper asking how much had been spent out of this $31,000 for construction and I received an answer that $3,077 had been spent for construction on the Elmira branch. I was very much pleased to hear the minister say that before this branch was finally located, an engineer would go down and locate it where it will do the most good to the greatest number of people. When the engineers do so, no doubt the branch will be located where the survey was run in 1904.

and that is through the village of Souris East. Souris is the only shipping port in that part of the country for many miles, and all the freight would have to be carried there from East Point and Elmira. If the road is put where the last survey ran, or six miles farther than they would over where the 1904 line was located, because the branch running from Souris to Elmira will be very little if any longer than the branch running from Harmony to Elmira. But when they get to Harmony, they will have to go in five or six miles over the old road and will have to pay passenger and freight rates on the six miles, which will be a considerable expense and not give accommodation to the people through Souris as if the branch were built through Souris as outlined in the survey of 1904. If the minister will say that before this branch is finally located, an engineer will be sent, that will give assurance to the people because the people want to have the line into Souris East.

Mr. GRAHAM. The chief engineer will go down himself.

To increase accommodation at Charlottetown, $184,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for a wharf and freight shed, $53,000, extension of the east side of wharf $11,000, engine house $11,000, additional freight accommodation $10,000 There was expended last year $138,000. There has been expended at Charlottetown all told something like half a million dollars. Tenders were asked for the wharf and Messrs. Reid and Archibald got the contract. Mr. Clark got it for the freight shed.

Mr. FRASER. Has the minister received any complaints concerning the new station built at Charlottetown about a year ago? I have a letter, lately received, saying that the roof is leaking badly, that the plastering is falling down and the workmen are engaged already making repairs, and also that there are several large cracks in the stonework and in the concrete around the building. Has the hon. gentleman any information as to the defective work that seems to have been done there?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the defects cannot be very serious, for we have not heard anything of them in the department. I have had the misfortune to do some building myself, and I imagine that there is no building in the world, if looked at twelve months after construction by a person who wishes to find fault, but some defects will appear. I am informed hat this building in Charlottetown is a first-class building.

Mr. FRASER. I am only furnishing the information I have, and if it is true there must have been some very defective work there.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will make inquiries.

Mr. PROWSE. I had the privilege of going through there two weeks ago. There were a couple of places where the roof leaked, but not seriously. I did not hear about any cracks, and if they had been there I think I should have heard about them. Some people are apt to make mountains out of molehills, and you cannot always rely on what you hear.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I must ask the minister to let the next two items stand—the Transcontinental and the Hudson Bay Railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does the hon. member want the Hudson Bay item to stand also?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Yes; the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) cannot be present to-night, and he has some inquiries to make.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked me not to go on with the working expenses item to-night, and if these others are not to be taken up, I have no more estimates to go on with. I would not have agreed not to go on with the revenue item if I had known that exception would be taken to going on with any of these expenditures on capital.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. There are only two items here.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it not unreasonable to ask that the Transcontinental item should stand, but I think the Hudson Bay item should go through.

Mr. LAKE. The minister might give some information as to the Hudson Bay vote, and that might be sufficient to allow it to pass later on. We would like to hear as to the surveys, and also as to the future policy of the government in this matter.

Mr. GRAHAM. Some days ago, I laid on the table all the information with regard to the surveys up to a couple of weeks ago. The gist of that information is the raising of the question as to whether Fort Nelson is not a more favourable harbour than Churchill. As we wish to get the best possible harbour, I am asking for an appropriation to make a further survey of Nelson as well as Churchill. If I remember well, the engineer figures that the route to Nelson will be sixty miles shorter than to Churchill. If that be the case, and if we can do as well or better by going to Nelson, it would be foolish for us to build these sixty miles of road. The country toward Nelson, I believe, is equally as good as the other. That question having been raised by the engineers, my idea was that

we ought to spend a little more money and learn just where is the best port. The road will stand in just the same position as before so far as construction is concerned. We have no idea of abandoning the project, and will proceed at the earliest possible moment that the conditions will warrant, but I am asking for $65,000, part of it a revote, to learn the best route and the best harbour,—but, of course, not to proceed with actual construction.

Mr. LAKE. No survey of Churchill has been made?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, they have made a survey of Churchill.

Mr. LAKE. But not of Nelson?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. LAKE. Do we understand that this money is simply for the examination of the harbours and nothing beyond that?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is absolutely for survey work; it is to be spent to gain information. Of course, with this amount, we could not do anything in construction.

Mr. LAKE. There will be an examination of the harbours, I suppose ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, we are asking our engineers to get all possible information as to the harbours also. The hon. member (Mr. Lake) threw out the suggestions as to the possibility of making ocean navigation as far as Winnipeg. That does not enter into our calculation in asking this amount; that is a question for the future. Our present object is to make sure of the port to which we should build the road.

Mr. LAKE. It was understood by this House, I think, that the money to be expended on the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway was to come from a special fund to be created by the sale of pre-emptions.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. I understand that a certain amount of that fund has already been provided. Does the minister know how much that fund is at present, and can he estimate how much will be available twelve months from now, when, as I understand, he expects the actual work of construction to go on?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is not in my department, but in the Department of the Interior, but I think little or none of that money can be available yet. If my memory serves me well, the purchasers of these lands have a certain time in which to make payments, and so there will not be any money in the treasury from the sale of these lands at present. An hon. friend near me informs me that there is a small amount on hand. But, of course, it must go into the Consolidated Fund and be voted out just as though it were not the proceeds of the sale of these lands. There is no intention of abandoning the work, but it is in the same position as other large works and at present we do not feel like proceeding with it. Construction will be proceeded with as soon as conditions prevail that will allow us to undertake it. We want in the meantime to ascertain the best available route with the best available port, as between Fort Nelson and Fort Churchill. Perhaps the Minister of the Interior could give the infromation as to the money obtained from the pre-emptions.

Mr. OLIVER. I had the figures here a few days ago but I have forgotten exactly what they are. The payments on pre-emptions do not become due for three years so that no money has yet been received, but about two millions acres of land have been taken as pre-emptions. Whatever has been paid in on account of purchased homesteads, upon which the first payments are made with the entry, will be in the treasury and could be considered as available for construction purposes, but what the amount is I cannot at the moment say.

Mr. LAKE. Will the government wait until they derive sufficient money from pre-emptions before commencing work or will they place the money from the pre-emptions in a special fund and pay for the construction of the railway from that fund, providing the money for construction immediately and recouping themselves from the fund afterwards?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that the question of the amount of money received from the pre-emptions would not control the beginning of the road and as proof of that, if conditions had not arisen which have impelled us to cease for a time from undertaking these large works the construction would have been started perhaps this season, but that condition having arisen and there being also the other question which the hon. gentleman has raised as to the comparative merits of the two ports, I think it would be advisable even if we had the money on hand and were otherwise ready to start, to wait until we made a full and complete survey of the other route.

Mr. LAKE. I agree as to the advisability of waiting to ascertain which is the best port, but that will not occupy the whole of the next year and the money might now be taken for the commencement of construction. However, the government have decided not to take that money and the opposition have no power to move an amendment in that direction; we have to accept the position as it exists. Is it the policy of the government to construct the road as a government work or to place it in the hands of a private corporation?

Mr. GRAHAM. The question of how the road shall be constructed is a large one. I think that last session it was left in this way, that the government proposed to construct or to have constructed a line from The Pas to a port on Hudson bay. The Premier during his tour stated that the government proposed to construct it as a government road. I do not pretend to be quoting him literally but I think that was the meaning of his utterance at Niagara.

Mr. LAKE. I do not think it was as definite as that; I understood at that time he had not made up his mind. He may have made up his mind since, but at Niagara I think he said it was still an open subject as to whether it should be dealt with by the government or handed over to a private corporation.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not care to go any further than the Premier's statement at Niagara, and I have given what I construed to be the meaning of that statement.

Mr. LAKE. The minister stated that the government was prepared to construct a line to the Hudson bay from The Pas on the Saskatchewan river. What is the condition of the line now running to The Pas? Are trains running over it and do the government propose to make it part of their system or will they construct a road quite independently of the present line to The Pas.

Mr. GRAHAM. The government's idea was to construct from The Pas Mission to a port on Hudson bay and not to duplicate a line already constructed. The idea of the construction of the government road was to give railway connection from the nearest line to a Hudson bay port. I think I had some complaint a few weeks ago that trains had not been running regularly on this line. I communicated with the railway company and was informed that the trains were starting on a certain date and since that time I have not had any complaint.

Mr. LAKE. The line as I understand was reported completed to a considerable distance last year and the land grant of 12,800 acres a mile was granted to the Canadian Northern Railway. Were trains running over the line so reported as completed during last summer? I understand that trains can run over the line in winter when the ground is frozen. But I have had information given to me from a credible source that it is practically impossible to run trains over that line during the summer season when the frost is out of the ground. Could the minister give the committee some information in regard to that particular matter? It would be very interesting to me to hear what the condition is and whether the government is proposing to take any steps to have that line put into a condition that trains can be run regularly over it during the present season?

Mr. GRAHAM. If I had any information concerning it I would be delighted to give it to the committee. The only complaints concerning this line, as far as I can remember, except my hon. friend's observations last session in the committee, were the ones to which I have referred and no further communication having been made on the subject for a certain length of time——

Mr. LAKE. How long?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot just say. It was for some time, but I am not prepared to say because my memory does not serve me. But, on communication with the railway company they said that they were starting a train. I conveyed this communication to the gentleman who made the complaint. Since then I have not heard. They may be running a train or they may not be. But I should think that a question of that kind would be the subject matter of a complaint to the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. LAKE. The minister has stated that it is the intention of the government to run this line simply as far as The Pas from the Hudson bay. I hope he will reconsider that decision. It appears to me that if this line is to be run as a government undertaking, as I understand from the minister that is his general idea of the matter at the present time, it would be very inexpedient to run it simply as a feeder to the Canadian Northern Railway. I have always held the opinion that the Hudson Bay Railway should be a government undertaking and that it should be run so that it could make connection with the three great railways of that country, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway, so that the shippers on these lines of railway will be able to get the full benefit from its construction and operation. I hope the minister will come to see that that view of the case is the correct one, and that he will not start out with the idea that his railway is simply to stop at The Pas.

Mr. MAGRATH. I would like to ask the minister if I am correct in understanding him to say that no work will be done on the construction of the work this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to ask the goverment whether the inspector has passed the whole of the road from Etiomami to The Pas? I think the latest information which was given to this House was that a considerable portion of the road had been accepted and passed by the government inspector. Has it all been passed and has the land grant been given upon the whole of the railway up to the present time?

Mr. GRAHAM. My present information is that it has not been altogether, but I would not say that for sure. I can get that information and give it to my hon. friend to-morrow.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. From what point is this new survey going to start?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will start from The Pas Mission or from a point on the survey already made to Nelson. It will go along the Nelson river probably.

Mr. LAKE. I understand the minister has agreed to give me this information the next time his estimates are up?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will send it to my hon. friend.

Mr. BRADBURY. I find in the Votes and Proceedings of last session, No. 39, that the following subsidy was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway:

To the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for a line of railway from Winnipeg beach northerly to Gimli, not exceeding 9½ miles; and a line from Gimli to Riverton, not exceeding 25 miles; not exceeding in all 34½ miles.

Under what conditions was that subsidy granted and how long have the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build that line? This is a very important line to the settlers in that district, and I would like to know if this is just to remain a subsidy or whether the road is to be actually built. The people have been promised this road for years. Before the elections this subsidy was used in that part of the constituency as an inducement to the electorate to vote for the government candidate. I want to know if the government are going to ask the Canadian Pacific Railway to build that line?

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course, this is in the statute now and so long as they comply with the statute the government have no power. They are given the regular time in their charter to begin and to complete the railway. The House need not renew that charter and when their charter lapses their subsidy also lapses. The Subsidy Act itself fixes the time for starting and completing the work. If they do not comply with the statute and if they ask for a renewal of the subsidy, parliament, in its wisdom, may not renew it.

Mr. BRADBURY. How long will it be before they will have to ask for a renewal?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not like to speak from memory. If my hon. friend will look up last year's statute he will find it stated there.

Mr. BRADBURY. There is another matter I want to draw the minister's attention to and that is the condition of the Komarno branch through to Icelandic river. They have built that road to a point on Russell lake. The work was stopped last September and the contractors were taken off, but just on the eve of the election, my opponent, Mr. Jackson, went out and engaged 150 Galicians and put them to work on the dump. As soon as the elections were over these men were taken off. I would ask it the Canadian Pacific Railway will be required to complete that road at once. It is a great hardship to the people of Icelandic river that the road should not be completed. I do not know whether the government or the Canadian Pacific Railway were responsible, but somebody was responsible for putting these men on.

Mr. GRAHAM. These roads are all being constructed under the same condition. I am surprised, to put it mildly, that the Canadian Pacific Railway would do anything to assist the present government. I did not suspect them, but if my hon. friend assures me that it is so I would take his word absolutely, even although I were not obliged to, because I believe it would be correct if he said so, but it inspires a new feeling within me to think the Canadian Pacific Railway did that.

Mr. BRADBURY. I want to assure the minister that it is an absolute fact that 150 men were put on the road and that immediately after the election the men were taken off the work.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. They were paid out of the election fund.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not know how they were paid. They got their money I presume.

Public Works, Ont.—Blanche river—improvements on main stream and south branch, $6,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to remove snags and cut channels through shoals obstructing navigation at low water on the Blanche river which empties into Lake Temiskaming. There is quite a settlement on that river. The work was commenced in 1904-05.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Is there navigation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, for small vessels; there are four boats now on the river.

Burlington channel piers—reconstruction, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is contract work. It is for reconstructing the piers destroyed by storm.

Mr. HENDERSON. When were they destroyed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the spring of last year.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the piers be of concrete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. This forms the entrance to Hamilton harbour. We are building piers both on the lake side and on the bay side.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will this vote complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; the total probable cost will be $110,000.

Mr. A. HAGGART. Why is the work not included in one contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The head blocks are by contract, but much of the other work is repair work and the engineers say that it can be more economically done by day's labour.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who is the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Joseph Battle.

Mr. HENDERSON. The work on this channel has been going on continuously year after year for a long time. It is the duty of the government to keep that channel open and it is absolutely necessary to do this work because this forms the outlet from Lake Ontario to the city of Hamilton. I remember that at one time I suggested that instead of spending $50,000 a year the government had much better ask a sufficient amount to complete the whole job at once.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Since confederation $200,000 have been spent there and before confederation, $400,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. It would be much better to complete the work at once and give the people of Hamilton the benefit of it rather than to make this vote a kind of hardy annual.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Repairs have been necessary from year to year, but last spring there was a large amount of damage done.

Mr. BARR. When will the work be finished?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In about two years.

Mr. MARSHALL. What is the length of these piers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The wooden superstructure to be replaced by concrete on the south pier is 1,500 feet by 20 feet and there is a further reconstruction in concrete 420 feet by 30 feet. I presume the north pier is about the same length.

Cobourg—Extension of breakwater, dredging, &c., $60,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is contract work and the total probable cost to complete the improvements will be $154,000 outside of the dredging.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Who has the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Randolph Macdonald Co., Limited, has the contract for the breakwater; W. E. Phin has the dredging.

Mr. BARR. What do you pay for the dredging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For rock $3 a yard; all other materials, such as sand and clay, 18 cents a yard, scow measurement.

Goderich harbour, repairs to piers, &c., $5,350.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for renewals of the walings on the piers, and general repairs, estimated at $1,000; and for 290 feet lineal of protection work on the inner harbour. This work is done by day's work.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Why not put it under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. These repairs can hardly be put up to tender.

Harbours, rivers and bridges, general repairs and improvements, $25,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the minister said that the piers of Burlington channel were destroyed or badly damaged a year or so ago by a heavy storm. I may say that at that part of the lake there appears to be a good deal of washing away of the banks. The village of Burlington is within about half a mile of the Burlington channel, and there is a continual washing away of the shore in front of the village, and also two or three miles eastward; and the people there have an impression that it is the duty of this government to construct a breakwater to prevent this continual washing away, otherwise the village may be gradually wiped out. It is already encroaching very closely on the leading street of the village. The village has a population of only 1,700 or 1,800, and could not afford the expense of constructing a breakwater, and the people are looking to this government to do something of the kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why to this government ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I will tell the hon. gentleman why, and I have a very good reason. The gentleman who opposed me in the last election promised the people that if he were elected he would secure a breakwater. I assume that he did not make that promise off his own bat, but that he must have had some instruction from the Minister of Public Works that a breakwater would be constructed there, and he held that out as a reason why the people should vote for him instead of for me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What did the hon. gentleman promise?

Mr. HENDERSON. I promised nothing. I simply promised that I would call the minister's attention to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose that is all the promise he made.

Mr. HENDERSON. No, he promised a great deal more than that. I have been informed that he promised the breakwater. The Minister of Agriculture went into that county to speak on behalf of this gentleman, which gave him a standing, and the people had the right to expect that any pledge given by him would be carried out by the government for which he was seeking their support. If the promise was made in good faith by the government or through the government candidate, I think the minister ought to do something about it. I think it is a proper thing to do, and I believe the government is spending money in a great many instances where possibly it would not be doing as good service. I may say that while there is a considerable amount of shipping from that port, it has never to my knowledge had a dollar of government money expended there, either in dredging or in building a dock. Any docks there are private docks, and the government could well afford a do something of this kind for the people. I think it is the duty of the government to protect the village, and not allow a portion of it to be practically washed away. Since the promise was made by the government candidate, I hope the hon. minister will send an engineer to look into the matter and see if something can be done. The matter will have to be dealt with some day, either by the municipality or by the government. I do not see that the provincial government can be called on to do it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why not? Is it not purely local in its character?

Mr. HENDERSON. There are a great many local things done by the government. The building of the Burlington piers is local.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is for the advantage of navigation.

Mr. HENDERSON. And the other is for the protection of the village.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is not that the distinction?

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not know that the distinction is sufficient. The inland waters are, I think, under the care of this government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only navigation.

Mr. HENDERSON. And it is the inland waters that are practically washing away the people's farms and highways. It seems to me that this is the government that will have to do that work by and by, and the sooner it is undertaken the better. If this washing away is allowed to go on for a few years longer, a great deal of harm will be done, and it will certainly cost more to prevent it five years after this than it will now. I would suggest to the minister that while his engineers are engaged in examining the Burlington canal, which is within two and a-half or three miles away from the places I speak of, it would be well to send one to look into this matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that he knows personally that the Liberal candidate promised that a breakwater would be built and that he had the authority of the government for making that statement.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not hear him make that statement, but I have it on authority perfectly reliable, and I have no doubt he promised those people that he would apply to the government for the construction of a breakwater there to prevent the shore from washing away.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a different statement? He said he would apply to the government.

Mr. HENDERSON. But he did not get elected.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not his fault.

Mr. HENDERSON. The people, I presume, did not put much confidence in him and had the good sense to believe that the Minister of Public Works would not be so corrupt as to build a breakwater only on condition that a supporter of the government would be elected. If it is a proper and wise thing to build that breakwater, I have no doubt the minister would do it just as well as if the other gentlemen were elected. I was not present at any of the meetings and did not hear the gentleman make that statement, but that was the current report, and I have not the slightest doubt as to its accuracy. But apart from that, the claim is a proper one. That important village and shore has never received any government consideration whatever. It is a place of considerable importance. There is a large amount of grain and apples shipped from there, and they have never received a dollar for the construction of a pier or the dredging of their harbour. I am happy to say that they have a sufficient depth of water without dredging, but as for the docks, they are private and belong to the men who do the shipping business. If the minister will promise to send an engineer to look into the matter and see what can be done, he will be taking a step in the right direction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The reason I asked my hon. friend if he ever heard the statement made by the Liberal candidate that this breakwater would be built, was because I have heard a good many rumours as to

alleged statements made by Liberal candidates and have found, on inquiry, that they were absolutely without foundation.

Mr. HENDERSON. No doubt the hon. minister will find that this one is correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend had heard the statement he would be sure.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not hear it myself, but have it on the best authority.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I would rather assume is that probably the Liberal candidate, being impressed by the necessity for this work, promised that if he were elected, he would urge it on the favourable consideration of the government, and I would rather infer, from the last version which my hon. friend gave, that that was all the candidate said. This matter had not been very strongly brought to my attention, and I certainly gave no assurance that a breakwater would be built there and did not authorize any one to give that assurance. But as the matter is brought to my attention, I shall have it looked into.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is all I can expect the hon. minister to say at present.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With regard to many improvements of this character a question of great importance is arising and will no doubt be pressed home upon us very strongly in the future, and that is how far the federal government should go in the carrying on of protection works which are not for the purposes of navigation, but to protect towns and villages situated as Burlington is. I have during the past year been asked to join in the cost of building protection works on the Fraser river; and as towns and villages grow up on that very extensive river, there will be very large demands of a similar nature from them in the future. If I would undertake these works on behalf of this government, the federal exchequer would have very heavy burdens imposed on it. In the past we have done works of this character. On the Fraser river we have borne one half the cost, sharing the cost jointly with the provincial government. We have been asked to do that on the Saskatchewan river near Edmonton and at other localities where there is equal danger. Only the other day my hon. friend from Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Girard) wrote a very strong letter inclosing petitions setting forth, the very serious condition of affairs at a place some distance below the Saguenay where there is a large village located on the banks of the St. Lawrence, and where the banks are very high and there is considerable danger of their sliding into the St. Lawrence, causing great destruction of property and loss of life. I did not feel that this was a federal work for which I could pledge the government to ask parliament for an appropriation. The work has nothing to do with navigation, it is purely local in its character, and hon. gentlemen will see how difficult it is to draw the line. It requires great consideration, because if we undertake in a general way works of this character, it is difficult to estimate where we shall be able to stop.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The village of Burlington, on the shores of Lake Ontario, has been a very prosperous place for a great many years and a large shipping point, yet not a dollar of public money has ever been spent on the wharfs. Look at the millions we are voting to other provinces for similar works. But you may begin at Burlington and go down all the way as far as the province of Ontario extends and all along the shores of the St. Lawrence and Lake Ontario, and you will find that all the wharfs there have been erected by private individuals. In other provinces however the government not only builds the wharfs but will come down with an estimate for a wharf and turn it into a bridge. Here at Burlington, on the shores of Lake Ontario, the people built their own wharf, and not only the wharf, but the town is likely to be undermined from the lake, yet the government will pay no attention to it although their candidate promised that they would give relief if he were elected. I have drawn attention on several occasions to the township of Wolfe Island. The people on that island have no means of getting off except by boat, and they have to put their hands into their own pockets and build their own wharfs. Wolfe Island is at the foot of Lake Ontario. The only way to get there is by steamer. Steamers ply on both sides and the government have never contributed a dollar. If it were a little creek in some of the other provinces, the government would build the wharfs themselves, and construct docks where there is no navigation. Application has been made on behalf of Burlington, and that application should be recognized by the government without delay. Last night we discussed a work carried on by this government—building a concrete pier for the municipality to set a bridge upon—

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was four years ago.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. We had it before the committee last night. It was shown that it was built inshore from the current where it would not prevent the silt from coming down as was said to be the purpose. Why should not the provincial government or the municipality be called upon to do that work? It would seem that the municipalities in constituencies that return supporters of the government are treated differently from those that return members of the opposition. I think it is time that the government should come to some definite

understanding as to the kind of works it is their duty to erect and as to those which should be left to the province or municipality.

Little Current—improvement of Northern channel in Georgian bay, $28,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the dredging work of the year. It is very important work.

Mr. ARTHURS. At what portion of the channel ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Right at the town of Little Current. We are widening the channel and straightening it. There is a very swift current there, and this work will make what is known as 'the inside route' for steamers. That is, it will pass inside Manitoulin Island.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Is this vote of $28,000 for work that has been done or for work that is to be done ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Work to be done during the coming season.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. I notice that in the supplementary estimates there is a vote of $82,000 for the same work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is to close up for work done during the current year.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Does the minister intend to deepen the channel beside Picnic Island out of this $28,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, there would not be enough for that purpose.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. How much of the channel is to be completed? I think there is about 1,200 feet already dredged.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was about 1,800 feet in which work had to be done, and this is to complete the work.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. I suppose that, under this item, the minister could give no information as to the work done on Honora wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No appropriation is being asked for that wharf, and therefore I have no information before me with regard to it. If he desires it, I will get the information.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. The minister is aware that a wharf was built there just before the elections. I shall have something to say about it later on.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know when it was done. The House did not rise until about the first of August.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. To what depth has this northern channel been dredged?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Twenty-two feet.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. And what is the present depth of the part that is being dredged?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Twenty-two feet.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. And what is the present depth of the part that is being redredged?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When we began the work, the depth was about 14 feet. It will be noted that this is rock drilling and blasting.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. And there is no appropriation for widening the channel towards Picnic Island?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. To widen it would be very expensive. It is a needed work, but it cannot be done at present.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. I presented a petition to the minister from the vesselmen showing the necessity of widening the channel at this point. Does he purpose doing anything about it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have a report on it, and I recognize the necessity for it. But it is one of those works not imperatively necessary at the moment, and I regret to say that we shall be obliged to let it stand over for a short time.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Last session, $125,000 was voted. Did the minister expend that and $82,000 besides on that work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some money was due from the previous year. I could get the full details if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Geo. Taylor) would like them.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Where did the money come from for the work which has been referred to as having been built just before the elections?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That has nothing to do with this appropriation.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Was there an appropriation for it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think there was. But we have a general vote of money for repairs.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How much was spent out of the general vote, or out of any vote on this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no memorandum of it here.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman get it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to do so.

McGregor's creek—renewal of bank protection work at Chatham, $7,100.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. This is protection work on a bank.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the renewal of sheet piling protection on the south bank of McGregor's creek, reported by the engineer in charge to be needed to prevent the bank sliding into the creek. Since this estimate was made, a further break has occurred endangering the houses, in fact, some of the houses have actually fallen in. I think a distinction can be made between this work and the work at Burlington, because, in the opinion of the engineer, this has followed dredging operations carried on by the federal government, and therefore we have thought it our duty to build protection works. When I speak of dredging by the federal government, I do not mean the present government, because this was done before the present administration came into power.

Mr. MARSHALL. Is this work to be done in the city of Chatham?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Montreal river—improvements above Latchford, $25,000.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Is this in connection with the dam to be built there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to construct a dam just above Latchford for the purpose, as the expression is, of drowning out the Pork rapids, and so affording navigation for the conveyance of the large number of people who are going up that river to engage in mining operations and to settle on the land.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Have negotiations gone on between this government and the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Commission relating to the land about to be drowned?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Negotiations have gone on for a very considerable time, and it is largely in consequence of these not having been brought to a successful issue that the work of building this dam has not already been undertaken. I desire to say, and I say it with regret, that the commissioners of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway have not shown the disposition which I should have expected them to show to facilitate this work. We have endeavoured to get them either to make a reasonable settlement as to land damages or to waive any claim for damages because the building of this work will be of great benefit to the interests of the province of Ontario, but so far we have not been successful in coming to an arrangement.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Are any further improvements contemplated in the Montreal river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is another rapid at which we have been urged to build a lock but we have not decided upon that.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Has the matter been brought to the attention of the Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines of Ontario?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. I understood him to say he was disposed to make any arrangement to get that improvement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We went to the trouble and expense of appointing Mr. Davis of Latchford to get the land damages settled. He reported that he had interviews with the Commissioners and also with the Ontario minister to whom my hon. friend refers, but he was not successful in coming to an arrangement. I hope that now the matter has been brought more forcibly to the attention of the Ontario government we will be able to come to a satisfactory arrangement soon. The work is important and I regret that we have not felt it was desirable or safe to enter into the contract because of the possibility of having these claims outstanding. The moment I can see daylight, so far as land damages are concerned, I am prepared to go ahead with the work and let the contract, but I do not want to enter on the work with an uncertainty as to the amount of claims to be brought against the government for flooding the lands.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it not within the power of the government to expropriate the right to flood these lands?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Possibly it is, but I do not think that when the federal government is prepared to engage upon a large expenditure for the purpose of improving the navigation of a river like the Montreal river, which would give accommodation to people going in there to settle upon the lands of the Ontario government, to develop their mining properties, that the Ontario government which owns the townsite upon the shores of Temiskaming lake should make any claim against us for damages that might occur through the flooding of unoccupied lands and particularly of town lots unsold, and not built upon. I do think they should join with us to that extent in having these improvements made and give freely and without compensation the lands which would be affected by the building of the dam.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course I appreciate that the hon. gentleman thinks that the chairman and other members of the Commission and the Minister of Forests, Lands and Mines are not acting in a reasonable way, but it is not impossible that these gentlemen have the same view in regard to himself. I know the chairman of the Commission and some of the members and also have the privilege of knowing the Minister of Mines, and I be-

lieve him to be not only a very capable but a very reasonable gentleman who would be sincerely desirous of doing everything possible to facilitate the improvement of navigation for the benefit of people using that river. Perhaps the minister would bring down any correspondence he may have in reference to the matter, which is of some importance, as the river in the summer should be a very excellent highway, affording access to a country lacking in other communication.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to bring down the correspondence.

Mr. WRIGHT. Did the minister give directions to his department at Toronto to look after this matter? It would seem to be of sufficient importance not to leave it to an irresponsible gentleman in that northern country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not accept the suggestion that the matter was left to an irresponsible gentleman. We appointed a gentleman of high standing in Latchford to endeavour to make a settlement with the owners of land which we thought would be flooded by building the dam. Among the owners were the Commissioners of the Ontario and Temiskaming Railway, representing the Ontario government. We instructed Mr. Davis to confer with the Commissioners and also with the Ontario government and he reported that he had several interviews with the Minister of Lands and Mines of Ontario as well as with the Commissioners, and that he was not able to make a satisfactory arrangement.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. What is his profession?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A lawyer.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. He knows nothing, of course, about the value of lands.

Port Stanley—groynes on east side of harbour entrance, $7,100.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is protection work for the protection of new Orchard Beach from further erosion. The groynes are to be built on the east side of Port Stanley entrance. The claim is made upon us—and this also differentiates this from the case to which some hon. gentleman referred to-night—that by reason of the breakwater built there the waters of the bay were given a certain direction and caused erosion of the soil. The department recognized the strength of that claim, and the work of building these groynes for the protection of the land was entered upon.

Mr. MARSHALL. I think the minister is justified in spending that money just as he says. I know the location and it is necessary work. Will the work be done by day's labour or by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to be done by contract and the contract has been let to John H. Smaill, of Port Burwell. The contract price was $6.535.

Mr. MARSHALL. Who is the overseer? The gentleman in charge now is named Smith.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think an overseer has been appointed; Mr. Smith may have been appointed recently but I have no memorandum of it.

Mr. MARSHALL. This expenditure is very necessary. Port Stanley is an important harbour where there is a large revenue from the coal traffic. The amount is not too large. I find nothing for Port Bruce. Is it the intention of the minister to spend any money in improving that harbour this summer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has not been decided to spend anything at Port Bruce during the coming season.

Mr. MARSHALL. I hope the minister will spend some money there. It is an old harbour gone down. It is now used as a fishing port. There are men engaged in fishing there who have their homes, boats and nets and everything invested in their plant, and unless the harbour is kept open it will be useless. Unless the harbour is improved it will be useless. I hope the minister will set aside something, not a very large amount, to keep the harbour in such a condition that fishermen can go in and out.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will make a note of it and have it looked into.

Richard's Landing—St. Joseph's island—repairs to pier, $1,700.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What is the explanation of this? Is not that the wharf that was built up there where the summer hotel was erected?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, this is away up in the district of West Algoma not far from Sudbury.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Will this complete it?

Mr. PUGSLEY This will complete the repairs.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Were any of those repairs done last season?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will require $1,700 for repairs during the coming season. We have spent, up to the 30th November, $1,398.46. Repairs have been going on during the winter, so that we will have spent about $1,600 by the 31st of this month.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. In addition to the $3,000 voted last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the total estimated cost is $4,700; $3,000 was voted last year and we are asking for $1,700 this year.

River St. Lawrence—improvement of Canadian channel between Kingston and Brockville, $75,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to improve, by blasting and dredging out what will probably be all rock, the Canadian channel between Kingston and Brockville, so that vessels navigating the St. Lawrence can go through the Canadian channel instead of being obliged to use the American channel. The work is being done under contract. The total estimated cost is $125,000.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Who has the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Frank Gilbert, of Montreal. Tenders were called and in response to a public advertisement these tenders were received ranging from $3.95 per cubic yard of rock to $4.98. The contract was awarded to Frank Gilbert, his being the lowest tender, at $3,95 per cubic yard of rock.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I understand that most of this is removing an island at Fiddler's Elbow?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is quite a large number of points at which material has to be removed.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. That work will be proceeded with this summer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is being proceeded with this winter.

Rondeau harbour—improvements, $25,000.

Mr. BEATTIE. What is being done at Rondeau?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are breakwaters to be built.

Mr. BEATTIE. I was there a short time ago and I thought the piers were very good.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to extend the breakwaters to afford protection to the harbour. There is a contract let for the construction of breakwaters and dredging.

Mr. BEATTIE. This is to further improve the harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to extend the breakwaters to a thousand feet.

Mr. BEATTIE. This is to extend the piers outward? The piers were very good as far as they went. This has become a very important harbour, there is a very large coal business being done and large steamers come there. I think this is a desirable work. Port Stanley and Rondeau are two of the most important harbours on the lake. Besides doing a large coal business I do not know but that they are good harbours of refuge in case of a storm.

Sault Ste. Marie wharf — dredging approaches, $55,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the work.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Southampton—extension of and repairs to town dock, $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract also.

Toronto harbour—improvements, $375,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the western channel with which the committee is familiar.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. This is under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Before leaving the Ontario items, I want to draw the minister's attention to the fact that last year a vote was put through for a wharf at Gravenhurst. I also want to draw the minister's attention to the fact that it was not built and that nothing has been done there. It was kept before the electors all summer and when the election time came it was a very important issue whether the people would get their wharf or not. A communication was sent to the minister right in the midst of the election and a telegram was apparently received from him which was published and put in the hands of every elector in the town, stating that it was owing to the persuasive qualities of the Reform candidate that the minister had come to the conclusion that a wharf was necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was that a telegram from me?

Mr. WRIGHT. From you. I would draw the attention of the minister to the fact that from time to time representations have been made from the town council of Gravenhurst, and strong deputations have waited upon the government urging this public work. I suppose the government came to the conclusion that they would put a little vote in the estimates for that wharf and apparently the Reform candidate was sent for and came down here so that he might get credit for this appropriation. As I have said, the telegram of the minister was used to that effect in the riding of Muskoka and in the town of Gravenhurst, and the people were led to believe they would get the wharf at once. This was used with very telling effect against myself in the campaign and it lost me a considerable number of votes, and had it been that the minister had twenty-five or thirty wharfs to build in the riding, I

might have lost my election. However, I simply want to express the hope that the persuasive eloquence of my opponent which had such an effect on the minister will not have ceased to exercise its power, and that he will not forget that the town of Gravenhurst needs a wharf very badly. If there are supplementary estimates brought down I hope the minister will include in them an appropriation for this work and that at the very earliest possible moment he will have a decent wharf constructed in the town of Gravenhurst. I have drawn the attention of the minister and of his predecessor to the fact that there is a great deal of shipping in these northern waters and that this accommodation is badly needed. I can tell him that if the wharf is built the people will appreciate it very much.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did the hon. gentleman issue a circular during the campaign in regard to his own action in reference to that wharf?

Mr. WRIGHT. I issued no circular with regard to the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information was that during the campaign the hon. gentleman either had issued a circular or made a statement that he had succeeded in getting the item in the estimates for the Gravenhurst wharf and repudiating the fact that our friends had anything to do with it. I was asked whether that statement was true and I did either write or telegraph giving credit to the gentleman who had come to Ottawa upon at least one occasion and urged very strongly the necessity for a wharf at Gravenhurst. I placed the credit where it was due so far as obtaining the appropriation for the wharf was concerned, and to correct any misapprehension which I had been informed my hon. friend was endeavouring to spread among the electors. With regard to the wharf itself, I was impressed with the necessity for it. There is a good deal of shipping at Gravenhurst and the amount was put in the estimates in good faith last session, but unfortunately owing to the condition of the revenues this wharf must stand over for a short time as many other necessary public works.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Will the minister give us a copy of the telegram?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not a copy; I think it was a personal telegram sent from St. John.

Mr. ARTHURS. I want to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to two wharfs in the district of Parry Sound for which appropriations were made last year. One of these appropriations was for a wharf at the village of Maganatawan on the Maganatawan river. I understand the minister said that these works which had been commenced would be carried to completion. In this case a grant of $1,200 was made for that wharf and something over $500 was spent for the purchase of the old wharf, the apparent intention being to extend it. I call the attention of the minister to the fact that the existing wharf is entirely inadequate. At present the boats are being tied on the banks of the river at various places and unable to reach the wharf. I shall be glad to have an assurance that the balance of this appropriation will be expended in enlarging that wharf. Then also with regard to Parry Sound, there were some thousands of dollars placed in the estimates last year for the extension of the wharf there. The work was prosecuted in the days immediately preceding the election and carried on for a week after the election when it was discontinued. A large amount of timber is at present on hand and the appropriation has not been exhausted. In this case also I would like to have the assurance of the minister that the balance of the appropriation will be used as the work is necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Arthurs) say whether in his opinion both these works are necessary public works and works which should be carried on in the public interest?

Mr. ARTHURS. I think the minister will agree with me that the work at Parry Sound is most necessary and that the wharf accommodation there is very small considering the importance of the port.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What about Maganatawan?

Mr. ARTHURS. That is exactly in the same position. There are 20 or 25 steamers plying there and there is not room at the wharf purchased by the government for more than one steamer at a time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very glad that my hon. friend conforms to the opinion I entertained last session that these works were necessary, and I regret that I have been obliged not to include in the estimates an appropriation for them for the coming year; they have to stand over the same as many other public works throughout Canada.

Mr. ARTHURS. Am I right in assuming that the minister has stated in the House that those works which had been commenced would be carried on to completion and that the works which had been left aside were those which had not been commenced or for which tenders had not been called?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I stated to the committee that in drawing the line in reference to works which were to stand over we had provided that where contracts had been let

or where the work had been undertaken by day's labour they should be carried to completion. If any work has been done on the Maganatawan wharf which would be of no value to the public unless there were further work done, or if the work were likely to be damaged if it were not completed then I think it ought to be completed. But if a further extension is only needed to get increased accommodation I think it might stand over without detriment to the public interest the same as many other works in different parts of the country.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The timber is bought and lying there rotting.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So far as the wharf at Parry Sound is concerned I think that is being done by day's work, and if the timber is there—

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Rotting.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It cannot be rotting because it is only there a short time and we will see it does not rot. I will make inquiries of the engineering department and see what can be done.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to Meaford harbour situated on the Georgian bay. I understand that recently a petition has been sent to the Minister of Public Works with reference to that harbour. I quite re-recognize his policy of cutting down the estimates for Public Works, but at the same time I think that in the case of Meaford there should be an exception made. As I understand, the government adopted some plan or scheme for the improvement of the harbour, and in accordance with it have already spent $70,000 or $80,000, for which the town is grateful. But a storm of last fall proved beyond doubt that that plan will have to be radically changed, because it is not such as to prevent the devastation of the harbour. A number of boats lying in the harbour were tossed about and some of their upper parts destroyed 'and some had to be removed to Owen Sound.' I would therefore ask the minister if he can put something in the estimates of the present year to preserve the harbour. This is one of those cases in which, if nothing is done, what has already been done by the government may be permanently destroyed. I understand that a deputation from Meaford is about to come to Ottawa to interview the government and to present a memorial on this subject. The harbour of Meaford is not a small harbour. It has many manufactures, a large elevator and a great deal of the grain from the west passes through that harbour on its way to the sea-board; so that it is more or less a national port. I would ask the minister in all earnestness to see if something cannot be done during the present year, either by a vote in the supplementary estimates or otherwise, for the purpose of preventing the destruction of that harbour and whether he cannot have an inquiry made as to whether some change should not be made in the plan or scheme adopted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that I have received the memorial to which he refers and I intend to look into the matter very carefully. But as to making provision during the present session—

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. You have a general vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But out of that we can only provide for small works; we cannot build wharfs or breakwaters. As to putting an amount in the supplementary estimates, I regret that I am not able to give my hon. friend any assurance at the present moment that there will be any supplementary estimates and there is nothing in the present estimates that would warrant me in proceeding with the work in the present year. If there should be supplementary estimates, I will give the matter consideration.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Would the minister send a competent engineer there for the purpose of making an examination?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have already referred the memorial to the chief engineer of my department.

Mr. MADDIN. Would the Minister of Public Works tell us why the objects for which moneys were voted in the supplementary estimates of last session are not being carried out by revotes this session?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because our revenues will not warrant us in doing so. During the past year there has been a falling off of about $12,000,000 in the revenues, and, as I have already explained several times in the committee, we had to cut down the estimates in my department by some $7,000,000 or $8,000,000. It became necessary therefore to postpone the construction of a large number of very necessary public works which were provided for in the estimates of last year.

Mr. MADDIN. Is it not a fact that the country is better off financially at the present time than it was when the supplementary estimates were brought down in July last? Is not the fiancial condition of the country as good now as it was when he sent that telegram to the province of Ontario to which the hon. member for Muskoka has referred?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That telegram was only to correct what I thought was a wrong impression that was sought to be conveyed.

Mr. MADDIN. But there was an amount in the estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course there was, and I was only speaking of that, not making any promises for the future.

Mr. MADDIN. Is not the financial condition of the country now better than it was when that amount was put in the estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am satisfied that the outlook now is exceedingiy good.

Mr. MADDIN. Is not that a reason why the hon. minister should live up to his pre-election promises in respect to public works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What pre-election promises?

Mr. MADDIN. They were contained in the estimates.

Manitoba—harbours and rivers and bridges —general repairs and improvements, $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a general vote to do work which is not specially provided for.

Mr. ROCHE. At what places are you going to have it expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no special places in mind at present. Last year the expenditure up to the 31st of December was $3,667, leaving a balance of a little over $2,000 unexpended. There are always repairs and small works to be done in different sections of the country.

Mr. BRADBURY. Some little time ago I interrogated the minister regarding the bridge at Lac du Bonnet. The bridge is too low. I understood that the matter was referred to the resident engineer. It is a very serious matter. I have had several letters in the last few days asking if the government has taken any action.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who constructed this bridge?

Mr. BRADBURY. The city of Winnipeg.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would not be a matter for my department specially to interfere in.

Mr. BRADBURY. The bridge is across a navigable stream, and I think the government owns it. I do not think the government would allow it to be constructed without its approval.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans would have to be approved.

Mr. BRADBURY. I am informed that at high water there is less than four feet between the water and the girders of the bridge, and as the current is very rapid, it is a menace to life and property. Something ought to be done, and done at once.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend can easily understand that if a bridge was not built according to the plans, it would be quite open to any one to file information and compel the city of Winnipeg to remove the bridge. I do not think it would be the duty of my department to do that; it would rather rest with the Attorney General of the province. He is the man in whose name any information for that purpose would have to be laid. However, I have given instruction to have a report made, and shall be glad to lay it before the House as soon as it is revised.

Mr. BRADBURY. If the plans were approved by the Department of Public Works, in what position would the government be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not like to say what would be done in that case. That would show that somebody had blundered in case the plans were defective.

Mr. BRADBURY. If the city of Winnipeg had not carried out the plan submitted to the government the city was responsible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BRADBURY. On the other hand, if it had built according to the plan submitted to your engineer, surely the government is responsible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be the fault of our department, but as to whether there would be any legal responsibility, I am not at the moment prepared to say. It might be an error of judgment. I have sent for a report.

Mr. BRADBURY. This is a serious matter and I hope the minister will take it up seriously. There is another matter to which I wish to call his attention. There was placed in the estimates of last year, just previous to the general elections, an amount of $7,500, for the purpose of commencing what was termed a protecting pier at Winnipeg beach. This amount is conspicuous by its absence in the estimates of this session, does that mean the work has been abandoned?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The fact of its not appearing in the votes ought to be convincing proof to my hon. friend that it will not be possible for me to go on with the work during the present season.

Mr. BRADBURY. I want to recall to the hon. gentleman that on the 1st of February I asked him the following question across the floor, as will be seen in 'Hansard,' page 352:

What has the government done regarding protection pier at Winnipeg Beach? Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the construction of this pier at once? If not, when?

The minister replied as follows:

Plans and specifications have been prepared contingent upon certain work being performed by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Boundary Park Realty Company. It has not yet been decided to go on with the work, but a decision will be come to before very long after we hear what the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Boundary Park Realty Company are prepared to do.

This reply conveyed the impression that the Boundary Park Realty Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway had not carried out their part of the understanding which must have existed between the government and these companies. The reply which the minister gave me at that time was published in one of the Winnipeg papers, and in that way came under the notice of the Boundary Park Realty Company, and the secretary of that company wrote me a letter which I think I should read to the committee for the information of the Minister of Public Works:

Winnipeg, Feb. 3, 1909.

G. H. Bradbury, Esq.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—In a despatch from Ottawa it is stated that the building of the protection pier at Winnipeg Beach was being held up by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Boundary Park Realty Company.

Speaking for the Boundary Park Realty Company, I may say that we completed our part some months ago by giving a clear title, free of cost, to the Canadian Pacific Railway to about seven (7) acres of land fronting on the proposed harbour.

They in turn gave us a written agreement to the effect that they would do the necessary work inside within a certain time after the Dominion government built the pier. We have done our part and the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot do anything until the outside work is completed by the government. I understand that the railway are willing and anxious to go on with the work at the earliest date possible.

Any further information you might want from us would be gladly given. We are very anxious, as are all the other Winnipeg Beach residents to see the matter go through without delay as we have waited for over a year for a safe anchorage for our boats. Thanking you in advance for the trouble you are taking in this matter,

I remain, yours truly,
C. GORDON CRUIKSHANK.

I submit that the inference which the minister wished me to draw from his reply was that these companies had not carried out their part of the understanding.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My answer does not say that. It says that we were waiting to hear from them and then will decide what we will do.

Mr. BRADBURY. I think the fair inference is that these companies had not done what they agreed to do.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that.

Mr. BRADBURY. I think that is the fair inference. When the despatch was published in the Winnipeg papers, that was the inference which the Realty Company drew from the reply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The telegram apparently was a misstatement. The telegram said it was alleged that the work was hung up by these companies. I used no such expression in the House. Therefore the company must have been misinformed by the telegram.

Mr. BRADBURY. The minister said that the plans and specifications had been prepared contingent on certain work being performed by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Boundary Park Realty Company. The government therefore were to go on with the work if these companies did what they had agreed to do. Well, the realty company, on the strength of the appropriation voted last year, did dispossess itself of seven acres of valuable land fronting on this proposed pier, and the Canadian Pacific Railway gave them an undertaking that as soon as the government carried out its part of the work, the Canadian Pacific Railway would proceed and do their part.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do you not think my department ought to have some word from the Canadian Pacific Railway? Do you think we are bound by a private arrangement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Realty Company of which we were not informed?

Mr. BRADBURY. I cannot help but feel that the reply of the minister was hardly ingenuous. I think the inference he wished to convey was that these companies had not implemented their pledges; and in view of what has taken place in this committee from time to time, it is evident that when the money was voted last year, previous to the election, there was no real intention on the part of the government to proceed with the work. The minister said to-night that the reason why the government did not proceed with some public works was because of the falling off in revenue. That would be a good reason, were it not for the fact that in the lower provinces the government are providing in the estimates for the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars for works not really as necessary as this one at Winnipeg Beach. At that place it is really necessary, in the interests of life and property, that a harbour should be built. The building of that pier, if I understand the purpose of the government, is required for a harbour. There is no harbour within 25 or 30 miles

along the lake front, so that a very dangerous condition exists. I would strongly urge upon the government to make that expenditure this year. In view of what I know, it strikes me that this was simply a pre-election promise.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A promise to build an unnecessary work.

Mr. BRADBURY. If the minister thinks it an unnecessary work why did he put a vote in the estimates for it last session? Either he must have known then that it was necessary or he was deceived by the then member for that constituency in this House, because when the late member, Mr. Jackson, came before the electors, he referred to that in his address. In that address he said :

> $7,500 has been voted for a pier at Winnipeg Beach. This pier is to cost $16,000. The contract will be let this fall.

In addition to that statement in his published address, we had men coming down from Winnipeg and Selkirk, purporting to be contractors and going over the work and measuring it, and giving out all through the district that they were going to proceed with the work as soon as the bay was frozen over. In addition to that, we had the government tug lying there, with its engineer and staff of helpers, during the time of the regatta held there late in September. With four or five thousand people there, this government tug was pointed out by the friends and admirers of Mr. Jackson as proof of how the government was taking care of the people and was so prompt in responding to the request for the building of a pier. They were told that the pier would be proceeded with and that before spring they would have the pier completed and would have a first-class harbour. This work was dangled before the eyes of the electors during the whole campaign. The same is true of the Elmwood post office. A vote of $10,000 was put in the estimates for this work. And, further up the lake, $4,000 or $5,000 was to be spent at Gimli. This last-named work was proceeded with, and it was the only one that was proceeded with. It was gone on with during the campaign; men were hired by the day, and the whole dredging outfit that had cost this country a large sum of money was moved, at great risk, from the mouth of the Winnipeg river to the Icelandic river, where it was kept going for several weeks, and $4,000 or so was spent in dredging. I hold that this principle of making appropriations on the eve of a campaign, even if the government is serious and intends to spend the money, is a bad one. But how much worse is it when large appropriations are made running up into tens of millions of money, only to be dropped the following year. Of many of these appropriations made last year, not a dollar is to be found in the present estimate. It looks like making pledges to the people that the government never intend carrying out. I am satisfied there were thousands of voters fooled and tricked by these appropriations into voting for the government. It is a deplorable thing that the government of a big country like Canada should be guilty of such conduct as I believe this government stands guilty of. If there were words that I could use that would be strong enough to induce the minister to reconsider his decision in this matter and to implement the pledge that was made——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I must say the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bradbury) has not a very coaxing way about it.

Mr. BRADBURY. I grant you, Mr. Chairman, that I have not the same smooth way that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It sounds as if you were declaring war.

Mr. BRADBURY. I wish to point out to the minister that we are not blind to what the minister and the government did previous to and during the last campaign. The mere fact that, when I asked that question in the beginning of the session, and received the answer I did from the Minister of Public Works, the Boundary Park Realty Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had fully discharged all they had undertaken to do, convinced me that the minister and the government had no intention, when that money was put into the estimates, of ever expending it. But this is not a political question so far as I am concerned. While this work will be in my constituency, the building of that pier would not go to accommodate my constituents. It would be built at a summer resort and would mainly benefit the people of the city of Winnipeg. I want to to say that this is a very serious matter. Several lives have been lost on that beach, because there was no harbour in which boats could seek shelter from the storms. There is no doubt that the promise was made to build that pier, and the appropriation put in fooled quite a number to vote for the government candidate last election. I have not any great hope, I confess frankly, of inducing the minister to reconsider his decision, because I have noticed his attitude in the House in regard to several of these things, and, no doubt, the government will take the position taken by the minister, that on account of the falling revenue, it is not wise to proceed with this work. I have already pointed out that if this be a good reason now, it was much stronger when this vote was put in the estimates, for everybody who knew anything about the country's finances knew that the revenue was falling and that this condition

would continue. But this did not stop these gentlemen making the appropriation. They were on the eve of an election, and they opened the flood-gates and voted, not merely millions but tens of millions, and, as I have said, fooled thousands of the electors from the Atlantic to the Pacific, into giving votes that they would not otherwise have given.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bradbury) has certainly presented an argument against engaging in this work in Lake Winnipeg. I had supposed, from the arguments presented to me last session by the gentleman who then represented the constituency that while Winnipeg Beach was resorted to in summer by many people, yet this work was necessary in the interest of navigation as well, and would be an advantage to the commerce of the lake. But the hon. gentleman, says that it is used only as a summer resort for the people of Winnipeg. He presents an argument which makes it very important to consider whether or not this work should be postponed, pending the completion of works that are essential for the commercial and navigation interests of the country. It is a question, and always will be a question, how far the federal government is justified in spending money simply to afford summer resorts for the people of large cities. However, that is a matter that has not been brought to my attention as it has been by the hon. gentleman this evening. But, though he has presented that view of the case, while I do not say that the work will be abandoned, I do say that it will have to stand over the same as many other public works of greater necessity than this would appear to be from the hon. gentleman's statement. I do not think, if he is sincerely desirous of accomplishing anything for his constituency, that he has gone about the matter in a way which one would expect. He acts as if he were seeking to provoke some quarrel—not personal, but political—with myself in respect of this work. I repeat what I have said, that, when this item was put in the estimates last session, it was put there in good faith upon the urgent representation of Mr. Jackson, who then represented the constituency.

Mr. BRADBURY. And just on the eve of an election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was put there at the only time when it could be put there. Parliament had to be asked for the appropriation, and parliament did not rise and the Supply Bill was not passed until about July 20. After that we had to consider how rapidly we could go ahead with the works parliament had authorized. The hon. gentleman speaks of Elmwood public building. He does not do himself justice or seek to do me justice in that because we proceeded with that as far as we could reasonably go, we purchased a site, we showed our good faith in that way and we now have the site vested in the Crown and will be in a position to go ahead with the work whenever parliament puts me in a position to do so. All the items were put in the estimates in good faith and not with a view to dangling them before the electors or misleading the electors. The best evidence that we have acted in good faith is that in many constituencies, I would almost say scores of constituencies, which have returned our freinds to parliament we have deferred going on with many of these public works. We have not shown any discrimination and intend to treat the various works in good faith, and with a desire to carry out, as far as possible, the wishes of the people in respect of works which are really necessary and to meet the public convenience as far as we reasonably can. My hon. friend has referred to an answer I gave in this House and he has followed the example of one or two hon. gentlemen opposite, an example which I do not think he should follow. He says he does not think I was ingenuous in making this answer. Let me see if he was justified in that statement. First, let me say that the answers in my department are not prepared by me, nor are they prepared by the ministers in other departments. We send them to the proper official who prepares the answer in accordance with the facts, and I rarely see the answers until they are completed and ready to submit to the House. His insinuation that I was not ingenuous is not justified. The question was:

1. What has the government done regarding protection pier at Winnipeg Beach?

2. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the construction of the pier at once? If not, when?

My answer was:

Plans and specifications have been prepared contingent upon certain work being performed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and Boundary Park Realty Company. It has not yet been decided to go on with the work, but a decision will be come to before very long after we hear what the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Boundary Park Realty Company are prepared to do.

My hon. friend says the Boundary Park Realty Company has made an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway; but my department has not been informed of that. We were to undertake this work if the Canadian Pacific Railway did a certain amount of work towards the completion of these harbour works. We have had no communication, as far as I am aware, from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and no information as to the arrangement between that company and the Realty Company. When we get word from the Canadian Pacific Railway as to what they are prepared to do,

then I am prepared to bring the matter before my colleagues and the decision as to when the work shall proceed will rest with the government.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not feel like allowing the minister to place a false construction on what I have said and I feel he has done that. In the first place, regarding what was said about the pier being of no use to the navigation of Lake Winnipeg, I stated distinctly that lives and property were lost last year because there was no harbour there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did he not say it was purely a summer resort for the people of Winnipeg?

Mr. BRADBURY. I did not say it was purely a summer resort. I said it was a summer resort and was largely used by the people of Winnipeg, and not so much by residents of the county of Selkirk. If the pier were converted into a harbour, as it ought to be, it would be of very great value to the navigation of Lake Winnipeg; but according to the hon. gentleman it is to be simply a pier and he says it is contingent upon the Canadian Pacific Railway doing certain work. The fact is that the Canadian Pacific Railway could not do any work until the government had built the pier; their work came in after the pier was built.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Surely they could enter into an agreement to do the work?

Mr. BRADBURY. There must have been some understanding between the government and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Boundary Park Realty Company before the hon. gentleman authorized an appropriation of $7,500 to start this work. On the face of it it is evident there was, because the Boundary Park Realty Company, on the strength of that agreement, dispossessed itself of seven acres of valuable frontage to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway gave an agreement to the Realty Company that as soon as the government would carry out their part of the work, the Canadian Pacific Railway would complete their part. It must be plain to the committee that the fault lies with the Department of Public Works and not with the two companies. The government have failed to implement the promise they gave to the people and the understanding must exist some place between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Boundary Park Realty Company and the government. The hon. gentlemen say there is no agreement, and that they have had no communication from the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that we had had no communication. I said we have had no communication as to the completion of the agreement, and no agreement has yet been entered into. There was some time ago a proposed agreement, but we had not been informed of the completion of the agreement with the Realty Company and no agreement has been entered into.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not know how the minister can justify the appropriation of last session if there was no arrangement between the companies interested. There is no question that the two companies had carried out their part of the agreement and the government had failed to carry out theirs. The minister accused me of being unfair in saying he was not ingenuous in his replies and he stated that he had nothing to do with the making up of the replies handed to him. I am not supposed to know that, I am simply taking the reply given by the gentleman across the floor of the House. I cannot hold the deputy responsible for his replies; I must hold the minister who made the replies.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And the reply happens to be according to the actual facts.

Mr. BRADBURY. If the reply is according to the facts, I was quite right in saying that the minister was hardly ingenuous in making the reply, because if he knew the facts, his statement that it was contingent upon the Realty Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway doing something was not accurate. Consequently I think my statement that the minister was not perfectly ingenuous is in accordance with the facts. I do not wish to antagonize the minister; but I am here a new member and I have a duty to my constituency to perform. This work should have been carried out to protect life and property. If the intention of the government is to create a harbour at that place there is no question that one is needed, that would be open to the lake boats. I understood from the minister that it was simply a pier, and when I made the statement that I had thought it was used principally by people from Winnipeg I stated what was accurate and at the same time if a harbour was created there it would be a great benefit to the lake traffic. I do not intend to take up any more time upon this question, but I am sorry that the minister has seen fit to make the statement across the floor of the House that I have been guilty of conduct that an hon. member should not be guilty of.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A statement by an hon. member that another hon. member had been guilty of conduct unbecoming to a member of the House would have been checked by the chairman.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not use that expression.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not think I am misquoting the hon. gentleman. I think he made the statement that when I said he was not ingenuous I had done what no hon. gentleman should do in this House. I hold that when I made that statement I was stating simply what the facts warranted me in stating and I think the hon. gentleman ought to withdraw his statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not make it; therefore I could not withdraw it.

Mr. ROCHE. Is this vote for the repair of bridges built by this government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a general expression. It says Dominion bridges. There would only be one at Shellmouth.

Mr. ROCHE. Is that the only Dominion bridge that has been constructed in Manitoba?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so. I am not aware of any other.

Mr. ROCHE. The minister will remember that a short time ago I had some communication with him in reference to a bridge across the Assiniboine river not far from the town of Roblin. The minister's reply was not favourable stating that this bridge could not be looked upon as a Dominion work and explaining that in the province of New Brunswick all interior bridges were constructed by the provincial government. That was not very useful information to me inasmuch as each province probably has its own particular system. The province of Manitoba grants fifty per cent of the cost of the construction of bridges and the municipalities contribute the other fifty per cent. In this case the bridge I asked for is very much in the same position as the Shellmouth bridge inasmuch as it is across the same river, close to the boundary line between Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and the people of Saskatchewan make the town of Roblin on the Manitoba side their market town. I might draw the minister's attention to the fact that the people there have been very hard hit for a couple of years past, they have been visited by frost, their crops have been injured, they are not wealthy people and they are not in a position to construct this bridge. Inasmuch as it is really, in effect, an interprovincial bridge I thought I was justified in asking the government to give a grant as they did in the case of the Shellmouth bridge. I would like to ask the minister to reconsider his decision in that regard. There is this to say about the Shellmouth bridge, that it is a splendid bridge, but far more money was expended on that bridge than there was any necessity for. Upwards of $43,000 was expended upon that bridge, it was built higher by several feet than there was any necessity for and the result was that it imposed an unnecessary expenditure upon the municipality to build the approaches to the bridge. There have been other bridges across that river constructed by municipalities in Manitoba at a cost of less than $10,000. This has been a very expensive bridge and the government could easily have constructed three bridges with that amount of money and thus have given accommodation to a greater number of people. I would ask the minister if he does not think that this bridge, is just as much entitled to a grant from the Dominion government because it is as much an interprovincial bridge as the bridge at Shellmouth ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be pretty difficult to justify the building of this bridge. We were criticised a good deal by reason of having built the Shellmouth bridge.

Mr. ROCHE. Adversely criticised ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ROCHE. By whom?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know by whom; probably by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. If the hon. gentleman had been here last night he would have heard a very severe criticism of my department because, two or three years ago, permission had been given to a municipality in the province of Quebec to rest one end of its bridge upon a wharf which had been constructed by this government. Suppose the constituency which my hon. friend so worthily represents had been represented by a Liberal and he had found an item for building a bridge in that constituency how the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) the lieutenant of the leader of the opposition, would have railed against us for engaging in the construction of what should have been a local work. The ground upon which the Shellmouth bridge was justified was that the territory adjoining the province of Manitoba was not a province but was part of the Northwest Territories and all public works at that time in the territories were carried on at the expense of the federal government. It was also justified on the ground that the Dominion government owned a large area of land to which this bridge would give access. It was somewhat difficult to justify it, quite a point was strained, but I am afraid that if we were to build another bridge wholly within a province it would be difficult to justify it. At all events I was obliged to give to my hon. friend the answer that I did give, that I did not feel that I could ask my colleagues for an appropriation for constructing what would be entirely a provincial bridge.

Mr. ROCHE. I think the minister is quite incorrect when he says that the grant was adversely criticised in this House. The only criticism called forth by the item was by myself, and it was not adverse criticism, but rather because of the fact that the vote appeared year after year in the estimates and very little progress was made with the construction of the bridge. The item first appeared in the estimates in 1904 prior to the election at the instigation of the then Liberal candidate who made the construction of that bridge his principal drawing card in the contest. This is the first occasion upon which I have heard the reasons assigned by the minister to-night. One was the fact that the government had a certain amount of land in that vicinity and the other was that the province of Saskatchewan had not been formed at that time. I feel convinced that the bridge, the construction of which I am urging upon the government, is just as necessary and just as much entitled to a grant from the Dominion government as was the Shellmouth bridge. The minister told us that he had some difficulty in persuading his colleagues around the council board and in justifying the grant to the Shellmouth bridge. I thought that most strange because the bridge was nearly completed before he came into the cabinet at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I had to call for a large additional vote to go on with the work.

Mr. ROCHE. $43,000 was too much to expend on that bridge and there is no necessity for any such expenditure.

Lake Dauphin—lowering lake by removing obstructions from bed of Mossy river, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government are doing this with their own plant.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. $10,000 was spent last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Carried.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You would not carry that? I would like to know how that expenditure of $10,000 was made last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Cost of material purchased $1,025; day's labour, chiefly the building of the dredge, $8,263.77.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What was the material that cost $1,025?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be lumber for the dredge and machinery as well.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Where is this dredge being built?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Right at the site of the work.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Where is the site of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At the Mossy river.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Which end of the Mossy river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell which end; I think it is about the middle of the river.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was this material bought by tender ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, bought at the lowest price in the usual way. We got prices.

Mr. CAMPBELL. From whom ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell you, a great deal of it would be lumber.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Has that dredge been built?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not completed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is it even partially built?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, I was at that place and there is no sign of a new dredge being built although there is a pile of lumber there which I was told was for the purpose of building a dredge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When was the hon. gentleman there?

Mr. CAMPBELL. In November. When were these expenditures made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the dates of the expenditure. We have not had a report recently from the resident engineer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who is the resident engineer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Dufresne, at Winnipeg. He thought he would complete it in three months.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In the case of a large expenditure like this I am perfectly justified in asking from whom the material was bought and why it was not bought by tender. My late opponent was in the lumber business and I want to know how much he has profited, if at all?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The department would have to communicate with the resident engineer and I would be glad to get the information and lay it on the table or hand it to my hon. friend. I will undertake to wire to Winnipeg.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If it was bought from the source I suspect, it came very near to be a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. Will you please take that into consideration?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get the information.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Where is the work to be done with this expenditure of $5,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the Mossy river.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Where on the Mossy river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Between Lake Dauphin and Lake Winnipeg. There are about 3,500 feet of river to be improved and of course the work will be done where there are most obstructions.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The purpose is to lower Lake Dauphin?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To clear the bed of the river, remove boulders and straighten the course.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am anxious for information about this because the government dredge has been working at the mouth of the Mossy river for the past five or six years and if this new dredge is going to be operated as the old one was it will not be of much use. The old dredge was equipped with a crane and the sand and mud taken out on one side of the dredge were dumped again into the creek at the other side of the dredge, to be washed back into the channel with every northeast wind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How many years ago is that?

Mr. CAMPBELL. As late as the time of the general elections last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will you allow me to say——

Mr. CAMPBELL. Excuse me first, because I don't want you to put words in my mouth, as I notice you are very fond of doing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The chairman should be addressed, and if reference is made to any other hon. member he must be referred to in the third person.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I submit of course to the ruling of the chair. Does that rule apply both ways?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then I would ask the chairman to notice that the Minister of Public Works has been addressing me as 'you.' What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The remark I made is applicable to both hon. members who used the expression.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The people living on Lake Dauphin are very anxious that this work should be done, and I trust that the money will be properly expended and not absolutely wasted as it has been at the mouth of the river for the past five or six years. They have succeeded in removing in six or seven years one boulder down at the mouth of the river, and as there are some thousands of them to be removed at the source of the river it will apparently take a considerable time to complete the work. How you are going to remove the boulders with a dredge is beyond my understanding. That dredge has been nothing more or less than a political dredge and the money expended there has been wasted. The government tell us that these are hard times, and so I want the money used and not wasted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear, that is right; that is the way we try to use it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman. Is it permissible to look a little lower down in the estimates and to ask if money which is going to be expended in other places should be expended in my riding where it is more necessary?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is not in order to move that the money in one item should be used for another purpose.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If it were in order, I would have very much liked that some of the useless expenditure which I see is going to be made in Saskatchewan, for instance, should be made in Lake Manitoba.

Mr. BRADBURY. A few evenings ago I directed the attention of the minister to the condition the bridge is going to be left in across the St. Andrews rapids, and I now want to renew my statement that it is the duty of the government to complete that bridge. There is no question that the bridge has cost a great deal of money. The provision for the bridge is made, and I presume that it will be completed and planked, and that it will then be left standing in the middle of the Red River, with no connection at either side. I contend that the large expenditure that has been made on it is entirely unjustifiable if the government does not complete it. The bridge will remain and the planks put on it will rot, and it will stand as a monument that will be no credit to the Minister of Public Works. The reply I got from the hon. minister was that the local government or the municipalities ought to make these connections. Every one from Manitoba knows that the municipalities are utterly unable to provide the money that will be necessary to make those connections. I am told by competent men that it will take from $75,000 to $100,000 to complete the bridge so that a vehicle could drive across it, and it is of course utterly impossible to expect that the municipalities can supply that money. The government have expended nearly $1,250,000 in providing the dam across the river and putting the bridge there, as far as they have gone.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Building locks as well, so that there would be a bridge under any circumstances.

Mr. BRADBURY. There would be a working bridge; but if provision had not been made for a passenger bridge I am satisfied that it would have cost the country at least $100,000 less than it has cost. My argument is that the government having seen fit to make provision for a passenger bridge, which I think was wise, the intention was to give the residents on both sides of the river a first-class bridge, but if the bridge is allowed to remain as it is, it will simply be useless as a passenger bridge, and the municipalities are not in a position to provide the connections. I again urge the government strongly to complete the work in its own interest.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I want to correct one statement of the hon. gentleman. He speaks of the planking on the bridge rotting. I may say there is no planking on the bridge. It is to be steel and concrete entirely.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before the item passes, I would like some assurance from the minister that he will see that this money is expended in a proper way, and not in the ways that moneys have been expended in the past.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That assumes something of which I have no evidence—that there has been any improper expenditure in the past. He would not expect me to admit that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like an assurance from the hon. minister that he will see that this money is properly expended for the purposes stated here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman can rest assured that the same prudent and economical management will take place in connection with this expenditure as we endeavour to have in all matters connected with my department.

River Assiniboine—improvements near Portage la Prairie, $1,000.

Mr. ROCHE. Is this for the same work that was carried on there last fall?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The same work. This is to settle land damages. The work has been completed.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.45 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 22, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the year ending March 31, 1908, part III.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

RAILWAY COMMISSION.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. S. SHARPE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) to a despatch which appeared in the 'Mail and Empire' of March 14, with respect to the Railway Commission. It says that Mr. Buell, of Brockville, representing the government, is presenting the complaints against the express company. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if this is a permanent counsel appointed in connection with the Railway Commission and, if so, why is there this discrimination in favour of the western shippers as against the eastern shippers? Why are not the farmers of North Ontario provided with counsel the same as the shippers of the west are?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). This is rather an old story. Mr. Buell has been engaged for some time investigating express matters for the commission. I do not know just what this particular work is but he is not a counsel engaged to present the general complaints of the people against the railway companies. This is rather an investigation into the methods of the express companies which has been going on for a year and a half or two years.

QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege or explanation. Bill (No. 69) has been on the Order Paper for a considerable length of time. I was expecting that it would be reached and when it was reached I intended to make an explanation which was due to the House with regard to something I said when the Bill was introduced. It was a Bill to amend the Land Act and I made the statement based on a memorandum handed to me containing the minutes and proceedings of the Senate, which showed that the Bill as it had passed the Senate had contained an amendment. I stated that the amendment made by the Senate had been dropped and that the Bill had passed this House and received the assent of His Excellency without the amendment. I also referred to section 42 of the Bill, but I do not purpose saying anything in reference to that now as at some future time I may have an opportunity of dealing with it. I simply want to say that I made a very careful inquiry into the whole matter and I found that a misapprehension had been created owing to a mistake made with respect to the matter in the Minutes and Proceedings and the 'Hansard' of the Senate. I have a copy of the minutes which gives the facts exactly as I gave them to the House, but I

find that the minutes are entirely wrong. The clerk of the Senate turned up the record and showed me that the Bill had passed the House without this amendment being in it, although the minutes stated that it had been carried in the affirmative. It came to this House and was passed. I was quite satisfied that I had done a grave injustice to some person, myself and the House by basing my remarks on a statement that was not justified by the facts. I merely make this explanation in justice to the clerk of the Senate and to others through whose hands the Bill passed. The mistake was entirely unintentional.

Mr. BLACK. I want to say a word on a question of privilege. On Friday last I made some remarks with reference to the Dominion Atlantic Railway which runs through the county in which I live. In these remarks I said that I had had an interview with the manager of the road. The sentence I used was this:

I was talking to the manager of that road and he said in one breath that they would not sell and in the next that anybody who bought the road must buy the steamers also.

I said that the manager said that they would not sell. 'Hansard' reported me as saying that the manager said they wanted to sell. This may appear a trifling matter, but it is quite a serious matter to the manager of the road. I would like a correction made more in the interest of the manager of the road than of myself.

INVESTIGATION INTO DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr Speaker, may I be permitted to renew my inquiry to the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as to when there will be some information given to parliament and to the country as to the action which the government propose to take, if the government propose to take any action, with respect to the report of Mr. Justice Cassels relating to the investigation which he has made. The Prime Minister will no doubt remember that I made this inquiry on Wednesday, I think it was, the week before last. The Prime Minister then thought he would be able to make some announcement with regard to it during the then coming week. I understand perfectly that he has been unable to do so and I am not complaining of that, but as the matter may have escaped his attention I take the opportunity of referring to it again.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The matter has not escaped my attention, but owing to some circumstances I could not take it up last week. Perhaps I may communicate with my hon. friend again on this matter to-morrow or the day after.

Mr. SPROULE.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BARNARD. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) when the return may be expected that I moved for on the 17th February in connection with the expenditure of public moneys on wharfs in British Columbia.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Orders have been given to hurry it as rapidly as possible, but I will make inquiry.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works as to the return in reference to Bonaventure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is being hurried along too.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to call the minister's attention to the fact that we are now a month and twenty-two days waiting for it, and it is a long time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend must bear in mind that there are a great many motions for returns and that ordinarily they have to take their turn in the department. They are being hurried as rapidly as possible. I will make inquiries.

CANADA LIFE ASSURANCE CO.

Further consideration in committee of the whole of Bill (No. 56) respecting the Canada Life Assurance Company. Mr. A. H. Clarke.

On section 1,

Mr. LENNOX. On this Bill we have a very eminent legal opinion on behalf of the policy holders, and as consideration was adjourned so that we might hear the opinion of the Minister of Justice I think we should have that opinion now.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. That does not apply to the first section.

Mr. LENNOX. The opinion of the Minister of Justice may go to the root of the whole matter as to whether we should pass the legislation or not.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Section 2, is the section with regard to which an opinion has been asked. This first section simply deals with the date of the annual meeting of the company.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It is quite true that section 1 is comparatively inoffensive but when the Bill was brought before us a week ago the member for North Simcoe asked that it be held over pending the opinion of the Minister of Justice both as to its legality and as to the wisdom of passing the legislation asked for. If we pass the recital of the Bill we in a measure commit ourselves to the principle. What can be gained by passing this one clause alone?

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. We are on the first clause and not on the recital.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not suppose that the first clause is very important but the question now is whether or not we shall have the opinion of the Minister of Justice on this important question to the people of Canada. We might as well get down to the root of the matter once and for all. We have had the gratuitous opinion of the Minister of Justice in a very defined way; I might almost say in an extravagant and heated way, upon a question not so important as this, and if the opinion of the Minister of Justice is not yet ready on this Bill we had better postpone its consideration. I do not say I will be guided wholly by the opinion of the Minister of Justice but I will certainly be influenced by it to the extent of giving it very serious consideration. We have the opinion of a very eminent counsel in England on this Bill and we know generally speaking that the Minister of Justice has very pronounced opinions upon giving legislation retroactive effect. This is a question that affects 35,000 policy-holders in Canada so that it is a matter of great importance.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I submit that this discussion is entirely out of order and I ask the Chairman to rule that when one section is being discussed it is not in order to discuss a subsequent section of the Bill.

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not agree with the promoter of the Bill (Mr. A. H. Clarke). The discussion on this Bill was adjourned for the purpose of getting the opinion of the Minister of Justice, and after we get that opinion we may not want to go on even with the first clause. I think the promoter of this Bill will make more progress if the Minister of Justice gives his opinion now, as some of us will be guided to a very large extent by that opinion.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I understand that some members of the committee have expressed a wish that I should pronounce some sort of opinion with reference to this legislation. I scarcely know upon what point that opinion is desired. Upon any legal question that arises with regard to this or any other legislation which may be under consideration I am at any time ready to express any opinion that I may entertain, but my difficulty is in seeing what legal question arises upon the legislation now before the committee. It may be that the question is as to the necessity for this legislation, and I can quite understand that there may be different opinions in that respect; it may be that there is no need for it. On the other hand it may be that under the true construction of the statute of 1879, which this legislation proposes to amend or to interpret, a result has been reached which was not the intention of parliament in 1879 when the previous legislation was passed. Now, with respect to what the true construction of the statute of 1879 may be, the whole question is no doubt one of law as to the interpretation of the language then used. Upon that subject I formed an opinion some months ago when the question was raised before the Department of Justice upon a reference to that department by the superintendent of insurance, and the opinion which I then expressed and which for my part I still entertain as a matter of law is, that under the wording of the Act of 1879, and giving to the language there used its strict legal interpretation, the company or the shareholders of the company cannot deduct from the general earnings of the company a percentage by way of interest upon the amount of their capital stock before calculating 90 per cent of the profits for distribution among the policy-holders.

I presume that the legal advisers of the company are of the same opinion, or this legislation would not be presented. So much for the opinion which as a matter of law I entertain as to the meaning and effect of the legislation of 1879. I do not know any ground upon which the competence and power of this parliament to pass the legislation which is now under consideration could properly be questioned. The matter is, so far as I can see, entirely within the jurisdiction of this parliament. I do not know any other question of law that arises. If it is a question of the propriety or wisdom of passing the legislation which is now before the committee, I respectfully take the position that every hon. member of this House is as well qualified as I am to come to a conclusion on the subject. That is not any matter of law. That is merely a matter of the propriety and advisability of passing or refusing to pass this legislation. But if any hon. gentleman desires to know what course I propose, as an individual member of this House, to take with regard to this legislation, I have no objection to stating it, whatever it is worth. So far as I am concerned, I intend to support the legislation, and I rest myself in doing so upon the action of the committee to which it has been referred. I think, in the matter of any private Bill, it is not usual for this House, or this Committee of the whole House, to decline to accept the considered action of any special committee which has taken the legislation into consideration and has passed an opinion with regard to it; and certainly I am prepared to credit the special committee in this case with having had established before it, before its report was presented to the House, such considerations as in its view justified it in the report which it made

favouring the proposed legislation. It seems to me peculiarly a question for consideration before a committee. The second section of this Bill, which is I suppose the only one about which any special amount of controversy would be likely to arise, is a declaratory section, stating what was the intention with which the legislation of 1879 was passed. That I take it is a pure question of fact in regard to which the committee which investigated this question is in a better position certainly than I am, and probably than any member of the House can be, to come to a correct conclusion. In the everyday experience of a practising lawyer, it is not an infrequent thing to find, in any legal document, that the true intention of the parties to that document may not have been correctly expressed. Every lawyer is familiar with an action brought by one of the parties to a contract, before a court of equity, to have the language in which that contract, if it has been reduced to writing, has been expressed, rectified by the court—to have the language of the document made to express what was the true intention of the contracting parties. In any such action, if it is resisted, we always have of necessity the opposing litigant declaring that the document as drawn expresses the true intention, that he so understood the bargain; and perhaps he will contend that he has altered his position upon the faith of his understanding of the language used in the document which expresses the contract. To determine what is the truth, in such a controversy, is the function of the court, and the court if it reaches the conclusion that the complainant is right, and that the written document does not truly express what was at the time of the contract the intention of the parties, does not hesitate to correct the writing and to express what it finds to have been the true intention with which the writing was signed. I take it that is exactly the position here. No court could correct this error in the language used by the parties thirty years ago; no court of equity could interfere in a matter of this sort. The only tribunal which could correct the mistake, if there has been one, is this tribunal, the high court of parliament; and in coming to a conclusion whether or not that correction should be made, this high court of parliament, I take it, ought to act not only cautiously and judiciously, but also judicially and on judicial principles. The first thing to be satisfied is that there was a mistake. It was, I take it, the function of the committee which considered this legislation to be satisfied of that; and in the view that before reporting this Bill the committee must have been satisfied that such a mistake did occur, it seems to me there is no difficulty on the part of members of the House who rely upon the work of the committee in accepting its conclusions. If it is the fact that there was a mistake in the language used in the legislation of thirty years ago, then that mistake ought to be now corrected. If the conduct of the parties interested, through all the years since 1879, demonstrates that there was such a mistake, and that that mistake was common to both parties interested, I presume that there would be no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that parliament to-day ought to say in clear terms what it would have said in 1879, if the danger of misunderstanding or erroneous interpretation had been then present to the mind of parliament. This legislation proposes to enact that in the language used in the Act of 1879, what was intended was that before arriving at the amount, annually or quinquennially, as the case might be, of the profits of this company, which were to be distributed to the policy-holders, the interest upon the amount of paid up capital might be deducted.

If that was the intention in 1879, and if that intention had then been clearly expressed, of course there would be no need for this legislation. We are asked to-day to determine what was the true intention in 1879 and to give expression to it. I was not present in the Committee on Banking and Commerce and am not able to say what facts were brought before that committee to satisfy it that this was the intention in 1879; but it has come to my knowledge in various ways that ever since 1879, the business of the company has been carried on under that impression. If we look at the conduct of the policy-holders, who received, under the statute of 1879, certain increased benefits, I would think that there was evidence in their conduct pointing to a like interpretation on their part. So far as I understand the situation, from that day to this, every policy-holder has acquiesced in this course of business. I have not heard that from 1879 up to the present time, any policy-holder has effectively objected, by bringing an action to have it declared that the course of business pursued by the directors in this respect was contrary to the true meaning of the statute of 1879. If any such action were before the courts, probably different considerations might arise. Probably, the question then for consideration by this committee would be whether or not such action could be interfered with by legislation. But so long as no litigation is on foot in connection with this difficulty, it seems to me that what we have is at most a difference of opinion between the shareholders and the policy-holders as to the meaning of the old statute of 30 years ago. I do not know that there is such a thing as a vested right arising out of a mistake. I have never heard that any defendant, resisting an

action brought before a court of equity to rectify the terms of a writing into which he had entered, could be heard to say that while the writing did not truly express the bargain, he had a vested right to hold his adversary to the consequences of the mistake. The whole question for the court to determine would be whether or not there was a mistake; and if the court came to the conclusion that there was, it would disregard any contention of the defendant that he had a vested right to hold his adversary to the consequences of a common mistake between the two. I speak with some deference. I have a personal interest in this matter. I am a policy-holder in the company to a considerable amount and am not a shareholder. If this legislation does wrong to the policy-holders, it injures me personally as much as any policy-holder whose policy is not greater than mine. But the whole question narrows itself down to the one question of fact, whether or not the Act of 1879 did really and accurately give expression to what then was the intention of parliament and of those who applied to parliament? If it did not, the mistake ought to be corrected, and no one has any right to claim that he is being injured because that mistake is now being made right.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The clause before the committee is No. 1, regarding the annual meeting. If it be the desire of the committee to discuss clause 2, there should be a motion to that effect. Otherwise the committee must confine itself to clause 1.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I move that clause No. 2 be considered.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If it was the desire of hon. members to ascertain from the Minister of Justice what position the government took with respect to this Bill and the retroactive character of the legislation proposed, that desire has been disappointed. If on the other hand, it was the desire of hon. members to secure any light on the subject from the Minister of Justice himself, in his personal capacity as a member of this House, then that desire has also been disappointed. But if the members of this House expected to have an expression of opinion from the hon. minister, based on reasons that are utterly unfounded, that expectation has not been disappointed. The Minister of Justice takes first the ground that this legislation has reached a status by reason of its having passed the Committee on Banking and Commerce, where he is not as free to oppose it as he otherwise would be. Not being a member of long standing, I do not wish to discuss at any length that position; but I am not aware that the mere passing of a Bill of this character through the Committee on Banking and Commerce places it in a position where is is beyond the responsibility of the government and does not require any endorsation from the minister, within whose particular province it falls. But on the other hand, I would draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to this feature of his own argument. He assures us that he holds a specific opinion, which he has entertained for some time, as to the legal effect of the amending Act of 1879, which opinion he believes the solicitors of the Canada Life Insurance Company also entertain. Let me point out to him that the very solicitor of the Canada Life who urged the passage of the Bill through the committee, did not make any such representation to that committee but the very opposite. Therefore if the position on that point taken by the Minister of Justice be correct, we should refer the Bill back to the committee, because the committee was absolutely misled regarding the position taken by the legal advisers of the Canada Life. The legal advisers of the Canada Life Assurance Company, or, at least, the adviser who was before the committee, distinctly stated to the committee that, in his view, the amending Act of 1879 meant what they now desire to have it declared to mean—meant that the profits there referred to did not include interest on capital stock. He stated that a contrary opinion had been given, and it was to remove the utmost possibility of doubt that this Bill was before the House. That is very different, and very materially different, from the position taken by the Minister of Justice, which position, he assures the House, is the legal stand taken by the solicitors of the Canada Life. Therefore. the Bill was put through the committee in such a way that it should not receive further sanction or higher status in the eyes of either of the Minister of Justice or of any member of this House. Now, the Minister of Justice goes on to further argue that only a pure question of fact was before the committee, and that that committee was as competent to judge of the fact as he or any other member of the House. What are the facts? In 1849 the Canada Life Assurance Company took out a charter. By the terms of that charter they were required to distribute their profits to the policy-holders and shareholders on the basis of 75 per cent and 25 per cent respectively.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. What section of the Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I have not the Act before me, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. H. Clarke) will not deny——

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) refers to what was in the deed of settlement. In the Act there

was nothing of that kind, it was left entirely to their discretion.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Perhaps it was in the deed of settlement of 1847——

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. You are right.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The point is immaterial. As the law stood at the time of the Act, and perhaps for some years before, the distribution had been on the basis of 75 per cent and 25 per cent, the company besides laying by a reserve of 4·67 per cent interest on their capital stock. By the amending Act of 1879, procured at the request of the company, a clause was inserted reciting that the company had been distributing during these years their entire profits and enacting that thereafter the distribution should take place in the proportions of 90 per cent and 10 per cent instead of 75 per cent and 25 per cent. Now, for some thirty years the Canada Life has proceeded upon the basis of the Act but has continued to put by a reserve of 4·67 per cent for the shareholders before arriving at the profits which they were to distribute in the proportion of 90 per cent and 10 per cent. The Minister of Justice takes the position that the question before us is simply a question of fact. He says the high court of parliament is in the position of an ordinary court of justice which has to deal with two litigants who have entered into a contract, one claiming that the contract is a mistake and the other resisting the claim, and the one resisting the claim perhaps setting up that he has acquired rights under that contract on the basis of that alleged mistake. The minister says that the parties now come before the high court of parliament in an analogous position. That is the foundation of his case. Is that a correct statement of the position? I submit that it is not. Do the two parties who entered into that contract in 1879 appear before parliament? They do not. The only party to that arrangement of 1879 was the House of Commons of Canada. The parties to the contracts appeared later, and they were the Canada Life Assurance Company and the 35,000 policy-holders, who, since that date, have acquired rights by the Act of 1879. The two parties as they existed in 1879 do not come before the high court of parliament. If there was any mistake, then it cannot be attributed either to the Canada Life Assurance Company or to the policy-holders, nor can it be attributed to the shareholders of that time. The mistake, if there were a mistake, is to be attributed to the parliament of Canada alone. Therefore, the legislation which the Minister of Justice now favours is not to correct the mistake of any of these other parties in 1879, but to correct a mistake of the parliament of Canada—that is, granting that it is a mistake. But who are the parties who are interested in this matter at the present time? Even assuming that the Minister of Justice's statement as to the analogous position of the parties is right—that is, that the parties to this contract who erred were the shareholders and the policy-holders of 1879—are they the parties in any sense who come before this House now? They are not. The parties before this House are the shareholders and policy-holders of 1909—different parties altogether. Thirty-five thousand policy-holders have come in since 1879 who were not parties to the alleged mistake of 1879, who derived no rights from the parties to that mistake, but stand in an absolutely distinct position and on a higher level altogether, and it is from the point of view of these policy-holders that this Bill should be considered. Has the Minister of Justice discussed the case from the point of view of the 35,000 policy-holders who have come in since 1879? Not a word has he uttered in his statement, which has been looked forward to for eight days in this House, with respect to the policy-holders; not for one moment has he stood in the position of these policy-holders or argued the matter from their point of view. The innocent policy-holders are the first to be considered. They are greatest in number and their rights are the greatest, and we should discuss this matter, and the Minister of Justice should have discussed this matter, from their point of view.

The Minister of Justice goes on to argue that the policy-holders have acquiesced. I have yet to hear it argued in a court of justice—where some very strange things are sometimes argued—that the acquiescence in any position of any party who is not a party to the original contract is a reason why that party should be deprived of rights which he otherwise would have. These 35,000 policy-holders either have rights under their contract with the Canada Life Assurance Company, or they have no rights. The Minister of Justice was considering whether or not they had rights which this Bill affected, and he frankly comes before this House and tells us that he thinks they have rights and that this Bill affects those rights. But he says that they have had these rights for thirty years and have never come before a court of justice and asked for redress. Is he going to set it up as a precedent that because certain citizens of Canada have slept on rights for thirty years that that is justification for the House of Commons of Canada to pass an Act to cut under those rights and take away the foundations on which they rest? If he does, where will his precedent carry him? If rights are not to be observed simply because no one has chosen to enforce them in courts of justice, then by what criterion does the Minister of Justice decide whether

he cuts into vested rights or not? This afternoon he comes forward and says there is no litigant. I regret that the rules of the House forbid me from referring to a discussion that took place about two weeks ago in reference to a similar principle. I will say, however, that the acquiescence of parliament has never in the past been held to have destroyed the rights of citizens in any way. Now they have the rights, but the Minister of Justice says they are not in litigation, therefore he says parliament is justified in cutting them out. Does the Minister of Justice lay it down as a principle that vested rights are not vested rights until they are in litigation? Have they no status in his mind until they reach the status of litigation? Are not vested rights just as sacred to him and to this House before they are the subject of a lawsuit as they become by virtue of a lawsuit? Will they by virtue of a lawsuit reach a position and a degree of sacredness that they did not possess before? Furthermore, has it ever been argued by the Justice Department of this country, has it ever been argued within three weeks of this date, that the outrage, that the violation of the 8th commandment consisted in taking away the position of a litigant, the footing of a litigant, after he got into court? Has it not rather been argued that the outrage and violation consisted in denying the right to litigate? It was the right to litigate that was before sacred in the eyes of the minister, it was access to the courts of justice that was sacred to them, and it was the taking away of that access that was an outrage. Why is it not an outrage to-day? Surely it is not the policy of the House of Commons to stand between a litigant and the court. Is it any more right and just to step in between the litigant and a court of justice than to go to the court and throw the litigant out? I see no difference. It has always been, as I have understood, the doctrine propounded by the Minister of Justice himself, and by the hon. gentleman who proposed this Bill, that the cardinal outrage of legislation of this kind was in cutting out the right to litigate, and not in throwing the litigant out of court. Why is that position changed? Why do the promoters of the Bill now come to parliament and say that these people cannot be said to have vested rights because they have not yet asserted them? Surely, that position is unworthy the dignity of this House, and unworthy the dignity and high standing of the Minister of Justice.

Now, what position are we to take? One of three positions we must take. Either firstly, the Act of 1879 is clear in its terms, and means that the profits include the same profits that any other business would include as profits, and include the interest on capital. If that is the case, then policy-holders who have come in since that time have absolutely vested rights, and this Bill is retroactive and takes away those vested rights. Surely the Minister of Justice, in receipt as he is and as he will not deny, and the Minister of Finance, in receipt as he is, and as he will not deny, and the Prime Minister, in receipt as he is, and as he will not deny, of specific statements of claims from policy-holders, from a policy-holder who has come in since that time, not only of a specific statement of his rights but of an absolute statement that he wishes to litigate those rights, surely these hon. gentlemen, in receipt of that very statement, and knowing his position as a responsible policy-holder of this company, will not say that they are not doing now exactly the same thing as taking away the rights of the litigant, and throwing him out of court as well. That is one case that may exist. Secondly, the Bill of 1879 may be absolutely clear in its provisions, and it may not mean that the profits include interest on the capital stock. If that is the case, then this legislation is null and void in so far as the second clause is concerned. Then the Canada Life Assurance Company would have no reason to come before this House and ask for an interpreting statute, because the legislation is now just in the position they want it. So that on the first two grounds they have no right to ask this parliament for legislation. But another state of affairs might exist. It might be that the Act of 1879 is doubtful in its meaning, that there is a latent or a patent ambiguity in it, and that it may mean that profits should include interest on capital stock, or it may not mean that. But if the third position is a correct statement of the case as it stands, then the courts of this country are established for the purpose of interpreting Acts of parliament; they are established for the purpose of saying what is the real meaning of this clause in the Act of 1879, that contains a latent or a patent ambiguity. Why should the House of Commons, in this case, step in and interpret this legislation, if it is doubtful, unless it proposes similarly to interpret legislation in every other case where it is doubtful, unless it proposes to usurp the functions of the court and act as interpreter as well as an author of legislation? Why does it step in in the interest of a large corporation against the interest of many poor policy-holders? If the meaning is doubtful, it is the province of the courts to interpret it; and I say that when this comes before the courts for determination, the considerations urged by the Canada Life Assurance Company and by the promotors of this legislation will be given such weight at the hands of the court as they ought to receive, as those considera-

tions should receive, no more and no less. Considerations of the intent of parliament, in certain cases, are entertained by the court; considerations of the intent of the promoters of the Bill in certain cases, are entertained by the court, and in every case where those considerations are entertained, they would be entertained in this case. Principles of equity and of justice in this country have determined to what extent and at what time such considerations as intent should apply. Why not leave it to the courts. The answer is that the Canada Life Assurance Company taking the ground that if this Act is doubtful in its meaning, want more consideration given to the intent on our part even as against innocent policy-holders, than they are entitled to have given it in a court of justice.

We want certain provisions to have certain definite meanings just as they would have if they were placed before the proper tribunal for interpretation. We want the rules of equity that apply in courts of justice to apply to this case in order to bring it to a definite conclusion and to achieve a definite result. I say that if this is a matter of doubtful interpretation as they themselves contend it is, it should go to the proper tribunal which will give every consideration its due and proportionate weight and no more. On whatever ground, on whatever principle we may apply with respect to the meaning of the Act of 1879, whether it be the first as outlined, that 'profits' have to be taken as meaning interest on capital, I say, it involves the principle of retroactive legislation and therefore this Bill is distinctly retroactive and unjustifiable on every ground of justice and equity. If it be the second, if the Act is clear and if the word 'profits' does not include interest on capital stock, then there is no need of the Bill at all. If it be the third, then it is clear, and the Minister of Justice will not deny, that it is the province of the courts of justice to interpret legislation. I think I have covered the ground as put forward by the Minister of Justice. Let me now call the attention of the committee to another consideration, which I frankly admit should not bear heavily with the members of this House, and which I do not think comes really to the kernel of discussion, because the kernel of the discussion is whether we are going to cut off these 35,000 policy-holders or not from any sound claims to which they are entitled and from which they will be cut off if this Bill should pass. The phase I desire, however, to refer to is that of an adequate return on invested captial. It is a well known fact that from the time the Act of 1879 was passed up to 1899 the capital stock of the Canada Life Assurance Company was $125,000. On that capital stock 4·67 per cent was laid aside as interest before the profits were arrived at. In 1899 that capital stock was increased and up to that time the reserve for interest amounted to the insignificant sum of some $5,800. The Minister of Justice might, in laying this matter before the House, have pointed out, I think very reasonably, that the policy-holders would not have benefited to any appreciable extent individually, by the compelling of their rights in a court as he says they should have done. It is only since 1899 that that might have been done and I think no one would contend that the results to the policy-holders would before 1899 have been at all commensurate with the outlay which would have been entailed in court. During these years from 1879 to 1899 the shareholders of the Canada Life Assurance Company were in receipt of very considerable premiums. They tell us now that unless this Bill passes we, who have put a million dollars into this company, will only get 3·6 per cent or 3·8 per cent and therefore at a very opportune time the Canada Life Assurance Company comes to this House and asks for this legislation. But, it was not always thus, nor would it be always thus? For twenty years, prior to 1899, their capital stock was receiving dividends and interest to the extent of 20, 30 and as high as 70 per cent. It would average, I believe, 30 per cent or probably more for the twenty years on the $125,000 of capital stock. Now they have increased the basis of their capital in order that they might get eight per cent on their money and they have come before us at the very time that the proportion of their capital stock, compared with the volume of their business, is large and when they are not able to extract the enormous dividends which they were enabled to extract in years gone by and which they will be able to extract in years to come. At a time when dividends are at the lowest they seize the opportunity to come before this parliament and ask for legislation. Is there any reasonable anticipation that the low dividends will continue? Just as in years gone by, before 1899, the volume of business as compared with the volume of their capital stock, was great and the dividends that they derived brought them thirty per cent, so, in years to come, as the volume of business of the Canada Life Assurance Company steadily increases, as the volume of business of all large life insurance companies is almost mathematically certain to increase, if this Bill fails to pass, it is practically a mathematical certainty that the rate of dividend which will accrue upon the million dollars of capital will be a great deal larger than it is today. So, we need have no apprehension on behalf of the shareholders. It is practically certain, there can be no reasonable

doubt, that the condition that prevailed before 1899, when the volume of business held a large proportion to the volume of the capital stock, will recur in years to come and that the volume of business will attain to the same proportion of the capital stock as in days gone by. There is no reasonable apprehension that these people under the law as it stands will not receive an adequate return on their money. The shareholders got together in 1899 and added to their capital stock to the extent of $875,000. Were they compelled to do so by any legislation from this House? I think not. They did so voluntarily and if I am permitted to quote the Royal Insurance Commission, they unwarrantedly increased their capital stock to the detriment of the policyholders. I am quoting that statement from the report of the Royal Commission. The Act of 1879 meant the same in 1899 as it means to day and will always mean unless this retroactive legislation is passed. They added to their capital with their eyes open and if that be so why should we come to the assistance of these people and relieve them from the situation into which they voluntarily plunged and plunged for their own benefit? I do not propose to go on and discuss the action of the Canada Life Insurance Company in piling up systematically, hurriedly, precipitately, its reserve to some $2,500,000 instead of following the course outlined in the Insurance Act except to say that by that very action the Canada Life Assurance Company have put between the shareholders and possible loss in time to come that fortification, and that absolved them, one would reasonably think, not being an insurance expert, from any necessity of adding to the volume of their capital stock, and it would certainly absolve them from any right to come to this parliament and say that by virtue of adding to their captial stock and of the results thereof they are entitled to an Act declaring the meaning of an Act thirty years old and interfering with vested rights that have grown up during those thirty years. Let me, before concluding, make one reference to a statement of the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice says that the policyholders have slept on their rights for thirty years, that they have for these years been in that position and that they could have gone to the courts. The same argument exactly applies to the shareholders. The shareholders, for thirty years, have let the legislation stand while they could have gone to the court or come to parliament to ask to have it changed. I do not think it is fair to state that the policy-holders have stood on their rights for that time.

The fact that I am a policy-holder in this company for one thousand dollars only will not I hope influence my position on the Bill, but it enables me to say that for the eleven years I have been a policy-holder I do not recall ever receiving any statement from this company to show that interest had been cut off before the profits were determined. It is only reasonable to assume that very many policy-holders would be in the same position, and even if they took the trouble to scan this report and compare it with the Bill very few would even suspect that their rights were being infringed. We are here to preserve rights as they are and not to preserve rights after they are in litigation. I want to make an appeal to members of the House who perhaps up to this point have been led to support the Bill without knowing its real meaning. I believe there are many members in the House who supported the Bill in select committee without knowing it has a retroactive character as the Minister of Justice has frankly admitted it has. Therefore, the vote of these hon. gentlemen in the select committee in no way binds them to support the Bill in this Committee of the Whole. Let hon. gentlemen who support this Bill, seriously consider what they will be able to say in years to come when people may come to them and state that under a misapprehension of the law they have invested money, and now want parliament to help them out of their difficulty. How can we ever deny to such people redress, even at the expense of innocent parties, if we set a precedent now which I submit will be fatal in years to come?

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I wish to raise an objection as to the insufficiency oi the notice to the policy-holders who are affected by this legislation. I wish Mr. Chairman, to call your attention to No. 90 of the rules of the House :

> All applications to parliament for private Bills, of any nature whatsoever, shall be advertised by a notice published in the 'Canada Gazette'; such notice shall clearly and distinctly state the nature and objects of the application.

Now, in the face of that rule I desire to call your attention to the notice published by the promoters of this legislation :

> Notice is hereby given that application will be made to the parliament of the Dominion of Canada at the next session thereof for an Act to amend the Acts relating to the Canada Life Assurance Company by changing the date of the annual meeting and making necessary changes as to notices of meetings consequent thereon, and providing for any further changes in the date of such meeting.

You will see that this is a very formal notice and that it does not really go to the essence of this legislation. Next follows a very innocent little clause in the advertisement which sets out the notice to the

policy-holders who will be affected and it says :

Defining the provisions as to division of profits.

I submit for your ruling, Sir, that this is not sufficient notice to the policy-holders who are going to be affected by this legislation and that it does not conform to the rule of the House as to setting out the nature and object of the application. Then there is another objection which I take and on which I ask your ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I submit to the hon. gentleman that it would be more convenient to raise one point of order at a time and have that disposed of.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Then, Sir, I ask your ruling on that point, and I submit that the committee should send the Bill back to the Committee on Standing Orders to investigate as to the insufficiency of the notice. I do not believe that any member of this House can think such a notice sufficient to the 35,000 policy-holders, especially in regard to retroactive legislation which is undoubtedly detrimental to their interests. The notice does not say whether this legislation is in the interests of the policy-holders or against their interests; it is so bald that they could learn nothing from it as to the true meaning of the legislation. Then the notice continues to say:

And extending the powers of the company as to holding real estate in Ontario and for other purposes.

It will be seen that the most vital matter in the whole Bill is inserted in the most innocent way between two other matters of a subsidiary character. The policy-holders have not received proper notice that this important legislation of a retroactive nature which is detrimental to their interests will be proposed to this parliament. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if in your opinion you think that notice conforms to the orders and rules of the House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Whatever weight there may be in the point raised by the hon. member may be argument against proceeding with the Bill, but this committee is instructed to consider this Bill, and I do not think the point of order is well taken as such. The objection raised by the hon. member should be dealt with either in the previous select standing committee or by the House itself. I do not think it is a question for this committee of the whole.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. The next objection I desire to take against proceeding with the Bill at this time is, that the Select Committee on Banking and Commerce has introduced an amendment to the Bill that was not contemplated in the notice given to the public. I refer to clause 4, in which the select committee has changed the denomination of the shares. That goes to the very existence of the company because it gives the power of re-dividing the shares into denominations of $100 from denominations of $400. In other words it gives the shareholder four votes where previously he was only entitled to one vote. I submit that the policy-holders and the shareholders should be heard on this amendment before it is considered by this House. Clause 4 reads:

4. The shares of the capital stock of the said company, which are at present one hundred pounds (Canadian currency) or four hundred dollars each, shall hereafter be divided into shares of the denomination of one hundred dollars each, and each shareholder shall thereupon become entitled to, and be deemed the holder of, four shares of one hundred dollars each in respect of each of the shares held by him; and the books and share registers of the said company shall be amended so as to conform to the provisions of this Act.

In support of my objection I refer to Bourinot third edition, page 779.

Mr. NESBITT. Mr. Chairman, you have given your ruling and I would ask if the hon. gentleman is in order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is in order; the previous point of order having been disposed of the hon. member is now raising another point of order.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I quote from Bourinot, third edition, page 779:

It is the duty of the committee to which any private Bill may be referred by the House to call the attention of the House especially to any provision inserted in any such Bill that does not appear to have been contemplated in the notice for the same, as reported upon by the Committee on Standing Orders.

In case the committee do not so report, and a member is of opinion that certain provisions of a Bill are not contemplated in the notice for the same, he may raise a point of order, and it will be for the Speaker to decide. In such a case it is the more regular course to discharge the order for consideration in Committee of the Whole, and then refer the Bill to the Committee on Standing Orders.

The committee on a Bill have no authority to make any amendments therein which may involve an infraction of the standing orders, or which may affect the interests of the parties interested, without due notice having been given to the same.

These amendments were not mentioned in the notice to the public, and therefore I hold that we cannot proceed with this Bill. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, on that objection.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Before you rule, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that

the point of order which has just been taken has no reference whatever to section 2, which is now under the consideration of the committee. When we come to section 4, to which the objection refers, then will be the proper time to discuss it.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I might also, Mr. Chairman, call your attention to the following, in the journals of the House of Commons, of the 28th March, 1870, volume 3, page 116:

The orders of the day being read, for the second reading of the Bill to amend the Acts of incorporation of the Great Western Railway Company;

The Hon. Mr. Carling moved, seconded by Mr. Shanly, and the question being proposed, that the Bill be now read a second time;

And objection being taken by Mr. Cameron, member for the electoral district of the south riding of the county of Huron, that certain of the provisions of the said Bill as amended by the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines were not contemplated in the notice given under the rules of the House, nor in the petition praying for the passing of said Bill;

Mr. Speaker decided that the Bill should be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders to report whether the powers to be conferred are in excess of the notice given, or whether they are substantially included in it.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Carling, seconded by Mr. Shanly,

Ordered, that the said order be discharged; and the Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

This is a case identically in point, in which the Committee on Railways and Canals made an amendment to a Bill that was not contemplated in the notice. This amendment, changing the denomination of the shares from $400 to $100, goes to the very essence of the constitution of the company and affects the voting power of the different shareholders. Consequently I submit that we should not proceed with the Bill until notice of this amendment is published, so that the parties affected may be informed that such a change is proposed to be made in their vested rights.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It does not appear to me that the point of order is well taken. It is an argument or reason why this committee might refuse to continue consideration of the Bill and not really a point of order. The words quoted by the hon. gentleman state the fitting course in the House.

In such a case it is the more regular course to discharge the order for consideration in Committee of the Whole, and then refer the Bill to the Committee on Standing Orders.

As the Bill has been referred to this committee for consideration, I do not think the point of order which the hon. gentleman has raised holds.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Do you hold, Mr. Chairman, that I am in order to make that motion?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman may move that the committee rise and report progress, and then the question will be before the House.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I move that the committee rise and report progress, and that the order be discharged and the question be referred to the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think this committee can accept such a motion. The hon. member may move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again, or that the Chairman leave the Chair. I would desire further advice on the point, but I am not sure that this committee has any power to discharge a bill or refer it to any other committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that is correct. An order for the consideration of a Bill can only be discharged by the House with the Speaker in the Chair. The only course to be taken to carry out the intention of the hon. member would be for the committee to rise and report progress. Then, if the House thought proper, the Bill could be referred back to the Committee on Standing Orders for a further report on the sufficiency of the notice. I would like to point out to the Prime Minister that the notice in this case is extremely meagre, and does not seem to have covered what was intended to be done. The only portion of the notice which could by any possible straining of the English language refer to what was contemplated are the words :

Defining the provision as to the division of profits.

If the notice had announced what was the obvious intention of the promoters of this Bill, it would have stated that it was intended to declare by the legislation contemplated that 90 per cent and 10 per cent of the profits as expressed in the Act of 1879 should not in any way include the profits derived from the investment of the company's capital. That would have given ample notice to every policy-holder throughout the country of what was intended. I do not imagine that there is an hon. member of this House who really believes that the notice as printed in the 'Canada Gazette,' gave the slightest intimation to any policy-holder of the real intention of the promoters. As a matter of fact, every one of us knows that no such intimation was made to the policy-holders of the Canada Life. The result is that, without any actual hearing of the men who are entitled to a hearing, this Bill has been passed by the

Committee on Banking and Commerce ex parte in the true sense of the word, without the persons interested in that particular aspect of the question having the slightest notice to come here and maintain their rights. In my opinion the Bill ought to be sent back for that reason, if for no other.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) has raised, as I understand it, two points of order. The first one is the general one that the notice given was not sufficient to enable the policy-holders as well as the shareholders to know what was the intent of this Bill. I understand that the Chairman has ruled against this objection. The second objection which my hon. friend has taken is that a section has been introduced in the Bill changing the character of the shares by providing that shares of $400 can be converted into shares of $100. This seems to be an objection which is worthy of consideration. But I would suggest to my hon. friend that, as section 2 is now before the committee, we had better pass that section, and when we come to section 4, it will be open to my hon. friend to raise his point, and we shall then give it the best consideration at our command. There is some force in the objection raised by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, that the notice has not been sufficient to cover the Bill. That is a point which has been passed upon already by the Standing Orders Committee, by the Banking and Commerce Committee, and by the Chairman of this committee. It is not too late to take it up again, but I would suggest that we had better go on with this Bill and then raise the point when the Speaker is in the Chair, if it be considered necessary to raise it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that our Chairman has ruled, and ruled very properly, that this is not really a point of order at all. Even if it were demonstrated to him that no notice had been given, he could not entertain that as a point of order, nor could he entertain as a point of order the fact that sufficient time had not been allowed in the notice. I entirely agree with you, Mr. Chairman, in your ruling, but that does not absolve this committee from its duty. It does not absolve this committee from saying whether or not the 35,000 policy-holders in the Canada Life are entitled to better notice of this Bill than is to be found in the 'Canada Gazette.' Some time or other this committee will have to determine that, and that question arises just as well on this section as it will on section 4. I venture to repeat my conviction that the notice given is not such as was contemplated by our rules.

Mr. TURRIFF. As a policy-holder I may say that I did not receive any information of this legislation. I understand now that the matter was advertised in the 'Canada Gazette,' the Toronto 'News,' the Monetary 'Times,' and some other financial papers. I believe I am in about as good a position to have received the notice as the average holder of the 35,000 policy-holders of the same company; and I am free to admit that if I had received that notice, I would not have been able to understand from it the legislation contemplated in the Bill now before us. Therefore, I think the point is very well taken, and that this Bill should be referred back on account of the insufficient notice. We must bear in mind that there are 35,000 policy-holders whose money is at stake and that this legislation proposes to be retroactive, and that it wipes out, to a certain extent, rights which these policy-holders possess or think they possess. In my opinion, had the Committee on Banking and Commerce been given the opinion of the Minister of Justice, they would never have passed this Bill. As the notice sent is not sufficient, this Bill ought to be sent back, so as to give the policy-holders an opportunity to come before the Committee on Banking and Commerce and state their views.

Mr. A. H CLARKE. I hope my hon. friend will not go on the platform in his constituency at the next election and make such a grave admission of incapacity as he has just given us.

Mr. TURRIFF. I will take my chances.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. He says he has not any knowledge of what is proposed in this Bill almost up to the present moment. Well, the first reading was on the 11th of February, 1909, and the Bill has been on his file in his desk for more than a month. During all that time he has had before him the full text of the section we are now discussing. It is therefore rather surprising that he should get up in his place and say that he has not learned the contents of this Bill up to the present time.

An hon. MEMBER. He did not say that.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I do not understand that the rules of the House require that full particulars of a Bill should be given in the notice. The notice is to draw attention that a Bill is to be introduced on a particular subject, and I venture to say that in the notice referred to, there is as much information as is contained in any notice of the kind. There is certainly as much information regarding the division of profits as regarding the change of date and the acquisition of more real estate. We have an officer here whose business it is to deal with these matters. Rule 95 is very clear:—

There shall be an examiner of petitions for private Bills.

Petitions for private Bills, when received by the House, are to be taken into consideration by the examiner, who shall report to the House in each case the extent to which the requirements of the rules regarding notice have been complied with; and in every case where the notice is reported by the examiner to have been insufficient or otherwise defective, the petition shall be taken into consideration without special reference by the Committee on Standing Orders, who shall report to the House recommending the course to be taken in consequence of such insufficiency of notice or other defects therein.

Everything was conducted regularly. The petition came before the examiner and he examined whether the requirements regarding notice had been complied with. I suppose if the notice had been put in the Toronto 'Globe' instead of the Toronto 'News,' my hon. friend would have seen it. but it would not have been seen by others equally interested who read the Toronto 'News' and do not read the 'Globe.' The examiner is an official of great experience. He has been in the employ of the House of Commons many years. He examined the notice in this case and reported that it was in every particular in accord with the requirements of the rules; and on his attention being again drawn to the matter, he still maintained the opinion that the notice was sufficient.

Mr. MAGRATH. As a policy-holder, I am exceedingly sorry this matter is being discussed here. This discussion will not do the Canada Life any good. Some gentlemen who have amassed wealth may become too aggressive. There is too much haste about this Bill and the way it is going through this House. Two classes of securities are concerned in it—those held by the stock-holders and those held by the policy-holders. The first represent $1,000,000, and the second $25,000,000. I am not saying whether this Bill is right or wrong. As a policy-holder, I do not want my heirs to draw one dollar which belongs to the stockholders, but I do not propose that the shareholders shall draw one dollar which belongs to my heirs. As a policy-holder, and I suppose as a citizen of average intelligence, I should have something to say about legislation affecting my rights, and I positively got no intimation from the Canada Life of what they contemplated. That company, as a business organization, should have notified the people it was doing business with, and for whom it acts as trustee. We have other corporations coming before this parliament for legislation, corporations which have bondholders as well as stockholders; and it is a principle, I understand of legislation, which this parliament insists upon, that the assent of the bondholders should be obtained, up to a certain percentage, before any legislation affecting their rights is passed. I am not asking that in this case, but I say that we should insist that the people who are interested should be properly notified. I am personally strongly of the opinion that in the Insurance Bill before this House, there should be a clause providing that where insurance companies seek legislation affecting the interests of the policy-holders, they should be compelled to give each policy-holder two or three months' notice so that he may be in a position to protect himself. I say again, I do not know that this legislation is bad, I do not know that it is good, but I do know that the people who have a large amount of money in it have not been advised. And I say that it is no excuse to plead that these companies give notice in the papers. Other corporations who come for legislation likewise give notice in the papers, but this parliament insists that the stockholders shall have the assent of the bondholders before that legislation becomes effective. And I think that is a fair position to take. These gentlemen ought to be told to go back, and the policy-holders should be given an opportunity to consider their interest in this matter. It is true, there is a gentleman, Mr. Laidlaw, who has been sending around literature on this subject. I can say that Mr. Laidlaw does not represent me; he has never had authority from me as a policy-holder, to send out complaints to this House. I have not been consulted as a policy-holder. I think it is wrong that this legislation should pass under the circumstances.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The motion before the committee, as I understand it, is that the committee rise and report progress. I think that every hon. member will admit that we are now in a very unusual position. I think that every hon. member will admit that the importance of this Bill and the gravity of the issues involved are such that it would be most regrettable if hon. members, in dealing with this unusual position, did not approach it with perfect calmness and impartiality, and with a sincere desire not only to do justice but to maintain the dignity of the House. I think that your ruling, Mr. Chairman, is, beyond question, correct. I think that no hon. member will dispute the soundness of your statement that the objection taken—that notice was not sufficient—while, in my judgment, a good objection, was not taken when effect could be given to it. But we are in this peculiar position: Here is an important point raised, yet it cannot be adjudicated on the merits. We are in a peculiar position also for this reason—and I think I may refer to it on this motion that the committee rise and report. This Bill came before the House a few days ago and the House thought the opinion of the Minister of Justice of such importance that it was

agreed unanimously to let the Bill stand until that opinion could be obtained. The Bill everybody recognizes as retroactive legislation. But the gentleman who promoted the Bill before the committee—I am not a member of the committee, but I am informed—denied that this Bill was retroactive legislation, but said that, inasmuch as the words of the Act of 1879 admitted of the possibility of a different construction, therefore to prevent the possibility of a construction which the House had not intended, it was desirable that this Bill should pass. Now, under the view of the Minister of Justice as laid down, it is perfectly clear that this clause, if it passes, will be retroactive legislation. If that be the case, and if the gentlemen before the committee distinctly repudiated that stand but asked to have this clause passed on entirely different grounds, I think we should not be casting any reflection upon the committee if the House, in its wisdom, should send the Bill back to the committee and ask them to consider this important legislation in the light of the opinion of the Minister of Justice which, for the first time, has been made public to-day. When it comes to the question of the word 'profits,' in the notice given in the 'Gazette,' it strikes me that the notice was really no notice at all, because this word 'profits,' as used in the notice, is a new word coined for the occasion. I am not aware of any case in the English language in which the word is used in the sense in which it is used here in section 2. If a person of ordinary English education finds the word 'profits' in a notice of application to parliament, he naturally takes it in the sense in which he has been accustomed to hear it used, and the sense in which any dictionary to which he might refer would authorize its use. It is a common word; we have banks, loan companies, other insurance companies in relation to which the word 'profits' is used. It cannot be a matter of great difficulty to find out what the word means, and I venture to say that the shareholders of any bank, the Bank of Montreal, for example, would be very much surprised to find that the 'profits' of the bank were only a certain small sum after the interest on the capital—and, I suppose, reserve also for that matter, for that is really part of the capital—had been deducted. Surely, the idea is so monstrous that the only way one can account for its being used in the sense in which it is used in this notice is that the individual and the company have become, as it were, synonymous, and so the gentlemen drawing the application for the Bill fail to distinguish between them. But, in law, they are very different indeed, even though these gentlemen may not be aware of the fact. It is the company that makes profits, and it is not reasonable to speak of the company as making profits apart from its capital. The money is the money of the company; it is not the shareholders' money. When the shareholder pays in his money for his stock, it becomes the company's money. The company goes into business with the money, employs agents and does everything else required in the business, and makes certain profits, including interest on the money paid in, which is the money of the company, not Senator Cox's, or that of any other individual. It does seem to me, in view of the peculiar circumstances, in view of the fact that the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Samuel Sharpe) has pointed out, that there is a very grave doubt as to whether the notice has been sufficient, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Justice had laid down an opinion not before the committee, it is most important that every opportunity should be taken to consider this matter very carefully. Therefore, I have great pleasure in supporting the motion that the committee rise and report progress, and I do so with the hope that when the Bill again comes before the House it will be sent back to the committee to see that justice is done to all parties.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the attention of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the exact language of that portion of the notice which relates to this matter. The words are 'Define the provisions as to division of profits.' I am inclined to go further than when I first brought this to the attention of the committee and to say that that phrase seems to have been very carefully designed to withhold any information as to what was the real character of the legislation contemplated. It would be perfectly easy to give proper notice in a few words. Let us suppose that the gentleman, whoever he may have been, who drafted that notice, had inserted these words, 'providing that policy-holders are not entitled to profits accruing by way of interest earned on paid-up capital.' That would have given notice, with a minimum of language, to every policy-holder throughout Canada. They would have understood exactly what was contemplated by the legislation proposed. But when, instead of that, you have an expression of a very nebulous character in these words, 'defining the provisions as to the division of profits' it seems to me a not unreasonable inference that there was no desire to give very useful information to the policy-holders throughout the country and in that way to prevent the organization of the policy-holders in opposition to the proposal of these gentlemen. I am not discussing the merits of the Bill at present, but I am in-

sisting that reasonable notice to the persons interested ought to be given. And I would point out to the Prime Minister a reason which has been already hinted at, but, perhaps, it has not been emphasized, as to why a notice of this kind in a case such as this ought to be very explicit indeed. The shareholders and directors of life insurance companies, under the conditions which attend the carrying on of that business in this country and in all English speaking countries, are such that the directors and share holders stand in a position of trust towards the policy-holders. They have charge of enormous funds, which they are bound to administer in a certain fiduciary capacity. Now they are entitled to make a profit out of the business; they are bound on the other hand, to do justice to those who have insured their lives and made provision for their families by means of the business so carried on. When the directors of such a company come before the parliament of Canada asking that the business conditions as between themselves and the persons for whom they are trustees, shall be altered—for that is the effect of this Bill—then I say that they ought to be held to the very strictest observance of the rules of this House, and every committee of this House ought to see that the notice given by the persons acting in that fiduciary capacity, is such that there can be no possibility of any misunderstanding. I think that is a reasonable proposition, which ought to commend itself, and will commend itself to the Prime Minister. It is very different from the conditions which meet us in respect of ordinary Bills coming before this House. Here we have the directors of the Canada Life Assurance Company, both as share holders in their own interest, and acting as trustees of the interest of 35,000 policy-holders, coming to parliament and asking that the provisions of legislation passed 30 years ago shall be altered in their advantage, and to the detriment of the 35,000 policy-holders; and it seems to me that, without discussing the provisions of the Bill at all, it is a firm foundation to stand upon that we should insist that the notice of that intention shall be expressed in the plainest possible way.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not feel disposed to quarrel with your decision, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As to the first point taken by the hon. member for North Ontario, taken as a technical objection, I can realize that you are probably right in saying that you could not entertain it. The second point, probably in the same way, though I was not present. But that throws upon us, the members of this committee, the duty of saying whether, under the circumstances as displayed by that notice, we are going on to legislate against the interests of the policy-holders. Now it is perfectly clear to me that that notice could not convey to the policy-holders an intimation of what it is now proposed we should do. No person reading that notice could possibly gather from it that we proposed to enact retroactive legislation affecting the rights of policy-holders; and because you, Sir, as chairman, have the right to rule it out as a matter of order, does not take away the fact that it goes to the very merits of the matter we are dealing with; and that we, as a committee, and the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, especially, and the Minister of Finance likewise, who is our guide in matters of this kind, should see to it that this legislation should not progress until it is made perfectly clear that everything has been done to bring to the knowledge of the policy-holders that their rights are being attacked. I am not prepared to say at this moment what attitude I should ultimately take as to what legislation should be enacted in this case. I have a strong feeling against this legislation as it is presented to us, yet I am prepared to consider whether it should be ultimately enacted. But I am firm upon this point, that we should one and all unite to say that until every reasonable facility has been afforded the policy-holders of knowing just what these people are asking, we should not, as a high court of parliament, enact this legislation, or proceed further with the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. I have just one word to say with reference to this, and it depends almost entirely for the present upon the matter of the notice. Until I heard the notice read by the hon. member for North Ontario the other day, I had not seen it, I had not paid any special attention to it. With reference to what had been the practice by this company, with reference to what had been the practice of other insurance companies in the distribution of their profits as between shareholders and policy-holders I knew pretty well what the general practice was. In that respect I had no great quarrel with this Bill. If it had always been the practice to divide the profits on the basis of a certain reservation, first, as remuneration for the shareholders, if that had been apparently agreed to by both parties, and sanctioned by a practice of twenty years, if that was the practice with other great insurance companies, and if there had been a mistake made at first, even although that practice in 1879 was contemplated, which was afterwards carried out, then I would not have been disposed to give much opposition to the Bill. But there was one thing that I should like to have known then, and one thing upon which I got very little light before the Committee on Bank-

ing and Commerce, that is, as to the views of the other party to the agreement in 1879, because the other party to the agreement was conspicuous by his absence—if you can apply the personal pronoun to the policy-holders. But when I heard the other day the notice that was given, and when I knew it was the essence of the law and the essence of the practice of parliament that the notice to be given should be full and explicit, no matter whether the matter is important or unimportant—although I agree that the matter is greater in proportion as the interests involved are more generally distributed and are of greater importance—I came to realize then that that notice would not have been to me, if I had been a policy-holder in this company, the least intimation in the wide world as to what was going to be done; the place that the notice occupies would seem to me to give it no prominence. What are the other things asked for? First, there is to be a change as to date of meeting, and notice as to this change of meeting. Then it goes on to mention a provision as to the division of profits. Then there is a third, extending the powers of the company so that they may hold real estate in Ontario, and for other purposes. I do not know what might be held as a sufficient notice under these words 'and for other purposes', but to me as a policy-holder, they would not have any meaning at all, and to my mind they would be no sufficient notice of a meeting.

However, I want to proceed with the second one, that defining the provisions as to a division of profits. Now do we not all know, those of us who were in the Committee of Banking and Commerce, as well as those of us who are here to-day, that the one important thing these gentlemen wanted in coming to this parliament, was to make a change in the division of profits? The important thing is not that they should change the date of their annual meeting, the important thing was not that they should regulate the form of notice which should be given of meetings, the important thing was not extending the power of the company as to the holding of a little real estate in Ontario, but the all-important thing was as to this arrangement about the division of profits. I want to read the whole of the notice to the Prime Minister so that the relation will be seen.

Notice is hereby given that application will be made to the parliament of the Dominion of Canada at the next session thereof for an Act to amend the Acts relating to the Canada Life Assurance Company by changing the date of the annual meeting, and by making necessary changes as to the notices of meetings consequent thereon, and providing for any further changes in the date of such meeting, defining the provisions as to the division of profits, extending the powers of the company as to the holding of real estate in Ontario and for other purposes.

That is placed there, not as the main object of this legislation, but it is tucked in quietly and comfortably between two other demands, one as to the dates of meetings and one as to the holding of real estate. It does not have the prominent position that it inevitably and certainly has in the Bill based upon this notice. Suppose I had looked at those words 'defining the provisions as to division of profits,'—what would I have said of it? It could have no other meaning than this: Here is a company with policy-holders and shareholders which is engaged in a business; it requires a certain amount of money to run the business and a certain amount is set aside for reserve and the rest is profits. This meeting is held to define as to how these profits shall be divided. Divided between whom? Between the earning corporation and those who have interests in the corporation. That would be the sole idea that would be brought to my apprehension by reading that notice. I would think of nothing else. But when we read the legislation, what is it? It is not as to the defining of the division of the profits, but it is as to discriminating after the profits have been made between the different parties to the corporation as to how much each should relatively get. That is the whole gist of the legislation. If it had read 'defining the provisions as to division of profits between the policy-holder and the shareholder', then I would have felt that there was something in the provision, which, if I were a policy-holder I would like to know more about, and which, if I were a shareholder, I would like to know more about, and I would say to myself: I am going to see what this is going to be. The notice is altogether insufficient, it seems to me, to express, in the plain use of English words, its meaning, and it would, to me, reading it, and I think to almost every other man, simply imply that, after the year's operations were through, the expenses were paid and the necessary reserve was laid aside, there was a plan to be proposed as to how the resultant profits should be distributed as between the corporation and those who held a special or individual interest in the corporation. We should be very careful how we pass legislation of this kind. We should be especially careful that the spirit as well as the form of the law and the rules of the House are thoroughly carried out and that the notice is sufficient. I do not believe that the notice is a sufficient one in this case, and therefore I should rather see it go back to the committee so that they might go into that matter specially. I beg leave again to dissent absolutely from the position taken by the hon. the Minister of Justice that my conscience is

absolved, that my responsibility is done away with as a member of this House, because, forsooth a certain recommendation comes from any committee of this House. Even if I were a member of a committee myself and the committee came to a certain understanding and so reported I would have a perfect right in this House, and my duty is not done as a member of this House unless I exercise that responsibility, to dissent and not hide myself behind the supposition that all has been done that has been necessary and that you must not question the result if, forsooth, the Committee of this House have recommended it by a majority vote. I appeal against any proposition of that kind, and I refuse absolutely to be bound by it. It is our right, as it is our duty to discuss the report of any committee and to feel ourselves absolutely free to dissent from it.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. As far as I have understood the observations of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat I said altogether the contrary in regard to this committee. I said that I was prepared to rest upon the finding of fact, which I assumed this committee had made, that there was an error, or mistake in 1879.

Mr. FIELDING. It is a well understood rule that where a member has not had an opportunity or when, for any reason, a member fails to make any very close investigation of a private Bill, he accepts the judgment of the committee, not necessarily as a finality, but because the committee has undertaken the work which he perhaps was not able to do. It is only in that sense, I am sure, that any member would urge the principle that the finding of a committee should be accepted. I hesitate not to say that if any member is willing to go to the trouble to look into a Bill for himself and to make a careful investigation of it he is not bound to pay the slightest attention to the judgment of the committee. But with regard to most of these private Bills, it happens that many members, either from disinclination, or occupation in other directions, do not attend the committees and do not give close attention to the details. It is therefore the practice of the House in such cases to accept the findings of the committee, and I think that as a rule that practice has worked well. Let me say, that the point as to the insufficiency of the notice has perhaps considerable strength. In a matter of such grave importance, affecting the interests of a great financial institution and affecting the interests of a very large body of shareholders and stockholders, there is everything to be gained by proceeding cautiously and slowly. It should not be said that this House is disposed to pass any legislation of this character if the legislation will not bear careful investigation and critical examination, just as any legislation that we pass should, and I would therefore say to my hon. friend in charge of the Bill that I hope he will accept the suggestion that the Bill be not proceeded with further to-day, but that progress be reported with the view of permitting the Standing Orders Committee to make further inquiry into the question as to the sufficiency of the notice. Speaking entirely for myself, as this is a private Bill which does not call for any declaration of policy on the part of the government, I am inclined to think that this Bill is a good one, that it is a Bill that is necessary in the interests of a great number of people. I did not take any part in the discussion in the Committee of Banking and Commerce, but I listened very closely to the proceedings. I was particularly impressed by the powerful speech in support of this Bill made by the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) who, with a full knowledge of all the facts and of the history of the Canada Life Assurance Company, reviewed all the circumstances of the case and gave very powerful reasons why the Bill should pass, reasons which influenced his mind as well as mine. For 30 years it has been the practice of the Canada Life Assurance Company to apply this method of declaring their profits, first to charge interest on their capital and then to strike the balance and distribute the profits accordingly. We have therefore the practice of 30 years of the Canada Life Company which has never been called in question. There must be some statutory limitation in all these things. And, while one may hesitate to adopt legislation which is of a retroactive character, while one may hesitate to adopt legislation which would take away some man's private rights, I say there ought to be some statutory limitation and that if men have slept upon their rights for 30 years they ought not to complain very much if it becomes necessary to confirm a practice which they themselves have acquiesced in.

Mr. FOSTER. What about the policy holder of a year ago?

Mr. FIELDING. Then there is the next point: that the practice of the Canada Life has been the practice, I am advised, of every other company issuing a participating policy in Canada; it certainly is the practice of the companies generally. I do not know that there are any exceptions, but as a rule the same practice which has been followed by the Canada Life for thirty years is followed by the other companies. That practice has been subject to the inquiry and investigation of the Insurance Department and no question has ever been raised as to the propriety of that method of computing the profits. The third point is that

it is, I am advised, the practice in England, where under precisely similar conditions interest on capital is charged before profits are declared. Now, all these are strong reasons I would say for confirming the practice which has existed for such a long time, and that practice is so well established in the minds of insurance men that in the preparation of the general Insurance Bill which is now before the House that practice has been imported into the Bill, and it is specifically declared that in the computation of profits you shall first charge interest upon capital. That provision in a general Bill will of course not be retroactive ; and of course this special Bill would be necessary to make the provision retroactive.

There is another view: that for many many years the capital of this company was $125,000 and the profits were distributed over that sum. After this practice which has now been called in question had been continued for a very long time, the shareholders put in $875,000 of new capital. I submit that these shareholders in putting in that new capital had a right to expect the continuance of the practice as to the regulation of profits that had been in existence for so many years. And when, a few years ago, they put in $875,000 of new capital with the full expectation that they were to receive interest on that capital before profits were declared, that being the practice of the company from its beginning, then if we are to turn round now and tell them that practice is wrong, the shareholders who put in that new capital are the men who would have the right to be aggrieved. If it be declared that the interest is not to be allowed before profits are declared, then clearly they were induced to invest that $875,000 of new capital in that enterprise upon a misunderstanding, to put it in the mildest form. And if this modern contention, which is only now brought to the front, is to prevail, then surely these gentlemen have a perfect right to say to parliament: let us take back the $875,000 which we invested upon the faith of an understanding which it now appears is wrong, I will put it as strongly as possible and I will say that I think this is retroactive legislation. Taking the opinion of the eminent English counsel which has been published in one of the documents; taking the opinion of the Minister of Justice; taking such information as I can get upon the subject I am inclined to think that while there would be no absolute certainty in the matter—while it may very well admit of a legal dispute and I suppose you can get good lawyers on one side or the other to argue the case—I am rather inclined to think it is retroactive legislation. I am inclined to think it interferes with rights which policy-holders may have. But, they are rights which the policy-holders never knew they possessed, rights which they never expected to possess, rights which they are not entitled to possess in equity, and therefore I would say that notwithstanding the fact that it may be retroactive legislation ; nothwithstanding the fact that you will say some action has been raised in court—although I believe that while there is actually no suit in court there may be one at any moment—notwithstanding all that, if we were dealing with the merits of the question, I should say that for the prevention of confusion and disorder it would be wise for this parliament to pass this Bill. See what will happen if you do not. Thirty years ago a shareholder in the Canada Life received a larger measure of profits than he was entitled to receive; he is dead; his estate has been closed up; if you want to get the money back how are you going to get it? Take the other side of the argument —thirty years ago a policy-holder received less profits than he was entitled to receive; hedid not get what he was entitled to ; he is dead and his estate is closed up; how are you going to adjust the matter now ; how are you going to get it from the shareholder who is dead; how are you going to find the policy-holder to give him what he should receive? There are possibilities of great disorder and of great trouble. I say there would be no wrong in giving legal effect to the understanding and practice which appear to have existed for thirty years and which every policy-holder of the Canada Life, so far as he knew anything about it at all, accepted. I say there would be no wrong in giving legal enactment to such measures as are necessary to carry out that understanding.

Mr. SPROULE. In view of the statement of the Minister of Finance that the policy-holders have never raised objection I want to say a word from their point of view. The fact is they never knew they were being improperly dealt with. I have a very strong letter from one who has been with the company for many years and his statement is that the profits he supposed were properly divided until of late years, seemed to dwindle away and could not be accounted for, and he says : I did not object because I did not know but that what I was getting was all that the law entitled me to. I expect that would be the case with practically the 35,000 policy-holders of the company. If they did not raise a claim because they were not getting what was coming to them under the law it was because they were not in a position to know how the division of profits was made and they took it for granted that the division was made according to law by honest men. But now it is brought to their attention and they feel very keenly with regard to it. The next question is as to whether they were or were not deceived. Take

the preamble of the Bill of 1879 and what would any ordinary business man in this country think of this :

The profits allotted are divided amongst the persons assured upon the participation scale; 75 per cent of all the profits realized from the entire business.

Would not any business man say that included profits from any source? If the English language means anything it means that, and if the policy-holder believed he was getting a fair division of all the profits realized from the entire business of the company, then he would naturally come to the conclusion he was getting all he was entitled to. The Prime Minister told us that the objection taken did not apply to the clause we are considering; but my answer is that the question of the sufficiency or insufficiency of the notice vitally affects the whole Bill and every clause in it. We would not be doing our duty in my opinion if we proceeded with the consideration of the Bill without knowing whether the notice was sufficient or insufficient, and I believe the only proper course for the committee to take is to report progress and let the House deal with the Bill.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Though I have charge of this Bill, I have no other interest in it other than that of a policy-holder; so that I am dealing with it in my own interest as such, and I believe that if the construction now sought to be put upon it should prevail, it would virtually ruin the company. It would reduce the dividends of the shareholders from 8 per cent to less than 4 per cent, while the corresponding benefit to the policy-holders would be insignificant. Based on a capital of $125,000 it would not amount to over five cents a year on a $1,000 policy. The interest of the policy-holders is wrapped up in the security of the company; it is of the utmost interest to every policy-holder that the permanency of the company be established. But if you reduce the stock to a basis of less than 4 per cent and compel the shareholders to contribute 90 per cent of their earnings on the stock of the $875,000 as well as the original capital of $125,000, they will get less than one half of one per cent on the capital they put into the company in 1900. It seems so unfair a proposition that I cannot imagine that any policy-holder would seek to put such a construction on the Act.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. Was this an important question when there was only $125,000 of stock paid up? It only became important after the shareholders put in the additional stock?

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Quite so, because in the one case they would only pay on $125,000, while in the other case they would pay on the whole $1,000,000. If the interpretation now sought to be put on the Act is right, the shareholders, in paying up the stock of $875,000 in full, were making the company a charitable institution. People may be charitable if they wish to be, but it is not the business of the legislature to compel them to be charitable. It might be that the policy-holders of to-day would get an immediate benefit; but in the ultimate interest of the policy-holders it would be one of the worst things that could happen for the company to be placed in such a position that the shareholders would not get such a rate of interest on their investment as would induce them to carry on the company. I have no personal interest in this Bill. I told Mr. Bruce, the representative of the company, that I would take charge of it if it were a meritorious and reputable Bill, and he assured me that it was. Whatever hesitation I may have had about it, the more I have studied the question, the more convinced I am that the Act which this House is being called upon to confirm is not only doing justice to the shareholders and preventing a fraud being committed on them, but is in the interest of the policy-holders themselves. Having stated my position a week ago to-day, although it was said that the Minister of Justice had been asked to give an opinion upon the Bill, I understood that it was desired to leave it over in order that it might be further considered, and I immediately acquiesced. Far be it from me to try to force this or any other Bill through the House if it has not had proper consideration. What is the object of the notice? Notice of a Bill must be given five weeks before it comes up. That is to inform the public that a Bill involving certain questions is to be brought before parliament. That notice, I suppose, is not seen by one out of a thousand of the insured. Very few people ever see the 'Canada Gazette,' and very few read the newspaper advertisements. But the matter becomes known when the Bill is introduced in parliament. Then all the newspapers put the facts, not in their advertising columns, but in their news columns, and the policy-holders and every other class of people find them out. I have just come from the west, where everybody knows about this Bill, and is talking about it. Although I am not a member of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, I was there one day, and I do not think it is possible to advance any argument here that was not brought up there. I think the notice was sufficient, and the opinion of a man like Mr. Panet, who has been in charge of that class of work for many years, that it was sufficient, leads me to feel that we are not very far astray in

accepting it as sufficient. However, if members want to further consider the Bill, I am not going to stand in their way. Though I am a little suspicious that these tactics are obstructive, I am going to give the benefit of the doubt to those who say they want to have further light on the measure, and therefore I am willing that the Bill should stand until next Monday, as I cannot be here again before then. I will therefore move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 79) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Mr. RUTAN. By subsection A of this Bill the Canadian Pacific Railway are asking for authority to build a branch line from Lannigan into Prince Albert, but our people think this branch line comes really under the charter for the Manitoba North Western Railway, which charter is also owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The people of Prince Albert are not satisfied to accept the mere promise of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and feel that they should be given some surety that the Canadian Pacific Railway will implement its promises. That company should be compelled to build a certain number of miles every year, under penalty of forfeiting its charter. The old Manitoba and North Western Railway was given a charter in 1883, and previous to that a charter was granted to the Portage and Western Road. In the former there was a building clause provided, under which a certain number of miles were to be built each year, and by 1890 the road was to be completed into the town of Yorktown. But this building clause was not carried out, and in 1893 the Canadian Pacific Railway acquired the Manitoba and North Western charter. That charter also carried a provision that at least 20 miles a year should be built until the line was completed into Prince Albert. But this was not done, and the Canadian Pacific Railway repeatedly came to parliament asking for an extension of time, until 1902, when the Canadian Northern were building their line from Dauphin north and west to Prince Albert. The Canadian Pacific then made two surveys over the old proposed line of the Manitoba and North Western, for the purpose of hampering the competing line, but they did not build a mile of that railway. They then came back to this parliament and applied for authority to divert their own line from Shebo west to Saskatoon. And on this occasion, the people of Prince Albert endeavoured to have a clause inserted providing that for each mile of railway built west, there would be one built northwest. This was not accepted by the company, and parliament allowed them a charter to build west. There are people in that section who moved out some 60 or 75 miles expecting this railway to be built because the charter carried a clause requiring so many miles to be built each year. Many hon. members here will know that Prince Albert district was settled as early as Regina on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and therefore had the right to expect some consideration from the granting of the charter to this Manitoba and North Western Railway.

It was not until the Canadian Northern had purchased the line from Regina to Prince Albert that the Canadian Pacific Railway asked for a charter to build from Lannigan to Prince Albert. This charter was granted, and it was thought by the people of that section that the Canadian Pacific Railway would fulfil this promise because they had been cut off from their connection with the city of Prince Albert, but we find to-dav that they are not prepared to go ahead and build although they have had their charter two years. Instead of doing so, they are again asking for an extension of time. As they have been promising to build the Manitoba and North Western over 16 years, the people of Prince Albert are justified in questioning the sincerity of the company, and are asking that they should be compelled to give some evidence of good faith by building a certain amount of road each year. The Canadian Pacific Railway have another Bill asking for an extension of time to build the Manitoba and North Western to Prince Albert. I do not think it is possible that they intend building two lines into Prince Albert. It would rather seem to me as if they wanted to hold the two charters and blanket the two passes available from the south and southeast into Prince Albert through the Birch Hills in order that no competing company may get a charter through those passes. Evidently in 1902 and for some years later, when the Canadian Northern was building branches through the west, they and the Canadian Pacific Railway were common enemies, but apparently there is to-day an understanding between them to try and cut out the Grand Trunk Pacific and other lines from getting charters to build through these routes. The people out there are compelled to haul their grain long distances and they feel that they should not be asked to take the mere promises of this railway any longer without insisting on some guarantee. I therefore beg to move as a subsection to clause one that the company, build 30 miles in 1909 and 30 miles each year until the road is completed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment proposed is hardly in order in its present form, because paragraph A of the Act of 1907 does not appear in this Bill. There is merely a passing reference to it. The amendment might apply as a separate subsection.

Mr. RUTAN. Then, I move it as a separate subsection.

Mr. TURRIFF. I also wish to move an amendment——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If there is no notice given of the amendment, it may not be in order at this time.

Mr. TURRIFF. The amendment I wish to move, Mr. Chairman, after you have disposed of the one now before you, is that letter (g) be struck out of section 1 of the Bill under discussion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. For such an amendment as that, one day's notice would be necessary.

Mr. TURRIFF. Then, I give the necessary notice, and, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilbert McIntyre) who is in charge of the Bill is absent, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

CANADA LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Committee on Bill (No. 56) respecting the Canada Life Assurance Company reports that it has made some progress and asks for leave to sit again. When shall the committee have leave to sit again?

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE (North Ontario). I understood that the arrangement was that this Bill was to go back to the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Why should it go back?

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. There are two reasons: In the first place, the committee could inquire into the sufficiency of the notice, on which point, if necessary, they could refer it back to the Committee on Standing Orders. In the second place, they could take into consideration the opinion given in this House to-day by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth). Therefore, I move, in amendment, that the order be discharged and that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). If the point is to be as to the sufficiency of the notice, I am not sure that the Banking and Commerce Committee is the proper one to refer it to.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). It seems to me the proper committee would be the Committee on Standing Orders. Then, it can come back to us from the Committee on Standing Orders and we can refer it then wherever we like.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—NATIONALITY OF EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SIFTON—by Mr. A. H. Clarke — asked:

1. What is the total number of employees upon the operating staff of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway above the rank of brakemen?
2. Of the total number how many are British subjects, and how many are citizens of the United States?
3. What is the total number of employees upon the engineering staff of the Grand Trunk Pacific, exclusive of labourers?
4. Of the total how many are British subjects, and how many are citizens of the United States?

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

1. The information to answer this question is furnished by the vice-president and general manager of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, as follows: Total number of men above the rank of brakesmen, is 135.

2. It would seem to be impossible to secure information as to the nationality of the men mentioned without making a complete canvass from Edmonton to Prince Rupert, where many of the employees are in practically inaccessible locations at this time of the year. The correspondence indicates that it would take at least three months to get the information. It is also stated that 90 per cent of the employees referred to are British subjects or have been residents of Canada for from three to ten years, this assertion being based on the March pay-rolls and from information at hand.

3. 231.

4. Answered by Number 2, in addition to which it is stated that the following are British subjects: Second vice-president, chief engineer, bridge engineer, freight traffic manager, assistant freight traffic manager, travelling freight agent, assistant passenger traffic manager, district passenger agent, general solicitor, assistant solicitor, general auditor, auditor of disbursements, auditor of freight accounts, auditor of passenger accounts, travelling auditor, treasurer, local treasurer, manager of telegraphs, land commissioner, right of way agent, master mechanic, assistant master me-

chanic, purchasing agent and representative at Vancouver, car service agent, chief medical officer, and district medical officers.

BRITISH COLUMBIA RAILWAY BELT—LITIGATION BETWEEN DOMINION AND PROVINCE.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR asked:

1. Are there any matters in litigation between the government of the Dominion and that of British Columbia respecting rights within the Railway belt in British Columbia? If so, what are the issues, and what progress has been made towards determination?

2. Does the Dominion government exert any jurisdiction over the foreshores of the Fraser river? If so, to what point on the river does the asserted jurisdiction extend?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. An action is pending in the Exchequer Court on the information of the Attorney General for the Dominion against the Burrard Power Company, Limited. The claim in the action is to have the court declare invalid a grant to the defendant company by the Water Commissioners for the district of New Westminster of certain rights to the waters of the Lillooet lakes and river, and for an injunction to restrain the company from taking any further steps in regard thereto. The matter was referred by the court to a special referee to take evidence and report upon the facts. The government of British Columbia was made a party in the proceedings upon the reference, evidence was taken and the report of the referee has been filed. The case now stands for hearing on a motion for judgment, made on the 16th March instant, and then adjourned to a date not yet reached.

2. So far as the Fraser river lies within the limits of the railway belt in British Columbia, or so far as relates to subjects covered by the 91st and the 108th sections of the British North America Act, the government is advised that the river and its foreshores are within the jurisdiction of Dominion authority.

WOLFE ISLAND CANAL.

Mr. EDWARDS asked:

1. When was the Wolfe Island canal constructed?

2. Did the government contribute to the cost of said canal? If so, to what amount?

3. Has the Dominion government contributed anything to the maintenance of said canal? If so, in what years, and to what amount in each?

4. By whom is the canal now owned?

5. How long since the canal has been used?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). There are no records in the department from which an answer could be given.

Mr. GRAHAM.

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT—PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE asked:

1. Has the Marine and Fisheries Department continued to buy supplies, or give contracts to the individuals, supply men, or companies on whose behalf commissions, gratuities or interest were paid to officials of the department, as found by the Cassels Commission?

2. If so, what are the names of such individuals, supply men and companies, and the amount paid or to be paid to them since the receipt of said report by the government?

3. Have any other departments purchased supplies or given contracts to any such individuals, supply men or companies since the receipt of said report by the government? If so, what are the names and amount thereof?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1 and 3. There may be cases in which it will be in the public interest to do business with some of the parties referred to. Each case will have to be considered on its merits as it arises.

2. If any particular name be mentioned the information will be given to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that the first clause of the question is not answered. It is as to whether it may be done or not; has the Marine and Fisheries Department continued to buy supplies?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the second answer governs that.

DREDGING IN OTONABEE RIVER, PETERBOROUGH.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

1. What is the name of the contractor doing dredging at or near Hunter street bridge, in the Otonabee river, at Peterborough?

2. What was the object of said dredging?

3. What amount of dredging has been done by the government during the year 1908 on said work, and what was paid during 1908 for said dredging?

4. Did the government own any boats or machinery used on this work?

5. Was any of the government material or machinery used on this work sold or transferred? If so, to whom, and what was received for same?

6. Were any contracts made by tender for this work? If so, were they called by public advertisement, and how many were received?

7. What are the names of the parties whose boats or dredges have been employed in connection with said dredging?

8. Have any of those engaged upon said works been employed by the government otherwise than by contract? If so, how much did they receive?

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

1, 6 and 8. Work done by day's labour with dredge hired from Conroy Brothers.
2. Construction of turning basin above Hunter street bridge.
3. Some 2,167 cubic yards dredged during 1908; nothing paid yet.
4. No.
5. No.
7. Conroy Brothers.

FILE HILLS INDIAN AGENCY.

Mr. CAMPBELL—by Mr. Bradbury—asked:

1. Has Mr. Godfrey, clerk to Inspector Graham, of File Hills Indian agency, resigned?
2. Has Mr. Godfrey made any charges against inspector? If so, what are the charges?
3. Is it the intention of the government to investigate the charges? If so, when?
4. On whose recommendation was Mr. Godfrey, lately clerk to the inspector of South Saskatchewan inspectorate, appointed?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):
1. Yes.
2. Mr. Godfrey has made certain statements to the effect that Inspector Graham has not been dealing honestly with the department's funds and other property.
3. The department has the matter now under consideration.
4. The appointment was made upon the department's being satisfied that it was necessary.

SQUATTERS ON LANDS NEAR DAUPHIN.

Mr. CAMPBELL—by Mr. Bradbury—asked:

1. Is the government aware that houses and outbuildings of squatters on lands south of Dauphin, lately taken into the permanent timber reserves, were said to have been burned last fall by government officials?
2. Did the government give instructions to have these buildings burned? If so, is that the policy of the government?
3. Did the government take any steps to care for the women and children so rendered homeless at the beginning of the inclement winter season?
4. Did the government give instructions to its officials to seize hay put up by said squatters? If so, have they paid or do they intend to pay for such fodder?

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

1. Yes, but the statement was not correct.
2. No.
3. Any provision necessary to assist squatters removed from the reserve was made and most of them have made written statements that they are well satisfied with the treatment given them.
4. No. If the squatters obtained the hay under permit it would be their property

96½

INDEBTEDNESS OF GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY TO CANADA.

Mr. COWAN—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What is the present indebtedness of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to the Dominion of Canada?
2. What are the several dates on which that indebtedness was incurred?
3. What rate or rates of interest does that indebtedness bear?
4. What payments have been made on account of that indebtedness or interest, and when?
5. If the company's indebtedness has been wiped out or reduced, how and when was this done?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The hon. gentleman will find that information was given to the House several days ago. I would refer him to the 'Hansard' of March 17, page 2840, which I think covers the whole question.

OSHAWA HARBOUR.

Mr. HUGHES asked:

1. Since taking over Oshawa harbour what officers have been appointed and what are their salaries, for duty at that harbour or in connection therewith?
2. What products have been landed at the said harbour by water route since the date referred to?
3. What duties, fees or receipts of cash have been collected by each department of the government since that date?
4. What expenditures upon the harbour or any part of it have been made by each department of the government since the date of taking over?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. No customs officer has been appointed since taking over Oshawa harbour, 8th April, 1901, for duty on account of such harbour.
2. Anthracite coal to the value of $79,251 has been landed at said harbour by water route since 8th April, 1901.
3. No customs duties have been collected on goods landed at said harbour since that date.
4. There has been no expenditure on said harbour by the Department of Customs.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works).
4. Expended by the Department of Public Works, $21,279.49.

POST OFFICES IN PEEL COUNTY.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. How many post offices are there in Peel county, and what are their names?
2. Is each office in receipt of daily mail?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. There are 63 offices in the county of Peel, as indicated by the following list:—

Albion, Alton, Alloa, Bolton, Belfountain, Boston Mills, Brampton, Britannia, Burnhamthorpe, Castleberg, Cedar Mills, Coventry, Caldwell, Caledon, Caledon East, Cataract, Credit Forks, Campbell's Cross, Cheltenham, Claude, Churchville, Clarkson, Cooksville, Castlemore, Coleraine, Derry, Dixie, Elmbank, Erindale, Grahamsville, Huttonsville, Hanlan, Inglewood, Kilmanagh, Lockton, Lisgar, Lorne Park, Macville, Mono Mills, Mono Road Station, Mount Wolfe, Mellville Cross, Mayfield, Malton, Meadowvale, Mount Charles, Nortonville, Palgrave, Palgrave Station, Port Credit, Rockside, Sleswick, Star, Sandhill, Snelgrove, Streetsville, Summerville, Stanley Mills, The Grange, Terra Cotta, Tullamore, Woodhill, Wildfield.

2. No.

DUTY ON BEET SUGAR.

Mr. HUGHES asked:

1. Is there any agitation or movement to have beet sugar refiners prohibited from importing their raw sugars from Europe under the preferential tariff?

2. Is it the intention of the government to grant to the beet sugar refiners the same rate of duty on European sugar as refiners now obtain on their raw sugars?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). If there is any agitation it is rather the other way. In regard to the second question, it is not expedient to make any announcement except in the Budget speech.

MAIL CARRIAGE—PICTOU TO MAGDALEN ISLANDS.

Mr. FRASER asked:

1. Has the contract been let for the carrying of the mails by steamer from Pictou to Magdalen Islands?

2. Were tenders called for the said contracts?

3. What are the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender?

4. What class of steamer did the tender call for?

5. What is the class or description of steamer provided by the successful tenderer?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Messrs. Bouchard Bros., Quebec, $10,995; Wm. Maclure, Pictou, N.S., $12,000; Magdalen Islands Steamship Co., Halifax, N.S., $10,000; Magdalen Islands Steamship Co., Halifax, N.S., $15,000.

4. The call for tenders required that the tenders should state speed, class and capacity of vessel to be employed.

5. Built 1895. Length 188 feet 6 inches, breadth 29 feet, depth 11 feet 1 inch. Gross tons 565. Net tons 159. Speed 11¼ knots.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

PULP AND PAPER EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. BELAND—by Mr. Lavergne—asked:

1. Has the government any information regarding the production in Canada of pulp and paper during last year? If so, what are the figures in tons?

2. What quantity of pulp was exported to the United States and England, respectively, during last year?

3. What quantity of paper was exported to the United States and Great Britain, respectively, during last year?

4. What amount in cords of pulpwood was exported to the United States during last year?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

2. During the last fiscal year, ended March 31, 1908, the quantity of pulp exported to the United States and Great Britain was as follows:

	United States.	Great Britain.
Wood pulp, chemically prepared, cwt..	769,514	13,660
Wood pulp, mechanically ground, cwt..	3,033,885	973,598

3. The exports of paper during the above period to United States and Great Britain were as follows:

	Great Britain.		United States.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
Wall paper, rolls.	512	$ 159	19,794	$ 6,440
Felt paper, rolls.	5,060	21,896	109,863	101,835
Wrapping paper, lbs..			594,695	$ 24,265
Paper, n.o.p. . .$		354,887		34,673
Printing paper .$		922,278		791,533

4. Cords of pulpwood exported to the United States during the above period were 901,861.

DRY DOCK AT NEW WESTMINSTER.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR—by Mr. Burrell—asked:

1. Has the government under consideration any application for assistance to a dry dock or marine ways enterprise at New Westminster?

2. If so, by whom was such application made, and what is the extent of assistance applied for?

3. Are there any other enterprises of like character in the neighbourhood? If so, what is the extent of the assistance extended to them by the government, or contemplated to be extended?

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

1. Yes.

2. By Mr. Ed. Mercer, who asks that government subscribe fifty per cent of cost.

3. Yes. No assistance rendered and none applied for.

MILES OF RAILWAY IN ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. McCARTHY—by Mr. Herron— asked:

How may miles of railway were under operation in the territory now comprised within the boundaries of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, respectively, on December 31, 1896, and December 31, 1908, respectively?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). To the 30th June, 1896, 1,772 miles; to the 30th June, 1908, 3,404 miles.

PORT OF PORT CREDIT.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. What was the total revenue for customs at Port Credit for the last three fiscal years, respectively?
2. Has the sub-collector been superannuated? If so, what is his superannuation allowance?
3. Has his successor been appointed? If so, who received the appointment, and at what salary?
4. What are his duties?
5. Upon whose recommendation was he appointed?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. The total revenue has been as follows:
Year ending June 30, 1906.. ..$22,000 98
9 months ending March 31, 1907.. 25,759 54
Year ending March 31, 1908.. .. .. 45,209 28
2. Yes; $343.33 a year.
3. John W. Heary has been appointed acting sub-collector of customs at Port Credit. Salary, $850 a year.
4. His duties are to receive customs entries and duties and perform the usual work of a customs collector.
5. He was appointed by the Minister of Customs.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS—CONTRACTS FOR DREDGING.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. What were the contracts awarded early in 1908 by the Department of Public Works for dredging in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec for work to be done during the year 1908, and did such contracts terminate and expire when the season closed?
2. If not, what contracts extended into and to be continued during the present year in said provinces?
3. Has the Public Works Department expended or awarded any of such contracts in said provinces for work to be done during the present year? If so, to whom and at what points and prices?
4. Were public tenders called for any such renewals or new contracts?
5. Is it the intention of the government to advertise for tenders for work to be done at the several points as mentioned in current estimates where work is to be performed in said provinces? If so, when will said tenders be called?
6. Is it the intention of the government to renew any dredging contracts in said provinces which expired last year, without advertising and calling for tenders in the usual public manner?

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

1 and 2. In Ontario: Blind river, Burlington, Cobourg, Collingwood, Goderich, Hamilton, Kincardine, Little Current, Meaford, Midland, Nigger and Telegraph islands, Owen Sound, Penetanguishene, Picton, Point Edward, Port Burwell, Port Elgin, Rondeau, Summerstown, Thames river, Thornbury, Toronto, Trenton harbour and Dark channel, Waubaushene, Wiarton, Wingfield basin.

In Quebec: Batiscan, Bécancour river, Blanche shoals, Chateauguay river, Dorion, Fraserville, Godfroy river, Hay island, Hudson, L'Assomption, Maskinongé river, Nicolet, Port St. Francis, River Jesus, Rivière du Loup (en haut), Rivière Ouelle, Saguenay river, St. Francis river, St. Lambert, St. Maurice river, St. Pierre les Becquets, St. Placide, Vaudreuil, Yamachiche river and Yamaska river.

All these contracts were made subject to extension if considered advisable. Contract with the C. S. Boone Dredging and Construction Company for dredging at Little Current specifies that work shall be completed within two years from date of signing, viz., 26th June, 1910.

3 and 4. No.

5 and 6. Matter under consideration.

DOMINION ARSENAL AT QUEBEC.

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

What were the names of the bidders, the brands, and the prices in connection with the recent tenders for spelter for the Dominion Arsenal at Quebec, for which tenders were called for January 31, and opened on February 1, as the former date was Sunday?

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

No tenders were called for January 31, nor opened on February 1, and therefore the gratuitous information that the former date was Sunday lacks point.

Tenders for ingot copper, pig lead and spelter were invited for January 30, and opened and awarded same day, by circular letter by the superintendent, Dominion Arsenal, Quebec, dated 22nd January last, from the following firms: Thos. Robertson and Company, Montreal; B. J. Coghlin and Company, Montreal; Lewis Bros., Montreal; Jas. Robertson and Company, Montreal; H. A. Drury and Company, Montreal; the General Supply Company of Canada, Ottawa; Mr. L. S. Macoun, Ottawa.

The quantities required were: Copper ingot for brass strip work, 219,000 lbs.; copper ingot for cupro-nickel strip work,

142,000 lbs.; pig lead, 290,000 lbs.; spelter, 122,000 lbs.

Contracts were made as follows: With B. J. Coghlin and Company for copper at $13.95 per cwt.; with Thos. Robertson and Company for lead at $3.31 per cwt.; with L. S. Macoun, for spelter at $7.75 per cwt. each of these being the lowest tender received.

The only other tender for spelter received besides Mr. Macoun's was Messrs. B. J. Coghlin and Company's at $8.10 per 100 lbs.

Messrs. Coglin's tender was for 'Golden Rod' spelter; Mr. Macoun's for 'Bertha' spelter; both in accordance with specification. A copy of the specification governing the supply of spelter is attached hereto.

The circular letter of the superintendent of the Dominion Arsenal inviting tenders, read in part as follows:

Sealed tenders marked on the outside 'Tenders for supplies Dominion Arsenal' addressed to the Director of Contracts, Militia Department, Ottawa, will be received up to 12 o'clock noon on 30th January, 1909, for supply of materials specified in attached statement.

Tenders were accordingly received by the director of contracts and opened by him and by a clerk in his branch conjointly, at 12 o'clock noon on Saturday, January 30. the successful tenderers and the superintendent, Dominion Arsenal, were notified, by telegraph, within one hour of the opening of the tenders.

SPELTER SPECIFICATION TO GOVERN SUPPLY.

1. The spelter to be of good quality and must not contain more than 0·1 per cent of iron or 0·1 per cent of lead and only traces of any other impurities.

2. Each is to bear the manufacturers' name or recognized trade mark and customary brand for quality of metal supplied.

3. Specimens will be taken indiscriminately from the supply and chemically analysed to ascertain if the metal conforms in quality as above.

4. The supply will be subject to the inspection and approval of an officer of the department.

NOTE—Certain Brands, viz: 'Lehigh Valley', 'Empire', 'Vieille Montagne', 'Extra Pure', 'Bertha', and 'Crescent', or any brands of equal quality and similar conditions, are found to be worked in this department—samples may be seen.

THE COASTING TRADE.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Was an order in council passed in December, 1908, changing the date allowing small vessels carrying coal, under 1,500 tons, in our coasting trade from July 1, 1909 to 1912? If so, at what date and at whose solicitation?

2. Was an order issued by the Customs Department regarding the coasting trade of Canada in December, 1908? If so, what were the orders issued by the collector of customs?

Hon. W. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. No.

2. The orders issued by the Customs in December, 1908, are as set forth in memo. 1510-B of December 17, 1908, and memo. 1514-B of December 31, 1908. I attach the memos:

File No. 71723. No. 1514 B.

MEMORANDUM.

Department of Customs, Canada,
Ottawa, 31st December, 1908.

To Collectors of Customs:

Coasting Trade of Canada.

Referring to memo. 1510 B, in the above matter, you are advised that by order in council of this date it is declared that steamships of foreign countries which had been admitted to, and were under charter to engage in the coasting trade of the Dominion of Canada, at 31st December, 1908, shall be permitted to continue in the coasting trade of Canada, in the carrying of goods and passengers coastwise in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec, on the same terms and conditions as are applicable to Canadian vessels until the first day of July, 1909, notwithstanding anything in the order in council of 17th December, 1908, respecting the coasting trade of Canada.

JOHN McDOUGALL,
Commissioner of Customs.

Mailed direct to outports and stations.

File No. 71723. No. 1510 B.

MEMORANDUM.

Department of Customs, Canada,
Ottawa, 17th December, 1908.

To Collectors of Customs:

Coasting Trade of Canada.

Referring to memo. 1452 B, of 13th January, 1908, you are advised that an order in council, dated the 17th December, 1908, contains the following provisions, viz.:—

At the Government House at Ottawa,
Thursday, the 17th day of December, 1908.

Present:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council.

Whereas, by an order in council dated 13th January, 1908, it is provided that certain orders in council by which ships and vessels of certain foreign countries had been admitted to the coasting trade of Canada, are repealed on, from and after January 1, 1909.

And whereas applications have been made to allow the ships and vessels of certain foreign countries to participate in such coasting trade to a limited extent and for a temporary period, pending the acquisition of suitable British ships, to which class of vessels

under the provisions of the order the coasting trade would on and after the said date be confined.

Therefore, His Excellency the Governor General in Council is pleased to order that the said order in council of the 13th January, 1908, shall be and the same is hereby revoked and the following provisions substituted for the provisions therein contained:—

All orders in council admitting ships or vessels of any foreign country to the coasting trade of Canada shall be and the same are hereby revoked on, from and after the 1st January, 1909, and thereafter such ships and vessels shall be subject to the provisions of sections 952 to 957 of the Canada Shipping Act, both inclusive;

Provided, that steamships of not less than fifteen hundred tons gross tonnage each, of the following countries, namely: Italy, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Austro-Hungary, Denmark, Belgium, the Argentine Republic and Japan shall be admitted to the coasting trade of Canada in the carrying of goods and passengers coastwise between any port in the province of Nova Scotia and any port in the province of Quebec, and vice versa, on the same terms and conditions as are applicable to Canadian vessels, until the 31st day of December, 1811.

JOHN McDOUGALL,
Commissioner of Customs.

Mailed direct to outports and stations.

REPAIRS TO CANADIAN SHIPS, &C.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE asked:

1. Were representations made to the Customs Department by any person as agent for the Dominion Marine Association, urging the government not to impose a duty on repairs made to Canadian ships in certain cases? If so, what are the names of such persons?

2. What ships have been purchased by the Dominion government from British shipbuilders since 1896?

3. What are the names of the shipbuilders who built each ship and the purchase price of each ship?

4. Were any tenders received for the building of these ships from Canadian shipbuilders? If so, what were the amounts of the Canadian tenders for each ship and the names of the tenderers?

5. What amount of money was spent on each of these ships for changes, improvements, additional equipment and repairs since they were taken over by the government?

6. Who were the Canadian agents, or persons representing each individual British ship-builder who secured a tender for the building of any ships for the government of Canada?

Hon. W. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. Mr. F. M. King, secretary of the Dominion Marine Association, has represented to the Minister of Customs that by unanimous resolution the Annual General Meeting of the Dominion Marine Association resolved to ask that the statute of last session imposing duty upon vessel repairs should be amended so that vessels should only require to go to a Canadian dock in cases where the accident occurred nearer to a Canadian dock having proper facilities for repair work, than to any dock in the United States; and then only when a Canadian dock is immediately available. My colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have to answer the other question.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Let it stand as a separate question.

Mr. PATERSON. I understood my colleague to say that he would like to have it stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. It is so very simple that it is hardly worth while to let it stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

MR. W. A. HICKMAN.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR asked:

1. Was W. A. Hickman employed at any time between the years 1898 and 1904 by the Department of Agriculture in connection with immigration work or any other work in New Brunswick or elsewhere, or by any other department of the government?

2. During what years was he employed, and for what length of time each year?

3. At what kinds of work was he employed?

4. What was the rate of wages or salary paid to him, and for what period was he paid?

5. What was the total amount paid to him for salary or wages, for expenses, and for any other purposes, respectively?

6. What was the total amount paid to him for all purposes?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (for Minister of Interior):

1. Yes. By the Department of the Interior.

2. From 1st May, 1902 to 30th September, 1903, continuously.

3. Immigration.

4. $100 per month; see answer to No. 2

5. Salary $1,700, expenses $3,496.36, other purposes nil.

6. $5,196.36.

At 6 o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing the claims of any person or persons in Nova Scotia against the government, by reason of personal damages or losses of animals or damages to property on account of the Intercolonial Railway, settled or paid between June 1 and December, 31, 1908; together with names and addresses of such persons, the nature of their claims, how settlement was effected, and on what date settlement was effected in each case.—Mr. Rhodes.

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions and reports addressed to the government, or Post Office Department, and all correspondence and orders consequent thereon, relating to the change of the name of the post office of Weymouth to Weymouth North, and of the post office of Weymouth Bridge to Weymouth.—Mr. Jameson.

For a return showing the names of villages, towns and cities in each province where post offices, customs buildings and armouries have been constructed during the years from 1903 to 1909, and cost thereof, the expense in each case of the yearly lighting, heating and caretaking, the revenue, if any, from any of these buildings, a list of buildings now under construction, the contemplated cost, and the probable expense of yearly lighting, heating and caretaking.—Mr. Samuel Sharpe.

For a copy of all orders in council directing that repairs be made on different wharfs in the county of Soulanges, a copy of all correspondence, reports, accounts and pay-rolls relating to the valuation of these works, the payment and the list of names of all who were employed as day labourers on these works; a copy of all letters, reports and recommendations exchanged between the government and all other persons relating to the choice of men to be engaged on these works and those who should be refused employment; a copy of the report of accounts produced by Mr. Alfred Bissonette, wharfinger at St. Zotique and of Mr. Trefle Poirier, wharfinger of the wharfs of the canal and river St. Lawrence in the parish of Des Cedres, and of those of Mr. Isaie Lalonde, son of Albert, farmer, of St. Zotique, a copy of accounts for furnishing wood, iron, cement, sand and stone used in the building of said wharfs, and also a statement of the materials purchased as aforesaid, paid for by the department, and which were not used because they were considered unfit for the building of these wharfs.—Mr. Lortie.

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, statements and writings between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, or its engineers or agents, and the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, or their engineers or agents, and between the commissioners and their engineers, and between the commissioners and their engineers and agents and the contractors or sub-contractors on districts B and F after-mentioned, as to classification or alleged over classification on districts B and F of the eastern division of said railway, and of all estimates, returns, certificates, memoranda, statements or writings, showing classification or over classification of the cuttings and work on said districts B and F.—Mr. Lennox.

For a return showing the names of Intercolonial employees dismissed or suspended during the year 1908, the position held by each, the date of dismissal or suspension, and the special cause alleged therefor; also the names of any such persons so dismissed or suspended who have been reinstated up to February 28, 1909, and the dates of reinstation?—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing: 1. Who were employed to value the land of the right of way for the canal from Holland river to Newmarket, and what other duties than valuation of lands these parties were entrusted with.

Mr. GRAHAM.

2. The remuneration of each of these valuators.

3. How long they were employed, and upon what terms.

4. (a) What properties they valued, (b) at what amount or rate in each case, (c) the acreage of each property, (d) in how many cases, by names, the valuations were accepted by the owners, (e) in how many cases, by names, the valuations were finally rejected by the owners, (f) in what cases expropriation proceedings were resorted to, and (g) the result as compared with valuators' figures.

5. What titles to all properties have been required.—Mr. Lennox.

For a copy of all correspondence, communications in writting and documents to the Minister of the Interior, or any official of the department, and the replies or communications from the minister or any official of the department, since January 1, 1905, relating to the transfer of certain swamp lands in the Big Grass Marsh, in the province of Manitoba, to His Majesty King Edward VII., for the purposes of the province of Manitoba.—Mr. Malloy.

For a copy of all correspondence, tenders and documents in connection with the construction of an ice-breaking steamer for Northumberland straits, let to Messrs. Vickers Sons and Maxim; also the same in connection with the construction of a lighthouse tender and buoy steamer for the Great lakes, by Messrs, Swan, Hunter, Wingham and Richardson.—Mr. J. A. Currie.

For a copy of all correspondence and memoranda relating to rural mail delivery in the province of Alberta?—Mr. McCarthy.

For a return showing the amount of produce of the following lines shipped to Great Britain or other countries in cold storage, or cooled air chambers, during the years 1907 and 1908: Apples, in barrels or other packages, pears, plums, tomatoes, fresh meat, in lbs., fowl, fish, butter, eggs and cheese; to what country or countries they were shipped, and their condition on landing; the system of cold storage principally in use on the steamships carrying such produce.—Mr. Sproule.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY INDEBTEDNESS TO THE DOMINION.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR moved :

For a copy of all orders in council, reports, accounts, contracts and other papers and documents of every kind, nature and description, touching or relating to the indebtedness of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no objection to the motion passing, but I do not think there are any papers; I think all the information on the subject was given to the House the other day.

Motion agreed to.

GEODETIC SURVEY OF CANADA.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg) moved :

For a copy of all correspondence, reports, documents, orders in council in the possession of the government relating to the establish-

ment of a geodetic service bureau, and the commencement of a geodetic survey of Canada.

He said : I must confess that what little knowledge I have on the subject of a geodetic and trigonometrical survey is due to the fact that last year some members of the Canadian Royal Society together with some members of the Canadian Institute of Engineers placed in my hands some literature on the subject and requested that I should discuss the matter in the House with a view of endeavouring to enlist the interest of members of parliament in this question which to them is of very considerable importance.

The terms ' geodetic ' and ' triangulation ' as applied to surveys may be alarming to some hon. gentlemen, as they were to me, when first I heard of them, and possibly I had better venture, in an imperfect fashion no doubt, a brief statement as to the import of these terms.

There are two methods of fixing a position on the earth's surface; first, there is the astronomical method, wherein the latitude and longitude of a given point are fixed by observations of the heavenly bodies; secondly, there is the geodetic method, whereby positions are located or determined from observations or measurements, made from a known point on the earth. The former method is open to error, owing to what is technically known as the ' deflection ' of the plumb line, or the deviation of the spirit level from the horizontal plane. This error varies with the topography of a country, and is more pronounced in mountainous countries. Errors in astronomical surveys amount in the average to one hundred yards, and in extreme cases to a mile or more. It is obvious therefore, that for accuracy a fixed and accurate starting point on the earth's surface is necessary, and this is obtainable only by a geodetic survey, or geodetic methods. It might be of interest to relate that McGill observatory in Montreal is the best located point in America, in other words, it is the primary meridian as regards longitude in America, and has been adopted by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The phrase ' triangulation survey,' or ' trigonometrical survey ' may be defined as one where a base line is very accurately measured between two stations; and one or more of the points are accurately fixed geographically, by determining the longitude and latitude to the nearest practicable limit. These triangles are then expanded working on the sides all over the country, thus ensuring accurate measurements; and all permanent points of the country are tied in to the triangulation—in this way permanently recording the fixed features of the country by a method that cannot vary; namely, that of tying it to the stars through the latitude and longitude of the determining points.

The importance of accurate maps for military and other purposes in connection with the administration of the country and the development of its economic resources are obvious. Possibly I cannot do better than to quote from Major E. H. Hills, head of the Topographical Section of the War Office, who some years ago made a report on the survey of Canada at the request of the Canadian government to show the value both to the state, and to private corporations or individuals, of a comprehensive series of topographical maps of the country. He enumerates them as follows:—

(a) Administrative and Political.

In all questions relating to the administration of public lands the sale and transfer of such; the setting out upon the ground of provincial, township and other public boundaries, the valuation of property for the equitable adjustment of sales, taxation and assessment, the administration of public works, such as canals, reservations, parks and highways; the reclamation and improvement of waste lands, and as base maps for all statistical purposes for the graphic representation of facts relating to population, industries, products and similar information.

(b) Military.

For military purposes such maps are invaluable in peace and necessary in war. In peace they are used for training and manœuvre purposes; for the laying out of camps and exercise grounds; for the planning of permanent defensive and offensive works; and for the representation and discussion of all military and strategical problems connected with the defence of a country and the successful prosecution of military operations on or outside its frontiers.

In war accurate maps are a matter of vital necessity and are of use for conveying information as to the nature of the country, means of communication, water supplies, natural resources, &c., and for planning marches, camps, fieldworks and general strategical operations.

(c) Engineering and Economic.

As preliminary maps for planning railroads, highways, electric roads, canals, aqueducts, sewerage, drainage and water supply schemes. In all such works the cost of preliminary surveys is thus saved.

For showing the extent, location and accessibility of lands, waters, forests and valuable minerals.

As base maps for hydrographical, geological, and mineral surveys.

I may say that all countries have recognized the value and necessity of carrying out precise surveys of their territory such works as completed were in progress in the United Kingdom, British India, British South Africa and in all the European countries with the exception of Turkey.

It might be interesting to note at this stage what work of this character has been

performed in Canada by the federal or provincial governments, and how far it approximates accuracy and general usefulness. We have land surveys carried on by the provincial governments; Dominion land surveys, and the surveys of the railway belt by the Dominion Surveyor General, and topographical surveys by the Geological Department. In addition to this may be added military sketch maps made by cadets from the Royal Military College during summer trainings, and surveys of the coast by the Admiralty and the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Again perhaps I could not do better than to read to the House some of the comments of Major Hills upon the character of these independent and disconnected surveys respecting provincial land surveys. He says:—

The provincial land surveys have been done by various methods, and, as naturally might be expected, are of varying orders of accuracy. Roughly speaking, all those dating before 1850 were done with the compass and are liable to large errors. Since that date they have, for the most part, been carried out with theodolite and chain, and there has, no doubt, been a considerable increase in precision in this work in recent years. At the same time it must be remembered that much of it has been done by inexpert men who, having been paid upon the piecework system, have had little inducement to strive for any degree of perfection. The actual work of the provincial surveyors has been marking out of the township and subdivision lines upon the ground. The townships in the older part of the country average about 10 miles by 10 miles, in the newly settled districts they are made 6 miles square, divided into 72 lots of 320 acres each. The surveyors are supposed to record any features, roads, streams, &c., which cross the boundary lines, and to make a traverse survey of any lake of which the area exceeds 20 acres.

These townships plans have been put together by the provincial land department into maps. In the work of compilation the actual position on the map depends upon points determined astronomically by crude methods. In the eastern provinces the fundamental positions are those of the old admiralty charts. There has as yet been no attempt to recompile them upon the precisely determined fundamental points which are now available. It is furthermore, evident that the combination of a number of plans, themselves inaccurate, can only result in the accumulation of large residual errors; so it is hardly surprising that such maps should be described by a competent authority as 'grossly erroneous.' All the work of the several provincial departments is valueless as a basis for a topographical map of any pretentions to accuracy. It is possible that some of the traverse lines especially those done in recent years and where the original records are available, might be of some slight assistance in the progress of a topographical survey, though it is questionable whether the attempt to use them would not ultimately prove unprofitable.

The land surveys carried out under the direction of the Dominion Surveyor General in Manitoba and the Northwest and along the railway belt in British Columbia, are of a far higher order of precision. The work in this case is of the same nature, namely, the demarcation on the ground of the township and section lines, and the method of execution is that of accurate chainage from well determined astronomical points. Many of the positions are referred to the international Canada-United States frontier, which was determined by a joint commission, using the Talcott method of latitude determination. Other astronomical latitudes have been fixed in recent years with all the precision of which this method is capable and the longitudes of fundamental points have been determined by the exchange of telegraphic signals. The surveys are not topographical, in the sense that they include neither heights nor contours, nor other representation of the form of the ground, but the points are probably fixed with an accuracy sufficient to enable a preliminary topographical map to be based upon them.

In the course of the survey of the railroad belt of 20 miles on each side of the Canadian Pacific railroad line a chained traverse has been carried over the whole line from Calgary to Vancouver. The precision of this work is not quite up to the standard of which the method is capable, but it is not probable that the position of any point on the road is in error by more than a quarter mile. A certain amount of topographical work has been done along the railway and a map of the whole belt on a scale of 1: 500,000, or 8 miles to an inch has been produced. It is the intention of the department to extend the map to the southern boundary of British Columbia.

The work done by the Geological Survey Department may be defined as a mixture of compilation and original survey. In the eastern provinces, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, where the provincial surveys are either non-existent or valueless, the work has been entirely redone by the method of chained traverses filled in by the compass. The resulting maps therefore attain a considerable degree of precision and in the case of Nova Scotia, where the survey on the 1-inch scale is about two-thirds completed, could doubtless be used as the basis for a preliminary topographical map. The fundamental position upon which the maps of this province are based is that of Halifax as taken from the admiralty charts. The latitude and longitude both of this place and of points at the north and south end of the peninsula, say Sydney, Cape Breton and Yarmouth, might now with advantage be redetermined.

In the case of New Brunswick a map of surface geology and forests on a scale of 4 miles to an inch, is now nearly completed. Three sheets in the northern part of the province remain to be done. In this map a number of heights taken from the railway profiles and from aneroid observations are given, the hills are shown by vertical hachures, and all the features as far as is possible on the scale are indicated. With a revision on the ground to add new roads, etc., and if reprinted with the elimination of the geology this map would make a fair preliminary topographical map of the province. The determination of the astronomical position of one part in the

province, say Moncton, should at the same time be undertaken.

In Ontario and Quebec the provincial surveys have been readjusted on new traverse lines and astronomical positions, and in the west also the work is partly original and partly based upon the Dominion land surveys. Most of the maps, with the exception of those covering Nova Scotia named above, and a few special sheets are on a scale of 4 miles to an inch in the east and centre, and 8 miles to an inch in the northwest

Three special topographical sheets, on a scale of 4 miles to an inch, have been done in the mountain region adjoining the railroad line. The method employed has been a very rough triangulation, based upon the points on the railway determined by the traverse already alluded to, with the details filled in by sketching. These maps have been reproduced in an attractive form with contours and hill shading, but they cannot claim to be more than reconnaissance sketches.

In addition to the work carried out by the civil departments, a considerable amount of military sketching has been done by the cadets of the Royal Military College, Kingston. Owing to the short time available for instruction and to the unsystematic way in which the work of the different men has been put together, the maps compiled from these sketches have hitherto been of less value than might fairly be expected. Lately a more scientific method of compilation has been adopted with a corresponding improvement in the results, but no method of compiling can by any possibility lead to the production of a complete map of a country which will, for a moment, stand comparison with one produced by actual survey.

In the report of the Geographer to the Department of the Interior for 1902, Mr. White, alluding to the difficulties met with in compiling the map of Canada on a scale of thirty-five miles to an inch, wrote:

The lack of an accurate topographical survey, the numerous sources from which information must be obtained, the difficulty in many cases of obtaining access to the plans of old and almost forgotten surveys, the necessity of incorporating surveys that are being made concurrently with the compilation of the map, which frequently alter the work almost as soon as completed, all tend to make the compilation of such a map a long and tedious operation.

Further on in the same report he wrote:

The difficulties encountered in compiling the new map of Canada emphasize the need of a topographical survey of at least the well settled portion of the Dominion. A few years ago I made a survey between two well determined points on Georgian bay and the west of Lake Ontario respectively, which showed that part of central Ontario, as shown in the best existing map, was over two miles out in longitude, and over a mile in error in latitude. Although our maps show streams, lakes, &c., even in the extreme north much of the information upon which they are based is of the vaguest kind.

A geodetic survey of Canada has been the subject of discussion by the Royal Society of Canada. On January 7, 1904, a deputation from the Royal Society of Canada waited upon the Hon. Clifford Sifton, then Minister of the Interior, to present the views of that society. The delegation consisted of Mr. T. C. Keefer, Sir Sandford Fleming, Prof. C. H. McLeod of McGill University and Hon. Senator Casgrain. This delegation urged upon that minister the necessity of a trigonometrical survey.

The Canadian Society of Engineers has memorialized the government upon this subject, and I desire to read just one feature of their address to which I particularly desire to call the attention of the House. It is as follows:

Referring to these requirements, it is understood that there are at the present time in the Dominion government some eight or more independent or semi-independent surveying branches, each of which conducts its operations after its own methods. These methods being conceived separately and in each case for special objects, do not of course accord, and the results obtained through them cannot be of a uniform standard as regards accuracy or topographical detail. The representations of such work on maps or plans are also carried out under varying methods of projection and on a great variety of scale. Such lack of unity of method and also of proper connection between separate surveys must obviously reduce very largely the permanent value of the work as a whole, and there is therefore not realized from our surveys that return which the money expended upon them would seem to justify.

Later, in November, 1906, by order in council, a committee on surveys was appointed to consider and report upon the necessity of an accurate survey of the Dominion, and the production of a topographical map of Canada based upon a network of triangulation. The committee consisted of the chief astronomer of the Interior Department, the Deputy Minister of Railways, the director of the Geological Survey, the chief of the general staff of the Militia Department, the Surveyor General of the Interior Department, the chief clerk of the Engineering Branch of the Department of Public Works; the chief of the Hydrographic Surveyor of the Marine Department, Prof. C. H. McLeod, Professor of Surveying and Geodesey, McGill University, Prof. Stewart of Toronto University, and the Principal of the Polytechnic School, Laval University. The committee on February 15, 1907, submitted the following conclusions to the Minister of Militia and Defence:

1. The committee is of opinion that a comprehensive and reliable survey of the Dominion for the production of an accurate topographic map, based upon a network of triangulation and showing the natural and artificial features of the country, is of urgent

necessity to the people of Canada, from the standpoint of public economy, the extension of public undertakings and the development of the natural resources of the country.

Public economy will be served by the early production of accurate maps, by the collection and record of reliable data for the benefit of all parties interested, public or private, and by the avoidance of the duplication or overlapping of survey work which at present frequently occurs, different parties surveying the same area independently for different purposes.

The extension of every class of public undertaking will be promoted, because such topographic maps will greatly assist in the location of roads, railways, canals, water supply, drainage and irrigation works. This has been found to be the case in all countries where such maps have been produced.

Development of the natural resources of the country will be furthered by the assistance which a reliable survey will afford to the geological examination of areas likely to possess mineral deposits, by the information it will give as to the location of agricultural or timber lands, and by the data it will afford for the preliminary investigations of water-powers, waterways, or other natural aids to industrial enterprise.

A reliable topographic map of Canada is absolutely essential for military purposes, to afford the fullest possible information as to the configuration of the country, its natural and artificial features.

It would be a basis for maps graphically illustrating all matters in connection with statistics such as population, industries, the products of the country, the areas of economic minerals and forests, qualities of soil, drainage and catchment basins of rivers and streams, the position of water-powers and the like.

I desire to call attention to the following remarks contained in this report, being a reference to the bearing of a geodetic survey upon hydrographic surveys. I was told some months ago by a gentleman qualified to speak, that some years ago, on the Atlantic coast it was discovered that a certain point of danger was inaccurately placed upon our charts, the error being some several miles. I do not recollect the exact point. The report proceeds:

An important benefit to be derived from a topographical and hydrographic survey would be the accurate delineation of the coast line of the Atlantic and Pacific sea-boards and the inland waters. It is inevitable that until this is accomplished many disasters must happen to shipping, which might be avoided in a great measure, if there were reliable charts of these waters. One of the first requisites in making hydrographic surveys for the production of accurate charts, is that control points must be accurately established on the shore. Large sums of money are annually expended on harbours, lighthouses and other improvements, yet in many cases the geographical positions of thse harbours and improvements have not been accurately determined.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN.

The report goes on to say:

In political and legislative matters, a topographical map would furnish useful and accurate information as to the boundaries of villages, towns, municipalities, &c., and it would also be of great utility in the administration of all public works and services.

It is possible, with a good topographic map, to plan and lay out engineering works to better advantage than by means of the ordinary preliminary survey. A topographic map would thereby effect not only a saving of large sums of money now annually expended by the government and by private companies in surveys for such undertakings, but would minimize to a great extent the cost of construction, since a better location may be obtained in many cases from a topographic map than from preliminary surveys.

In short, the benefits arising from a good general topographic survey may well be described as practical, political, administrative, military, statistical and economic.

2. The elaboration of a comprehensive scheme that will permit of a satisfactory co-ordination of existing survey material, whether due to the work of government survey departments or to private enterprise, is also a matter of national importance and great practical utility to the people of Canada.

For the proper co-ordination of existing surveys and the effectual control of future surveys, it is necessary to establish in a permanent manner the network of triangulation already referred to, so as to provide a series of points of reference, at convenient distances apart, whose geographical position and absolute altitudes have been accurately determined by appropriate astronomical observations, chains of refined geodetic triangulations and nets of precise spirit levelling.

3. Provision should be made for perpetuating bench marks, points of control, and important points in the interior detail of surveys by permanent monuments. This rule should be applied to all surveys of standard accuracy made under Dominion authority.

4. In order to secure the maintenance of adequate records, there should be a central record office in a suitable fireproof building, where the results of all surveys, inclusive of accurate copies of plans and profiles with brief descriptions, should be filed. For purposes of reference, these documents, when not required to be treated as confidential, should be made readily accessible to all departments or branches of the government service and to the public.

Deposit in this office of all such results, plans or other documents should be made compulsory upon the departments conducting surveys, and upon railway and other companies working under Dominion charters.

5. It is highly desirable that all general and sheet maps should be produced under standard arrangement as regards scale, projection and execution.

For the production of such maps the existence of a central bureau, where maps may be compiled, edited and engraved for the general survey, and, on repayment, for other departments requiring the same, would present many advantages. This provision should not prevent any department equipped for the

purpose from preparing its own plans or maps.

6. In order to secure unity, co-ordination, and efficient administration, as well as the systematic utilization of all survey material, and for the production in sheets of an accurate topographic map of Canada, it is desirable that the controlling and topographic surveys, the land triangulation basis of the hydrographic survey and the map bureau and record office should form branches of one department of the public service.

It is also desirable that these branches should be included with the department of the Geological Survey, together with such other branches of the public service as deal with the natural resources of the Dominion and the quality of whose work depends largely upon accurate maps of the areas under investigation.

7. The prosecution of surveys for special purposes, such as construction of canals or railways, improvements of rivers and harbours, laying off land for settlement, and the like, would be left to the departments to which these matters now appertain, but the departments interested in such surveys should be invited to carry them out, so far as consistent with the end in view, in accordance with such system as may appear best adapted to render the results of permanent value for topographic purposes.

8. The co-operation of the provincial survey departments should be invited.

The report then proceeds to deal with the cost of this proposed work, which I had better put upon 'Hansard' at this point, although that phase of the question is hardly applicable to this division of my remarks. It says:

9. It is not contemplated that surveys extending over the whole country should be undertaken at once. Their extent must be determined by the urgency of the requirements, and the control survey would in the first instance be confined to the better settled parts of the country and to those portions where geological and other researches into the natural resources of the country demand reliable maps upon which to base their operations.

The appropriations in the estimates now before parliament for the work of the branches which we recommend should be brought together are:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES.

Geological Survey, Supt. of Mines Branch..	$242,475
Hydrographers' Branch, including veys..	269,067
Hydrographers' Branch, including new steamer 'Tidal' survey..	349,500
Geographers' Branch..	58,890
Total..	$919,932

The money provided in these estimates if administered under the unified management, is sufficient, subject only to such natural development as may take place in the future, for the establishment of a systematic survey, without additional appropriations therefor by parliament.

Of the sums mentioned above there is available for field work of surveys:

Geological survey..	$ 25,000
Astronomical branch including Boundary Surveys and Trigonometrical Survey..	204,000
Hydrographic Branch..	150,000
	$379,000

Out of the chief astronomer's vote, $50,000 has already been noted in the estimates as for the trigonometrical survey, in connection with which some work has been done in the vicinity of Ottawa in 1905 and 1906, and triangulation forms part of the plan of operations of the International Boundary Surveys. A portion of the expenditure for the latter, say $10,000, may be consequently credited to control work making, with $50,000 above mentioned, a total of $60,000, available for purposes of control.

This will be sufficient to carry on the triangulation eastward from Ottawa towards Montreal and the Richelieu river, to conduct some triangulation on the River St. Lawrence, to assist the hydrographer who will thereby be enabled to devote the funds at his disposal more directly to sounding, &c., and to contribute towards control of work in the west, such as the continuation eastward along the 49th parallel of the boundary survey triangulation. All this work is such as will necessarily be included in the Geodetic Survey so soon as the methods of conducting the latter and the areas over which it shall extend shall have been determined.

Meanwhile the control work may be gradually extended over the country connecting the new surveys and correcting the old. It is thought that, with the union of the surveying departments mentioned, it will be possible in future years so to distribute the funds devoted to surveys among the several branches as to develop the topographic map systematically.

The inauguration of a systematic survey of Canada, therefore, calls for no immediate increase of expenditure. Whether there shall be increase, or continuance of the present expenditure in the future is a matter for future decision, based on consideration of the cost of the work in relation to the beneficial results obtained from it. This decision will rest wholly with the government and parliament.

10. For the complete working out of all the details which will arise from the foregoing, and especially to provide for that accord which is necessary in the operations of the several survey branches of the Dominion a Permanent Survey Board should be appointed.

The board should be similar in composition to the present survey committee, and have power to call in consultation such other persons as from time to time it may desire.

The board should advise as to the development and methods of the control survey. It should suggest such regulations as it might consider necessary or desirable regarding all surveys and mapping, and should invite co-operation towards securing the practical application of the same. It should constitute a board of conference for the several survey departments.

A reasonable appropriation, say $8,000 per annum, should be made for the necessary expenses of the board.

In the event of these recommendations receiving the approval of the government the immediate appointment of the board is urged, in order that they may undertake their duties without delay.

I do not know that I could do better at this stage than give to the House statements from individuals and reports showing the benefits that are possible from accurate topographical surveys. I desire to give to the House first a statement made by President Van Hise, of the University of Michigan, and which is, I think, a very practical illustration. He says:

A railroad company owned two lines in northern Michigan and Wisconsin which they wished to connect by a branch some forty miles in length. The country was unknown between the two lines. Under my direction topographical, geological and timber maps were made of about twelve hundred square miles, at a cost of about $25,000. After these maps were made the line was laid down in the office with a beautiful grade, and with the best location possible with reference to iron ore and timber. One of the features of the line was that it crossed a bold trap range which was supposed to be impossible to cross except at great expense, by finding gaps through it. This line crossed the branch of another railroad about twelve miles long, which because it went around the end of this trap range, when the gap was directly in front of it, was at least two miles longer than was necessary. These two additional miles of road cost fully as much as the entire survey of the twelve hundred square miles.

It is my profound conviction if topographical surveys were made of broad zones where it is expected to project railroads through forested country, that many times the cost of the survey would be saved in the construction of the railroads, besides getting a better location both as to resources and to grade than is possible by the random methods employed at the present time for the locating of railroads in rough forested country.

In answer to a question asked by the member for Cumberland a few weeks ago the Minister of Railways stated as to a recent survey for a projected diversion of the Intercolonial Railway, completed only about two months ago, that the cost thereof was $9,914.05. The greater portion of this amount might doubtless have been saved had that section of an old province like Nova Scotia been properly surveyed in the past. The statement has been made by General Francis A. Walker that:

If the state of Massachusetts had had a good topographical map in 1863, some $20,000,000 would probably have been saved in its public railway expenditure.

The area of the state of Massachusetts being 8,315 square miles, this saving would amount to over $2,400 per square mile. The topographical survey of the state has cost $13 per square mile. Dr. Frank D. Adams in a recent paper read before the Canadian Institute quotes from a letter from Dr. C. D. Walcott, lately director of the United States Geological Survey, as follows:

Such maps——

—those of the the United States Geological Survey——

—are as essential to the proper development of all the resources of a state. We have reached the point where officials of railroads, of trolley lines, those interested in highway improvements and in the development of city water supplies and sanitary measures as in general engineering work, do not think of spending one dollar on field surveys until they have first procured from this office the topographic maps and the records of levels run in connection therewith. We are in daily receipt of testimonials showing the sums of money and the time saved in connection with all preliminary and also of some location surveys for such enterprises. Above all, however, is the topographic map, an essential to the study, along modern lines and by best methods, of the mineral resources of a region. The old descriptive methods of discussing the geology of a district have long been abandoned in this country. It has been found that every dollar expended in preparing a mathematically correct base map upon which to map the geologic formations for strikes and dip and from which to construct structural sections, is returned many-fold in the value and accuracy of the resulting studies of the geologic formations and their economic possibilities. A good topographical map is just as essential a frame work upon which is to reproduce a facsimile of the underlying geology, as is the steel frame which modern architects use for, and support a masonry building of modern design.

I might give to the House many other statements and reports upon the urgent necessity of a trigonometrical survey of the Dominion, but it appears to be unnecessary to extend those already given. Now, I think this is an important matter and I believe a geodetic survey should be commenced as early as possible and that some work, even though but little, be performed each year. I believe also that this work should be carried on by a new departmental branch to be established, and not by one of the existing departments. This branch might be officered by the deputy heads of the departments now carrying on survey work. However this is but a matter of detail, and after all, is secondary to the main idea of a geodetic survey. I trust the government will see fit to take this matter into consideration and adopt at an early date a policy which will ensure the commencement of an accurate survey of Canada.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). There is no question as to the importance of the survey work carried on from time to time in this country, as any one may judge from a glance at the estimates or at the Auditor General's Report. It is a necessity in the development of our

country, and it is right that the fullest attention should be given to the matter. I am glad that my hon. friend has brought this matter before the House. I can hardly allow the motion to pass, however, without giving some information, and the views I hold based upon that information, which views are not altogether in accord with those my hon. friend has expressed. There is no doubt that the great feature of a survey is that it should be accurate, and that the various surveys should be properly related to each other. If it were possible that there should be a geodetic survey of the Dominion of Canada in advance of all other surveys, it certainly would be in the end a measure of economy, and would undoubtedly secure an accuracy that is not at present possible. But I need hardly suggest to the House that when it costs so much money as it does to keep within measurable distance of the actual survey requirements of the country as it progresses, the task of keeping ahead of the requirements with a geodetic survey would cost a sum beyond which I think the country could afford, or that parliament would sanction. If it were possible to keep in advance of settlement, in advance of railway construction, in advance of geological investigation, by a geodetic survey, still I do not think it would be advisable for the government to enter upon the enterprise, unless we assume that the country is made for the surveys and not the surveys for the country. A railroad survey is necessary because, for one reason or another, it is in the public interest that a railroad should be built, although there may have been no other reason for survey in the locality traversed by that railroad. It is desirable that there should be geological exploration, which should only be limited by the extreme bounds of our country; it is desirable that there should be lands laid out for settlement, well in advance of settlement, so that pioneers may have security in their holdings. But it would not be well that all these enterprises should have to wait until an accurate survey had been made in that part of the country where it was required for these various purposes. The theory that my hon. friend has expressed is an excellent theory, and no doubt it would work well if Canada were an island or a small and fertile country. But Canada being so extensive, the conclusion to which I am forced to come is that the proposition is not a practicable one, is not a business proposition, is not within the resources of the country, and would be greatly to the disadvantage of the country if it were undertaken. I speak however of a geodetic survey made in advance of the actual requirements, which is the ideal condition that my hon. friend has suggested. But a geodetic survey that will follow these requirements which I have mentioned, that would check up and bring into their proper relationship the surveys already made, is another matter. It is not as theoretically sound, but it is much more sound practically. It is within reach, it is possible and it is not only being undertaken but it has made very substantial progress. The representations which my hon. friend has mentioned were made to the government some years ago have been dealt with, have been acted on to a certain extent; and the astronomical surveys branch of the Department of the Interior, some two or three years ago, took up the subject of the making of a geodetic survey of Canada, beginning in those parts which were already settled, where surveys for settlement, or railways and roads had already been made. These surveys were not in themselves accurate and it was thought necessary and desirable that they should be established in their proper relationship to each other. In pursuance of that work parliament has voted, from year to year, a considerable amount of money and is being asked to vote $50,000 for it during the present session. The work of the geodetic survey has been in progress, has covered a very considerable portion of the better settled portions of Ontario, and is also in progress in the St. Lawrence valley in the province of Quebec. A number of members of the House have, from time to time, inquired as to the purpose and meaning of certain wooden towers which they have seen in different parts of the country. These towers are in connection with the geodetic survey and it may relieve the minds of hon. members of the House to know that they are not for any more harmful purpose than merely to establish the proper relationship of different points on the different surveys to the parts of the country in which they are situated.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they all wooden towers or are some of them iron?

Mr. OLIVER. I think they are wooden. They are for the purpose of observation. The work has been undertaken, has made good progress and so long as parliament is willing to pay for the work so long can it be continued. There is no difference of opinion between myself and my hon. friend as to the desirability of a geodetic survey, but what I want to place before the House is the difference between a theoretically desirable geodetic survey which shall be in advance of all other surveys and a practical geodetic survey which shall, as circumstances admit, follow upon the surveys already made for the various purposes for which surveys are necessary. It is true that there may be to some extent a duplica-

tion of work in the surveys which have been made. That is only to a very limited degree. The survey which is required in the western country for the allotment of settlers and the surveys which were required in this country in the early days for the allotment of settlers do not interfere with or duplicate the surveys necessarily made for the construction of railways or in geological investigations. There may be instances where the work overlaps but these instances are of very trifling moment. The main point is that the need of the country, as it is at the moment and in the places in which it exists, is met as at present without delay, or with the least possible delay and that, I submit is the object and purpose of any system of surveys. The absolute accuracy that is secured by the geodetic survey is something we can wait for until we can afford it, but we cannot afford to wait for it in pushing settlement and enterprise throughout the vast extent of this stupendous country. A geodetic survey of Belgium, or the state of Massachusetts, or of Ireland even, is one thing; a geodetic survey of the Dominion of Canada is quite another thing. Even a geodetic survey of the United States with its population of eighty millions and its stupendous revenue is quite a different thing from a geodetic survey of the Dominion of Canada with its population and revenue.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What progress has been made in the United States?

Mr. OLIVER. I have no idea.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, this is a very important subject and one that the House should not dismiss hastily. I very heartily agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean). The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) who has just sat down, unfortunately, does not seem to grasp the basic idea of the remarks of the hon. member for Lunenburg. He seems to think that a geodetical or a topographical survey is a theoretical survey and that the only practical survey is the method at present in vogue by his department in laying out town lots, farm lands and work of that character. Let me assure him that as far as practical work is concerned the most accurate method is that which conforms to the requirements of the triangulation and topographical survey, and that the theoretical and purely nebulous idea is the idea at present in vogue of having surveys made without having any fixed point and without showing any topographical features. It is well known that in every country in modern Europe and in the United States there is a topographical and geodetic survey. The hon. member for Lunenburg has explained very clearly the difference between the present system of surveying and a geodetic survey. Let me point out here that a geodetic survey commences first with the measurement of a known base. This base is measured with very accurate instruments and the error in a mile would not amount to the thousandth part of an inch. Taking a point say at McGill university,—a mile would be measured and from that the whole country would be triangulated and measured within the thousandth part of an inch. This work should be done, if it is to be done by us, with exceeding accuracy. The United States government undertook a survey of this description of the great lakes and I noticed by reference to some of the correspondence of the Waterways Commission, that the survey of the great lakes has proven to be false in many respects because there was a slight error, possibly when they began, which, of course, increased into a vast error when the large number of angles were triangulated and closed up. Of course, the triangulation of the country in connection with a geodetic survey could be very rapidly done and could be completed from coast to coast possibly within three or four years. Following that comes the topographical survey which radiates from the points fixed by the triangulation. I know a little about the subject and I may therefore be excused if I deal with it briefly.

The Department of Militia and Defence has already had a number of these topographical surveys made and I must say they are admirable so far as they go. Now, suppose the surveyors of farm lands throughout Canada were compelled to insert the topographical features necessary for a military map, the added cost would not be 25 per cent over the present cost and the work would be done at once and finished for all time. We were told by the Minister of Militia that the great general staff system of England is to be adopted in Canada. In every country in Europe one of the functions of the great general staff is to carry out an accurate topographical survey of the whole country. Nobody can doubt that at present there is an enormous waste in the making of surveys under our system. Even in the older sections we have surveyors privately employed in every township and their work is never finished because if they require to draw a second line after having drawn a first, there is no map and the work has to be done over again. We have also, under one department of government, the surveying of land into sections and quarter-sections, and that survey could just as well be conducted on the lines of a topographical survey in the first place. To do this it would need only the addition of one or two extra men to the surveyor's staff, because experience has shown that one square mile per day can be done by two men with such

a degree of accuracy that in no place will the work be out more than a foot or two at any particular point. Compared with the geological maps of the United States, our geological maps are but a laughing stock and as the attempts of school children. The railroads of the country do a great deal of topographical work, but the government of the country does not benefit by that at all. Then, the provincial governments are constantly spending money in making surveys and the existing system does not enable these to be available to the general advantage of the people of the country. We should understand, however, that a great many of the old surveyors are entirely opposed to a topographical survey because their system compared with the system which obtains in the best and most modern surveys is as different as night from day. They work with a chain, a field book, and a theodolite, but the modern system adopted in other countries is to do this work by the plain table method. Not one out of five of the old surveyors, good men as they are, understand anything about topographical work, using what is known as clinometer and prismatic compass and running various section lines over a square mile of territory, sketching the under features on a small portable drawing board as they go along. That is the military system of surveying, and it is as far in advance of the old method as the modern trolley car is ahead of an ox-cart. In the United States the engineering and surveying work is under the control of the war department, but in Canada almost every department of government has its engineering staff and at the present time we have the Public Works Department conducting a survey of the Niagara Peninsula to ascertain the best place to run the Welland canal, when at the same time we have an excellent map, prepared by the Militia Department, which would give the Public Works Department in fifteen minutes all the information required without going to extra expense. Here is an instance of duplication. If we are going to adopt the methods which have been found satisfactory in England and other countries we must group all our engineering staff under one department and that one department should be the Department of Militia and Defence. I say this with a good deal of diffidence, because of my being associated to some extent with the militia of Canada, but it is a fact that in the United States the geological survey and other surveys and all public works are carried out under the supervision of the war department, and with possibly one or two exceptions the records of the Uuited States for the last twenty years have shown nothing dishonourable in connection with contracts, and the contractors have had to live up to their agreements, because the men in charge of the engineering work were men of as high honour as could be found in any service in the world. We have in Canada the Royal Military College, which is educating the very men best fitted for this kind of work. The Minister of Militia will agree with me that every graduate of the Royal Military College must be a thorough topographical surveyor as well as an ordinary surveyor. If all the surveying and engineering work of the government were grouped into one bureau, then the various departments of the government could submit their proposals to that bureau, the engineering work could be done by it; and we would avoid the duplication of effort which we have at the present time, and I believe several millions of dollars per annum could be saved to the country. I submit that this board which has been referred to should be made a section of the general staff and we should in its initiation include among its members the very ablest engineers and surveyors in the country. Any one who looks at the German maps will see that they are done in two colours, black and white, and you can tell from a glance at them where every vineyard, every stable, every house, every elevation or under feature of the ground is located. As has been pointed out in the statement of Professor Van Hise, the cost of this work is trifling, and when once it is done it is final. If you want to find out anything about the topography of the country you will not have to send a band of surveyors to run lines or go on a voyage of discovery; any engineer can take a map of that kind and ascertain where a railway or a street car line or a canal should be located and all that remains to be done in any engineering scheme is to put down the posts in the places marked on that map.

This is a subject which I think this House should take into its very serious consideration, because it is not wise for us at enormous expense to commence adding additional boards or commissions or departments of work. Would it not be better to have more centralization of this work and to have it under a competent head? I know I am advancing revolutionary sentiments, so far as the ministers in certain departments are concerned; but ministers in charge of departments carrying on public works must realize that this is the way work of this kind is done in the mother country, to whose experience we constantly appeal for the best methods. The Minister of the Interior says that this system would tend to make the country for the surveyors rather than the surveys for the country. I claim that it would not. Any engineer who understands topographical surveying will testify that the additional cost, for instance of laying out a country in the north-west by a complete topographical survey

would not be more than 25 or 30 per cent. The only additional cost would be in having a department where the maps would be accurately defined on copper plates, and the plates would be kept in a safe place, so that if at any time additional maps were required, the plates could be taken and the maps printed from them. I understand that the Waterways and Boundary Commission are adopting that method for the lake surveys. A department has been established in Buffalo where all the work of their engineers is transferred to copper plates, so that it will form a permanent record. I think this House cannot do better than adopt the resolution, or at least the sentiments, of my hon. friend from Lunenburg. The hon. Minister of Militia is doing excellent work in this direction; and though his colleagues may think that he is throwing away good money in having topographical maps provided, I think that he who understands the matter will assure this House that for the defence of the country alone it is a wise expenditure of money. It is only within the last year that we have had any topographical maps of this country which would enable officers not acquainted locally with the country, even in the older sections, to find their way. An officer who understands the reading of such a map and knows its scale, can fix his position on the map in two minutes, and if ordered to march twenty or thirty miles to a given point, he could, by means of his compass, find the direction in which to go; and, even if he had to pass through forests and ravines, he could come within a few feet of the very spot to which he was required to go. I would like very much to hear from the Minister of Militia on this question, in view of the fact that we have now pledged ourselves as a country to accept the staff system adopted by England; and it should be our desire to carry out that system faithfully by establishing a department for carrying out both topographical and geodetic surveys.

Mr. C. A. MAGRATH (Medicine Hat). Mr. Speaker, being in an agreeable mood to-night I am disposed to agree to a great extent with the gentlemen who have preceded me. We had a scientific survey, topographical and geodetic, started in this country in 1876, in Mr. Mackenzie's time. That survey was carried on in the western country for three or four years, and was then abandoned; but provision was made in the Surveys Act under which men were to be qualified and known as Dominion topographical surveyors. I have devoted considerable study to that branch of my profession. There are two interests to be served in connection with surveys, the commercial and the scientific. While I agree with the mover of this resolution that it is very desirable to get a scientific survey started, I must at the same time admit the position taken by the Minister of the Interior that our great work is to get the country settled and to make the necessary surveys for that purpose. One criticism which I have to offer in regard to the move made by the government in collecting information is this, that it placed the matter in the hands of the officials of the various branches. While I have nothing to say against those gentlemen, while they are very able men, I feel that there must always be a certain amount of jealousy between the difierent branches. Under these circumstances it is desirable, if you are going to appoint a commission to investigate the question of a scientific survey, to go outside of your own officials. For my part, I would like to see a commission appointed by the government to investigate the methods in use in the United States, in France and in other countries, and to prepare Canada to take up a geodetic survey on the very best and broadest lines. I see no harm in that; I think it is a good move. I want to draw the minister's attention to the fact that in our western country we have a treeless area of from 50,000,000 to 70,000,000 acres. We have streams there running from the mountains and discharging into Hudson bay at from 200 to 300 feet below the level of the prairie. We have a soil largely clay, through which there is practically no percolation, so that it is almost impossible for people to get water in springs; and I take the position that any country where that is the case must be pronounced largely semi-arid in its character. I am not going to mention any particular localities; but if you examine the meterological returns covering fifteen or sixteen years, you will find many settlements where there is not on the average more than nine or ten inches of rainfall in the year. In this district near the Ottawa river, the water is carried near the surface, and the character of the soil is such that the water percolates through it, and in addition there is a very heavy rainfall. If nine or ten or eleven inches of annual rainfall is sufficient for crops, and if we are going to put an immense population into that western country, we shall have to have some system of water distribution. We cannot depend on the rainfall to secure for a very large population sufficient water both for domestic purposes and to supply the necessary moisture for crops. That in my opinion is a serious question, one that concerns every member of this House; because if there is any ground for my fears, we want to get busy, and get busy very quickly to see what we can do to help the people of our western country in this matter.

The mover of this resolution referred to Dr. Walcott and the work of the geological survey of the United States. That work was taken up some 15 or 20 years ago. In addition to taking thorough measurement of the

various streams, they also established contour lines throughout the country. The work is done at very reasonable cost, but it takes a series of at least 15 years for any scientific investigation to get with any reasonable accuracy what that water service is going to amount to, and the sooner we start that work on good broad lines the better. Take the river that passes our door, that river has been changing the last ten years or more. If we had been measuring that stream during all those years, we would have been notified by those measurements of certain things transpiring within the drainage area of that stream, and the same remark applies throughout the whole country. Our waters are the most valuable asset our country possesses and the sooner we get to work to obtain better measurements of our various streams the better. This is a matter which I commend to the hon. the Minister of the Interior for his most serious consideration. In the estimates there is a sum of about $10,000 for that purpose, but that is not sufficient. I spoke of this to the former Minister of the Interior a few months before he retired (Mr. Sifton), and he told me he would endeavour to put $20,000 in the estimates for that kind of work. We need a great deal more than that to do the work properly. The commercial end we must look after, and the scientific end will follow. Take the west, where we have these irrigation companies, we ought to have certain surveys made there. Let me mention one case for the benefit of the Minister of the Interior. We ought to have a survey made from the Old Man river to see if it is not possible to carry water from it into the district in between the Little Bow river and the Belly river, for the purpose of running small creeks through the country to supply domestic needs.

I had no idea this matter was coming up to-night, or I would have been prepared to go into it to a much greater extent, but I should think it would be only necessary to draw the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the work for him to see its necessity. I want to get from under the load if there ever should be a time in the prairies when the people will not find sufficient water for their necessities. The matter is one of most serious import to that country, and I most sincerely trust the hon. Minister of the Interior will take the same view of it.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). We are very much indebted to the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) for having brought this matter up and also the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) for the very able manner in which he seconded the motion. We are much indebted to these gentlemen for the very clear way in which the question has been discussed and the very valuable information vouchsafed to the House. I did not intend saying anything but since the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has appealed to me, I feel it would be only courteous that I did say a word or two, particularly as I have had something to do in a small way with certain surveys which he has been good enough to characterize as excellent and which, I am happy to know, have been appreciated throughout the country. I do not intend to enter upon a discussion of any controversial character. It is a matter of little consequence to me whether the surveys are carried out by the Militia Department or by the Department of the Interior, so long as an accurate survey is undertaken promptly, and I am glad to hear from my hon. colleague the Minister of the Interior that such a survey is actually being carried out. In the United States, as my hon. friends from North Simcoe and Lunenburg have observed, these surveys, and in fact all engineering work, are absolutely under the control of the war office, and after the experience of a century the system has been found to work amirably. As the hon. member for North Simcoe, (Mr. Currie) has said, in not more than one or two cases has the good faith of the engineers in the United States, connected with public works, ever been questioned in the slightest degree. It seems to me to be reasonable too that if in a peaceful country such as the United States has generally been, and in Canada such as we hope it will always be, it is necessary to maintain a military force and an engineering branch in connection with that force, it is very desirable that some important work should be given to that engineering staff. In the United States the engineering staff has been engaged in work of this kind. I think it would be desirable, in view of the class of men we have now in the engineering branch of the Canadian militia, that some work of this kind should be given them, and we have undertaken to do mapping work and surveys for the defence purposes of those portions of the Dominion of which an accurate knowledge of the topography is absolutely necessary if we are to know anything about the means of defending the country in the event of an attack being made.

As to how quickly this work shall be done that is a question, as my hon. colleague has pointed out, very largely of money, and I did not understand him to say that he in any way objected to carrying on a geodetic survey or a triangulation of the whole Dominion except from the point of view of the very great expense, and his

view is that it should be done gradually and that the surveys already carried out should be co-related for future use, I should hope that the report moved for will be brought down and printed and that every hon. member will carefully read it, and that parliament will be ready to vote to my hon. colleague the necessary sum to enable this geodetic survey and triangulation to be carried out in the most rapid manner possible, which very likely would not take, at the most, more than ten years.

My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has quoted the statement of a very prominent gentleman of Massachusetts, a statement which I have read myself, to the effect that if there had been a geodetic survey of the state of Massachusetts fifty or sixty years ago, millions upon millions of dollars would have been saved to the state in the construction of railways and other public works. The same thing would be true of this country. Fortunately for Canada, the country has only begun to be settled, and it will be possible, I hope, to have the advantage of a geodetic survey in many portions of the country before the construction of railways is extensively undertaken. The papers moved for, I believe, are under control of the Militia Department. I shall have pleasure in having them brought down, if this motion is carried, almost immediately.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion on the motion of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean). I think that surveys of this nature, so far as this country is concerned, have been perhaps too much a matter of secrecy; the public generally have not had the advantage of the information contained in those surveys. I think we differ somewhat from the Americans in that respect. There is not the slightest doubt about the benefit to the public in the United States from the topographical maps. For one thing, they have saved a great deal of expense to the agriculturists of that country in the carrying out of drainage works. The federal government has undertaken the reclamation of large areas of swamp land, and these surveys have been very valuable to the people interested in that matter. I think they estimate something like 73,000,000 acres of swamp lands to be reclaimed east of the Rocky mountains, and these maps which have been issued to the public have been used largely with a view to assisting the agriculturists in that respect. It seems to me that, under whatever department these surveys may be made, they ought to first take up the country that is more thickly settled, and where the information would be of greater interest to the public than in the outlying district. I can quite understand the force of what the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) says in reference to the expense. In a new country like this, we have to do a good many things in the rough, so to speak, because we must keep in advance of the immediate requirements of the people and the development of the country. The relation that these surveys may have to commercial enterprises is manifest, and I think that if they were taken up with a view to assisting in these as well as in military work, it would be greatly to the advantage of the people in the more rapid development of the country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I listened with a great deal of attention and interest to the very instructive speech of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) and I entirely agree that he is entitled to the thanks of the House for having brought a matter of so much importance to our attention. The subject was mentioned to me, I think about a year and a half ago, by Professor McLeod, of McGill, the professor in charge of this work in that great university. I was very much impressed with the view which he then urged, and on that account I have listened to the debate this evening with all the greater interest. I appreciate what has been said by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). We cannot expect settlement or mining development or any other of the great enterprises of this country, to wait until we have had a thoroughly scientific survey. That goes without saying; it is hardly necessary to urge it. I did not understand that the hon. member for Lunenburg did urge it. But he did urge the very great importance of having a thoroughly scientific and accurate survey undertaken and carried out as rapidly as might reasonably be expected, having regard to the undoubtedly very great cost of work of that kind. The minister tells us that the work had been undertaken and has already made considerable progress. I should have been very glad indeed if he could have given to us a little more information as to the progress made, but that, perhaps, will be disclosed in the documents moved for by the hon. member for Lunenburg. The Civil Service Commission of 1907 pointed out in their report, if my memory serves me correctly, that a good deal of work in surveying by the different departments was duplicated, or perhaps, done three or four times by different departments. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior does not seem to attach very much importance to that. But, possibly, there is more waste of that kind than one would gather from the hon. gentleman's speech this evening. Of course, we should all think it highly desirable that duplication of work in that way should be avoided, that the departments should co-ordinate to work a little more. I suppose there is always a certain amount of red tape wherever there are departments.

I remember my surprise some years ago on being told by a certain minister of the Crown of that day that his department had been obliged to pay demurrage for, I think, about ten days, while another department of the government was making up its mind whether it could use the wharf of that department. In the meantime, the public money was being paid over to the owner of a steamship with certain commodities aboard designed for the use of one of the departments. This friction and red tape as between the departments, should be put on one side, and these surveys should be carried on, as much as possible, without duplication of work. I do not know how far this work has progressed in the United States. They have been at work for many years. I should have been glad of information from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) or the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) on that point and also on the question how much these may expect to accomplish in ten or fifteen years. We have not received much information on that point. Perhaps it also will be disclosed in the papers brought down. I understand that the military surveys which have been referred to by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. J. A. Currie) and the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) are topographical and not geodetic. Passing from that for a moment, let me draw attention to the necessity of emphasizing the views put forward by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath). I am not nearly so familiar with conditions in the west as is that hon. gentleman or the Minister of the Interior, but I have been through the west on three or four occasions and have every reason to believe that settlement there is being retarded at the present time by the lack, in certain portions of that country, of water necessary for domestic use. The hon. member for Medicine Hat has pointed out the necessity of an accurate survey, especially in the west, of our water supply, that is water supply not only for purposes of irrigation, but for domestic use.

He intended to point out, as he has just now observed to me, the importance of some scheme by which the abundant supply of water flowing from the mountains through the great regions of the west which might be regarded as semi-arid, could be utilized to a greater extent than it has been utilized for domestic use, and he is under the impression that that could be done by a series of creeks or channels which would forward settlement very much in some of the regions where settlement has hitherto been difficult, and in that way give to the people of that western country a supply of water for domestic purposes which has been lacking to a great extent. When I was in the west about five years ago I was approached by the inhabitants of two or three different communities, who told me that they had been sinking artesian wells in various places to a great depth, but had not been able to secure water, and that some intervention or assistance from the government was absolutely necessary if those communities were to continue. It may be that in the particular instances which I have now in mind some relief has since been found, but there is no doubt whatever that this is a very serious matter in some portions of the west, and that it deserves the consideration of the government and of this parliament. I would only say in conclusion that while I thoroughly appreciate the attitude of the Minister of the Interior as to the necessity that great enterprises of settlement should go on without waiting for a scientific survey, still I am of the opinion advocated by my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) that an accurate scientific survey such as has been carried on, or is now in a very far advanced stage, in every civilized nation of the world, should be carried on in this country as well, and that a reasonable amount of the revenues of the country should be yearly diverted to this purpose in order that we may not be behind other great nations in this regard.

Motion agreed to.

DIVERSION OF THE WATERS OF THE ALLEGASH RIVER.

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD (Victoria, N.B.) moved for

Copy of all corespondence and reports between the United States and the Dominion governments respecting the diversion of the waters of the Allegash river, a tributary of the St. John river.

He said: I desire to submit to the House a few remarks in support of this motion. We see in volume 1 of the United States statutes, under the heading 'Constitution of the United States,' that the constitution and the laws of the United States made in pursuance hereto, and all treaties made and to be made with other countries, including those with respect to boundaries between Canada and the United States, are to be regarded as the supreme law of the United States, and every state in the union is bound thereby, notwithstanding any legislation it may pass. By the Ashburton treaty, the River St. John, which is 450 miles in length, taking its source in the state of Maine and in the province of Quebec, was made the international boundary between the United States and the province of New Brunswick, at a certain point where the said state borders opposite Madawaska county. By this treaty it was provided that in order to encourage and promote industry of the inhabitants living in the state fo Maine, or the province of New Brunswick, the waters of the River St. John and its tributaries, be free for the transportation of the products of

the forest and of agriculture. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that by the provisions of that treaty all lumber cut at the head waters of the St. John river was to be free to float down to the mouth of said river at St. John, on the Bay of Fundy. The Allegash river is a tributary of the St. John river, and is entirely within the state of Maine. In 1841, a year previous to the Ashburton treaty, an application was made for the purpose of cutting a canal between Lake Chamberlin and one of the branches of the Penobscot river. We find that this application was refused, for several reasons. In 1846 a company known as the Lake Telos and Webster Pond Log and Sluiceway Company was chartered by the legislature of the state of Maine, and was authorized to cut a canal between Lake Churchill and one of the branches of the Penobscot river. I desire to explain that the River Allegash takes its source in Lake Churchill, Lake Chamberlin and Lake Heron and a few other lakes. In 1874, another application was made for authorization to build a dam at the foot of Lake Churchill in order to divert the waters of the Allegash river into a branch of the Penobscot river, and prevent the lumbermen on the River St. John from enjoying the benefit they had derived from the waters of that river. Under the authority expressed or implied in this Act, the lumbermen of the state of Maine cut the canal and diverted practically part of the waters of the Allegash river into a river of their own. In 1903 our American friends were not satisfied with having diverted the waters of that river to their own use, and they made another application to the legislature of the state of Maine for authorization to build the dam a litle higher in order to secure still greater advantages. The people of the province of New Brunswick at that time were aware of what was going on, and they hired a lawyer and sent him over to Augusta, the capital of Maine, to oppose that legislation.

I am sorry to say that the legislature granted the application and consequently further authority was given to build dams, to cut canals and to divert more water from these lakes and from the Allegash river. What is the result of diverting that water from the St. John river? The lumbermen in the northern part of the province of New Brunswick are suffering every year. The lumber is driven down in the early part of the season passing the point at which Allegash river falls into the St. John river. In the beginning of June the water of the St. John river is lowered and a large quantity of lumber driven down from the headquarters of St. John is held back and part of it remains along the shore of the St. John river all summer. We know as a matter of fact that when a log remains exposed to the weather and the heat of the sun all summer its value, when it is manufactured into deals and boards the following season, is found to have decreased by probably one third. This is a great loss to the lumbermen of St. John and along the St. John river. This is a matter that I think should be brought prominently before the parliament of this country. We have tolerated the course of our friends in the state of Maine for years but I think the time has arrived when we should take steps to put an end to this grievance. We have now to submit our grievance to a commission and I am glad to say that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has seen fit to look into the matter very closely and that a commission has been appointed to deal with it. The commissioners, I understand are about to commence their investigation in connection with the troubles which now exist between the lumbermen in the state of Maine and those in the province of New Brunswick. The treaty lays it down most distinctly that the interests connected with the St. John river should be protected. It is a matter of surprise to know that on different occasions the state of Maine has passed a law authorizing people in that state to cut canals, build dams, and divert the water of the Allegash river into the Penobscot. The laws under which treaties are made are called the supreme laws of the land. I cannot understand how the government, the legislature and the senators of the state of Maine should have passed laws at direct variance with the provisions of this treaty. We cannot help feeling very deeply the injury done to our industries by not abiding by this treaty. We have felt the insult to our honour as Canadians and British subjects. The treaty has not been carried out to the letter as it should have been by our friends. Since they call every treaty made under their institutions the supreme law of the land they should be the first to observe it. I hope the commission already appointed will take this matter into their serious consideration. I hope they will not only inquire into the trouble which now exists between the two countries but that they will go farther and ascertain the damage which our people have suffered for forty or fifty years by the diversion of the water of the Allegash river into one of their own rivers.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, the question which my hon. friend (Mr. Michaud) has brought to the attention of the House is certainly one of verv great importance not only to the people of the province of New Brunswick who are engaged in lumbering operations upon the St. John river, but also to a considerable section of the inhabitants of the state of Maine, who are also carrying on lumbering and business

operations on the river and who are equally interested with the people of New Brunswick in seeing that the navigation of the river is preserved. This diversion of the waters of the Allegash from the river St. John into the Penobscot took place a great many years ago and, as my hon. friend has so well stated, it has been the cause of a great deal of dissatisfaction on the part of the people living on the St. John river, and it has led to very serious difficulty on several occasions, and, I think, I am safe in saying that upon more than one occasion it has almost led to bloodshed. Our people have felt that those who have acted under the authority of the legislature of the state of Maine have acted in disregard of those national obligations which the people of that country ought to observe towards the people of a friendly nation. While I was a member of the government of the province of New Brunswick I was the medium through which his honour the Lieutenant Governor was recommended to have a communication sent to the British ambassador in the hope of inducing the United States government to intervene and to prevent this diversion of which our people complain. The protests were sent forward by this government in the ordinary way and through the ordinary channels, but, unfortunately, they have not so far resulted in the grievance being remedied. Of course, one difficulty under which our people have suffered is that we can have no redress in the courts, because, if we were to proceed in the courts of the state of Maine, our people would be met by the fact that there has been passed a statute of the legislature of the state of Maine authorizing the company to which my hon. friend has referred to divert the waters in the manner which has been complained of. Therefore, it would seem as if the only recourse we could have is through diplomatic correspondence in the hope of inducing the government of the United States to take such action as may bring about a discontinuance of the interference with the navigation of the St. John river. I am happy to say that I believe, that, as a result of the feeling to which expression has been given by the government of the United States in agreeing to the waterways treaty and also in agreeing to the commission to consider the obstruction to the St. John river, there is apparent a desire, a sincere desire that these difficulties shall be overcome and that all the causes of friction shall be done away with. It is a very important fact that in the waterways treaty which has been submitted to parliament it is expressly provided that there is reserved to each country the right to insist upon the necessity of navigation being preserved, and that neither country shall have the right to divert any waters flowing into boundary waters or boundary rivers which would in any way materially lower the level of the water or interfere with navigation. If this treaty should become law, we will have in it a recognition of that principle and that right, and the logical consequence which I hope will follow at no distant day will be, that the United States government will take steps to do away with the provisions which have been made for diverting the waters of this very important river into a river in the state of Maine, and allowing it to flow again in its natural channel, thus preserving to our people the navigation of the St. John river which, as the hon. gentleman has said, is of extreme importance to the Dominion. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Michaud) that the papers for which he has now moved will be brought down as soon as possible.

Mr. JAMES CONMEE (Thunder Bay and Rainy River). The question raised by the hon. member is of more far reaching importance than its relation to any particular locality. I take it for granted that many of the boundary streams could be affected by conditions similar to those he has represented in this case. What has been decided by the authorities of the United States having charge of the department which deals with waters of this character ought to be applied here. A question arose of a very similar character with regard to the diversion of waters from the Rainy river. An American company, relying on legislation which it had obtained in the state of Minnesota applied to the department at Washington for the ratification of plans for the permanent diversion of a portion of the waters of the Birch lake drainage basin which was solely within the state of Minnesota, but in its course discharged southwesterly into the Rainy river which is an international stream. The Waterways Commission dealt with this matter and their report was ratified by the Secretary of War of the United States, and in giving their reasons for their finding and quoting authorities, they quote the opinion of Mr. Evarts, at one time Secretary of State of the United States, on a question between the United States government and the Mexican government with regard to the waters of the Rio Grande river which takes its rise in one country and flows into the other. The complaint in that case was that too much of the water was being diverted for irrigation purposes in the one country to the detriment of the citizens of the other who desired the water for the same purposes, and it was on that point that Mr. Evarts gave his opinion. The Waterways Commission commenting upon Mr. Evart's opinion reports :

It would seem that comity would require that in the absence of necessity the sovereign

power should not be exercised to the injury of a friendly nation or of its citizens or subjects without the consent of that nation.

If I understand aright the contention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Michaud) it is not that there was diverted into the state of Maine the actual boundary waters of the St. John river, but the waters of a tributary of that boundary stream, and this was a similar case :

The common law protects riparian owners against permanent diversions of waters which injuriously affect their rights, and this law is founded on principles not merely of social necessity, but of justice and right. While the common law is not a part of the law of nations its principles so far as they are founded in justice and equity, ought, where practicable to be applied by nations acting in their sovereign capacity. The Department of State of the United States has adopted this principle in the past and although the application was made in the case of conflicting riparian rights on a boundary stream.

That is very close to the conditions here:

Yet the commission can see no sound distinction between the position taken by the government of the United States in the case referred to, and cases of diversion of water wholly within one country where the diversion injuriously affects riparian owners in another country.

That, I take it to be upon all fours with the situation in this case. Then it says :

This application of the common law was made by Mr. Evarts, Secretary of State.

So that, having regard to international law and to the comity between friendly nations and to equity and right as laid down by this authority, it seems to me that the diversion of the waters in this case was not justified. I call attention to this for the reason that it is not happening on the St. John river or on the Rainy river alone, but that it may happen and is likely to happen in very many other cases, affecting vitally the interests of this country. I think, Sir, there ought to be a little more attention paid to this subject and still greater supervision in regard to these matters.

Motion agreed to.

THE HOME MARKET FOR COAL.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE moved:

That in the opinion of this House such steps should be taken as may be deemed most effective in conserving the home market to the Canadian Coal Operators.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is only the urgency of this question that tempts me at this rather late hour to detain the House for a short time while I bring to the notice of the government and of the country generally the great question of the coal industry in Canada. That question has been receiving attention in parliament ever since we first had a parliament, that is, since the days of confederation; and in connection with that question has been considered the question of free trade or protection in relation to the conservation of the market for our coal in Canada. I only call attention to the question now because of the great agitation that is going on at present in respect to the future of the coal market in this country. Let me point out the great interest that are involved in our coal trade. In Ontario and in the great west it may not be generally realized to what proportion the coal interests have grown in the province of Nova Scotia, particularly since the year 1893, when what is known as the Whitney legislation brought a large influx of capital into the province and put the coal industry on a much stronger footing than it had been before. To show the extent of the commercial interests of the province of Nova Scotia, let me lay before the House a synopsis of the trade of the province during the last calendar year:

Coal	$ 16,200,000
Coke	2,000,000
Gold	237,000
Gypsum, limestone and other materials	725,000
Stone and other building material	250,000
Pig iron	1,425,000
Steel	3,800,000
Steel rails, rods, &c	8,112,000
Fisheries	8,000,000
Manufactures, ships and freights	38,000,000
Products of the farm	26,500,000
Products of the forest	2,000,000
Total	$107,249,000

I give these figures because at the very basis of the prosperity of Nova Scotia as a country, in its various industries, lies the coal trade. And this is so not only in the province of Nova Scotia, but throughout the whole Dominion of Canada. For that reason I think I am justified in calling the serious attention of this House and of the country generally to anything that may detrimentally affect that very important trade. I might point out also the amount of capital that is involved directly in the coal trade of other parts of Canada. The annual coal production of British Columbia between the years 1836 and 1865 amounted to only 5,500 tons, from 1865 to 1898 it had grown to 1,000,000 tons; from 1898 to 1906 it had grown to 2,000,000 tons; and I suppose that to-day it amounts to about 2,500,000 tons. The capital invested in the industry in that province amounts to a large sum. The Wellington colliery has invested in it about $10,000,000, and it is equipped for a daily production of 5,500 tons.

The Western Fuel Company has a

capacity of 5,400 tons daily. Other companies in British Columbia are developing their properties very rapidly, and will in a short time have a production equal to that of the older and larger companies. The approximate amount of capital invested in British Columbia in coal alone is about $20,000,000. In the province of Alberta there is invested about $15,000,000. In that province there is an immense area of coal, extending from the Rockies to Manitoba and from the international boundary to the Peace river. In the province of Nova Scotia we have invested in coal alone, the following amounts:

Cape Breton	county..	$39,080,000
Inverness	"	10,500,000
Victoria	"	500,000
Richmond	"	2,000,000
Pictou	"	5,350,000
Cumberland	"	7,490,000
Total..		$64,920,000

In the industry of iron and the making of iron and steel and steel rails, which is almost directly dependent on the success of the coal industry we have a capital invested in the Dominion Iron and Steel Company of $30,000,000. I am not in a position to say exactly what the capital of the Nova Scotia Steel Company is, but it is a very large and prosperous company. The Londonderry Drummond Company has $1,000,000 invested in iron in the county of Colchester, and this industry depends to some extent for its existence and growth and prosperity upon the prosperity of the coal trade in the province. I am bound to say anything that I can say in support of this industry from the standpoint of capital, for it is important to us in Canada that every man who invests a dollar in any industry in this country should receive attention and protection from this House so far as this House can afford that protection consistent with the general interest of the country.

I am bringing up this question because this House is the tribunal which alone can deal with questions of this wide character, affecting the different provinces. If it could be dealt with by the legislature of Nova Scotia, if that legislature could protect and safeguard this great industry, I would not be troubling this House with any argument on the matter. But this question does not come within the sphere of any provincial legislature, and therefore I am obliged to appeal to the only tribunal which can deal with it. While it is the interest of this country that capital should be safeguarded and capitalists the world over be given the assurance that in Canada we have a parliament and parliamentarians who always keep their eye upon the best interests of those who are willing to invest their capital in this country, it is equally in our interest that we should likewise keep in mind the men, women and children who are dependent upon this particular industry in every part of Canada, and in doing this we are likewise improving the position of those who invest capital in Canadian industries. We have in Nova Scotia 103,000 people who are depending for their livelihood upon coal cutting and mining. That is a very large number of people. I do not think it would be exaggerating to say that the average family of the miner numbers four and that consequently four people are directly dependent upon every head of a family of every mine operator. I have said in Nova Scotia there are 103,000 people employed in the mines, and taking in those employed directly in the coal mines in other parts of Canada, we have 113,109 miners engaged in the mining of coal. Multiply that by four, and you have 452,436 directly dependent on this work. If you undertake to feed them as they must be fed and estimate the cost at the very small amount of $10 a month, you have $4,524,360 for the feeding alone without saying anything about their housing and clothing. That is an amount of money which even Canada, with its enormous trade, cannot afford to treate lightly, and it is an amount which the traders in Ontario and Quebec, who are directly interested, must not ignore. We are apt, in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, where the great question seems to be to get coal without paying any duty and therefore as low as possible, to ignore this factor. To get coal cheap seems to be the paramount question of importance in Ontario and Quebec regardless entirely of the trade dependent on the production of coal in this country. I submit that taking the 103,000 in my own province engaged directly in the production of coal, not more than ten per cent of their requirements is found in that province. You would be surprised to know that of these 103,000 people, mostly all are non-productive, that is as far as what they eat and what they require for clothing are concerned. It is important therefore that the large manufacturing centres of this country should realize that the flour, beef, pork, molasses, sugar and other goods which these people consume do not come from Nova Scotia except in a very small proportion. I venture to say that 75 per cent comes from Quebec and Ontario. For that reason it is highly important for those two provinces that the coal industry in the county of Cape Breton and the other parts of Nova Scotia should not be neglected.

There is one point I wish to make in respect to the trade in coal between Cape Breton and the city of Montreal and in respect to the steamers that ply back and forth between Sydney and Montreal. The idea seems to be in Ontario and Quebec

that if we had reciprocity the coal from Sydney and Louisburg would go to Boston and other New England ports. But our friends in the upper provinces who are now trading extensively with us in Nova Scotia, must not forget that if the coal trade of the maritime provinces should go to Boston, there also will go the other trade in dry goods and provisions and everything else which the miner requires. To-day the steamers which go to Montreal with coal bring back no other goods except those which the miner purchases, and these goods enjoy the advantage of cheap freight rates; whereas if the trade is directed elsewhere, we shall not have that steamer connection and these goods will not be sent to the people of Cape Breton as they now are. That is the point I wish to emphasize. I wish to point cut that this question of protecting coal is not a one-sided one. There is no class of people so profitable to the traders as the coal miners. A farmer may be well off and a merchant or a professional man, but, so far as purchasing powers are concerned, the coal miner is a much more profitable citizen so long as he has the money to spend. He is not as a rule stingy about spending money. He feeds and dresses his family well and is not at all conservative about his wealth. For that reason the miner and the working men generally in the coal mining districts are the best kind of customers, and it is well worth the while of our manufacturers and traders to see that the coal miner is in a position to bring up his family well and be of such assistance to the commercial world as he now is. What has startled myself and some others is the falling off of our trade in the St. Lawrence. I am not in a position to say exactly what is the cause, but what we do know is that year ofter year, particularly for the last two or three years American coal is gaining ground along the river St. Lawrence, in the province of Quebec, to the exclusion of our own coal. Let me draw your attention to the figures for the seasons 1906, 1907 and 1908.

Comparative Receipts of Coal in the St. Lawrence—Seasons 1906, 1907, 1908.

Names of Coal Companies.	Montreal.			Sorel.			Three Rivers.			Quebec and Lévis.			Recapitulation.		
	1906	1907	1908	1906.	1907.	1908.	1906.	1907.	1908.	1906.	1907.	1908.	1906.	1907.	1908.
Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co.	142,581	77,567	70,304	11,909	23,879	33,704	3,949	8,061	7,167	64,869	53,515	94,785	223,308	163,022	205,960
Dominion Coal Company, Ltd.	1,043,493	937,421	1,204,573	8,257	4,373	4,373	42,641	63,476	37,700	86,230	82,939	101,957	1,174,621	1,088,209	1,348,551
North Atlantic Collieries			1,830				1,400				738		1,400	739	1,830
Inverness Railway and Coal Co	34,405	39,334	19,150	10,342						25,142	37,862	62,826	69,889	77,196	81,976
Port Hood Coal Company		8,646						1,600			1,960	26,450		12,206	20,450
Mabou Coal Company			733												733
Intercolonial Coal Company	48,025	36,371	30,365							5,000	9,507		53,025	45,878	30,365
Acadia Coal Company	59,861	62,532	69,125										59,861	62,532	69,125
Nova Scotia Coals	1,328,365	1,161,871	1,396,080	30,508	28,252	38,025	47,990	73,137	44,867	175,241	186,521	280,018	1,582,104	1,449,781	1,758,990
Scotia and English Coals	28,900		7,000				4,000		46,990	650		14,000	33,550		67,990
American Bitum Coals	13,000	52,063	130,443		2,560	702	1,800			25,000	51,100	64,782	39,800	105,723	195,927
Year 1906	1,370,265			30,508			53,790			200,891			1,655,454		
" 1907		1,213,934			30,812			73,137			237,621			1,555,504	
" 1908			1,533,523			38,727			91,857			358,800			2,022,907

Now, I wish to bring particularly to the notice of the people that, so far as efforts to bring about reciprocity are concerned, reciprocity in coal in former days has not been a boon to the investors in coal mines in Nova Soctia or elsewhere in Canada. And when I speak of the coal trade of Nova Scotia, I am sorry to say I am not speaking of money invested by the people of Nova Scotia alone. The wealthy men of Quebec, Montreal, Ontario and other parts of Canada, have invested in these mines rather than the people of Nova Scotia. And, when I call upon the representatives in this House of all parts of Canada to take an interest in this question and safeguard the coal trade in the province of Nova Scotia, I am not asking them to safeguard the interest of the people of Nova Scotia only, but the interest of the people of every part of Canada.

In the year 1865, the coal trade had become such an important factor to the province of Nova Scotia, through the increased coal sales of the new collieries, which were opened out when the leases were granted, outside of the general mining association, that it was deemed necessary to appoint an inspector of mines, who could look after the mining interests of the province. This appointment was the first inspector of mines in America. In the year 1867 the government of the United States imposed a duty of $1.25 per ton on all coals entering their ports. The imposing of this duty very materially affected the output, and expansion of the trade of the whole province of Nova Scotia, as up to this time the New England states had always been their best customers, no other markets being then available, as at that time the local markets were small and restrictive, few miles of railway having been built, and all the coal being water carried by sailing vessels.

From the year 1850 to 1854 coal was admitted into the United States at a duty of 24 per cent ad valorem, and in 1853 the coal shipped amounted to 124,764 tons. From 1854 to 1866 coal was admitted free, when the exports rose from 139,125 tons to 404,252 tons. In 1864, a duty of $1.25 was imposed, when the shipments fell to 165,431 tons. In 1892, the duty was reduced to 75 cents, and the exports gradually fell until 1893, when the entire shipments of Nova Scotia coal to the United States only amounted to 16,099 tons. In 1894 the duty was changed to 40 cents for screened coal, and 15 cents for slack—through ½-inch apertures in screen bars. In 1896 the shipments of coal amounting to 174,919 tons. In 1897 the duty was made 67 cents. The shipments had increased until 1903, when the shipments were 968,832 tons, but have again decreased to 616,312 tons in 1907 and less for 1908, as the figures for the Port of Boston (Everett) are: 1907, 545,652 tons; 1908, 370,709 tons, a decrease of 47.18 per cent.

The great fluctuations of the duty in the United States made it imperative upon us, as early as 1893, to look elsewhere for markets for coal. I have already stated, the Whitney legislation of 1893, with which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) had so much to do and which was so successful in bringing about a happy solution of the difficulty at that time and has proven such a boon to the coal industry of Nova Scotia ever since. In 1905, some years after the Whitney legislation, the home consumption of coal in Nova Scotia had reached 1,651,735 tons, or 400,000 tons more than the total production of 1885. The neighbouring provinces bought from us in that year 2,120,148 tons. And we exported to other countries 703,401 tons. The total sales of Nova Scotia coal that year amounted to 4,475,284 tons.

For the year ending September 30, 1907, the following figures show how the coal produced in Nova Scotia was disposed of:

Nova Scotia consumed 1,842,419 tons or 36·50 per cent of the total sales.
New Brunswick, 424,128 tons or 2·92 per cent.
Prince Edward Island, 77,493 tons or 1·53 per cent.
Quebec, 1,709,592 tons or 33·87 per cent.
West Indies, 2,598 tons or ·05 per cent.
Mexico, 7,591 tons or ·15 per cent.
Other countries, 12,483 tons or ·24 per cent.
Bunker coal for steamers, 204,572 tons or 4·05 per cent.
United States, 616,321 tons or 12:23 per cent.

Of the total sales of 5,046,690 tons the home market and St. Lawrence ports consumed 4,203,134 tons equal to 83·28 per cent of the total sales, while the United States only ordered 12·23 per cent. Of the total sales Cape Breton county contributed 73·45 per cent. Pictou 12·46 per cent. Cumberland 8·14 per cent. Inverness 5·93 per cent.

We find that Nova Scotia exports of coal to the United States have fallen from 465,194 tons in 1865 to 88,495 tons in 1878. While Canada importations of coal from the United States have risen from 162,200 tons in 1865 to 746,516 tons in 1878. With a duty varying from 75 cents to $1.25 cents per ton on coal, the United States have increased their production of coal from 21,000,000 tons in 1866 to upwards of 50,000,000 tons in 1878, and this tonnage was raised to 480,363,424 in 1907 equal to 39·7 per cent of the world's production, while Canada produced 10,510,961 tons or 0·87 per cent of the world's production.

In reference to the production of coal in the United States, and taking the figures of Mr. E. W. Parker, the coal expert, and chief statistican of the United States Geological Survey for the year 1907, the latest returns available to date. We find that

the world's greatest production of coal to be 1,209,184,109 tons. Of this immense number of tons of coal produced, 39·7 per cent is credited to the United States. It will be observed that while Great Britain raised 299,970,677 tons of coal, or 24·8 per cent of the world's production, the United States produced 60 per cent more coal than Great Britain, and over 100 per cent more than Germany. Exclusive of Great Britain, the United States produced in 1907 more coal than all the countries of the world combined. It may also be noted that more than 98 per cent of the world's production of coal is from countries north of the equator, the countries south of that line producing less than 20 million tons of coal annually. In the United States the available supply of coal that is easily accessible is 2,200 million tons, and in Canada, according to the best calculations that we can make, the available coal supply is 32,893,240,000 tons. That is the percentage our coal area and our coal in sight, so to speak, bear to those of the United States.

In the year 1873 the government of Nova Scotia received in royalties from the sales of coal the sum of $83,000. This year, to show what an important factor the coal of Nova Scotia is, we have received into the coffers of that province $666,000 from royalties alone, considerably more than one-half the whole revenue of that province. Now to show to what degree expansion has taken place in some of the collieries, the following figures may be cited:

In the year 1877, Mr. John Rutherford, ex-inspector of mines, stated that between Sydney Mines and Lingan Mines, they had 260 to 270 coal cutters employed. In the year 1898 Sydney Mines alone had employed underground 492 men and boys, and on the surface, 243, a total of 735 who mined and shipped 267,000 tons of coal.

In the year ending September 30, 1907, the Sydney Mines had employed:

Underground—	
Skilled labourers	893
Labourers	535
Boys	100
Surface—	
Skilled labourers	112
Labourers	205
Boys	9
Total	1,864

They mined and shipped 664,404 tons of coal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out the very large development we have made in the production of coal in Nova Scotia, the very large amount of capital that is invested in the coal industry, and that we are rapidly being encroached upon and our market taken away by a foreign country. I think it is fair to point out that some steps should be taken to prevent this rapid falling away of our market in the St. Lawrence, which is our principal market, and in some way to conserve to us the market which is so profitable and important to us. I find here a statement made by so good an authority on the coal question as the Hon. R. Drummond, one of the leading authorities on the coal trade in Nova Scotia, who views with some alarm the importations of United States coal into Canada. 'Are,' he asks, 'the Americans beating us both in quality and price? And if not, how are the following increases in importations of American coal to be accounted for':

	Tons. 1906.	Tons. 1908.
Quebec	20,000	66,000
St. Hyacinthe	3,500	41,000
Montreal	22,000	243,000
Sherbrooke	1,500	11,000
Three Rivers	1,500	9,000
Sorel	334	12,000
St. Johns	1,500	17,000
Total	51,000	432,000
Summary of Quebec imports—		
Anthracite	563,655	737,624
Bituminous	51,000	451,000
Coal dust	15,000	105,000
Total	630,000	1,295,000

I have here tables carefully prepared showing the increases in the different mines the percentage, the number of men who are engaged in the work of producing coal at the different points, the capital invested and where the different mines are located. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these tabulated statements be accepted as read and handed in to the reporter:

Coal Companies.	Location of Mines.	Production.	Sales.	Motive Power.	Workmen.	Percentage of output used for motive power and by workmen.
	Cumberland county—					
Canada Coals and Railway Company	Joggins	50,385	32,623¾	11,192	1,919	26·02
Cumberland Railway and Coal Company	Springhill	339,039½	280,474½	36,759	16,436	15·69
Maritime Coal, Railway and Power Co.	Chignecto	44,143	36,015	5,164	1,333	14·71
Minudie Coal and Transportation Company	River Hebert	44,107	35,954	2,336	960	7·47
Prospect Coal Mining Company, Atlantic Grindstone C. R. Co.	Lower Cove	4,769	3,464	412	428	17·59
Scotia Coal Company (Ripley and Blenkhorn)	Maccan	2,088	1,615	265	128	18·82
Strathcona Coal Company	River Hebert	23,670	21,463	1,561	646	9·32
	Pictou county—					
Acadia Coal Company	Stellarton	385,006	312,687	64,515	8,924	19·08
Intercolonial Coal Company	Westville	301,490	274,524	25,854	6,532	10·74
Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company	New Glasgow	45,425	39,458	5,967	.....	13·13
	Cape Breton county—					
Dominion Coal Company	Glace Bay	3,456,937	3,072,676	190,813	44,709	6·81
North Atlantic Collieries	Port Morien	981	38	908	35	.....
Gowrie and Blockhouse Collieries	Port Morien	12,827	7,735	5,194	504	44·42
Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company	Sydney Mines	664,404	626,071¼	23,901	13,707	5·66
Sydney Coal Company	Sydney Mines	3,053	3,381	61	90	4·94
Mackay Coal Company	North Sydney	5,551	5,002	535	144	12·28
	Victoria county—					
Cape Breton Coal Mining Company	New Campbellton	1,394	926	230	238	33·57
	Inverness county—					
Inverness Railway and Coal Company	Inverness	261,004	225,517	21,907	3,995	9·92
Mabou and Gulf Coal Company	Mabou	8,303½	3,180½	4,547	290	58·25
Port Hood Coal Company	Port Hood	76,083	63,885	12,292	2,835	19·88
	Tons	5,730,660	5,046,690	414,413	103,873	9·04

Name of Company.	Amount paid in Wages.	Total Supplies.	Total Wages and Supplies.	Number of Employees.	Number dependent on Employees.	Dependent on Coal Mining.	Population of Towns.	Population Appreciably Benefited.
	$	$	$					
Pictou County—								
Acadia Coal Co	702,000			1,445	6,000	7,000		
Intercolonial Coal Co	490,681			970	3,000	4,000		
Marsh Colliery	60,000			90	250	250		
Totals	1,252,816	319,466	1,571,282	2,505	9,250	11,250	14,000	20,000
Cumberland County—								
Cumb. Ry. & Coal Co	884,000			1,600	5,000	6,500	6,500	18,000
Mar. C. R. & P. Co								
Minudie Company	166,000			450	1,500	2,500	3,000	3,500
Strathcona and others								
Totals	1,050,000	167,000	1,217,000	2,050	6,500	9,000	9,500	21,500
C. B. County —								
Dominion Coal Coy	3,750,000			8,300	21,000	25,000	40,000	40,000
Nova Scotia S. & C. Co	1,050,000			2,300	11,000	15,000	20,000	20,000
Other Collieries	150,000			350	1,200	1,500	2,000	2,000
Totals	4,950,000	1,358,000	6,308,000	10,950	33,200	41,500	62,000	62,000
Inverness County—								
Inverness Coal Co	464,000			908	1,500	3,000		
Other collieries	150,000			350	900	1,200	5,000	22,000
Totals	614,000	194,500	808,000	1,258	2,400	4,200		
New collieries	24,000	75,000	99,000					

GRAND TOTAL.

Wages	$ 7,890,000
Wages and supplies	10,003,000
Number of employees	16,750
Dependents on employees	57,350
Dependents on coal mining	125,000
Population appreciably benefited	175,000

Coal Trade by Counties for the Year Ending September 30, 1908, Province of Nova Scotia.

Tons in 2,240 lbs.

Province to where Coal is Shipped.	Cape Breton.	Pictou.	Cumberland.	Inverness.	Colchester.	Totals.	Percentage of Coal taken by Provinces.	
							1908.	1907.
Nova Scotia—By land	1,102,531	337,478	97,346½	73,283¼	422	1,611,050¾		
By sea	243,760½	9,979	1,382	84,459½	.....	339,581		
Total	1,346,291½	347,447	98,728½	157,742¾	422	1,950,631¾	35·56	36·50
New Brunswick	166,657½	74,159	236,621	31,212	1,681	510,330½	9·30	8·46
Newfoundland	179,790	24,690	.....	2,582	.....	207,062	3·75	2·92
Prince Edward Island	33,740	.....	.....	24,590¾	.....	63,330¾	1·15	1·53
Quebec	1,667,747	191,982	68,064¼	119,845	.....	2,047,638½	37·33	33·87
West Indies	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	00·05
United States	456,518	1,091	41,825¼	.....	.....	499,634¼	9 15	12·23
Mexico	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	00·15
Other Countries	4,697	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,697	0·08	00·24
Bunker Coals	193,352	.....	.....	.....	.....	193,352	3·52	4·05
St. Pierre	8,907	.....	.....	.....	.....	8,907	0·16	
Total in tons (2,240 lbs.)	4,062,900	639,369	445,239	335,972½	2,103	5,485,583½	100·00	100·00
	p.c.	p.c.	p.c.	p. c.	p. c.			
District percentages.—Totals, 1906	74·36	11·20	10·69	3·75	.....	.....		
1907	73·45	12·46	8·14	5·93	.....	.....		
1908	74·08	11·65	8·10	6·12	0C·05	.....		

Without saying very much upon this point I think I have shown sufficient of the facts and made out a case strong enough to call the attention of the government and the House generally to this very important question and to impress them with the necessity of taking some steps to preserve to the people of Canada the excellent market which we now have for the coal of Nova Scotia and wherever else coal is produced. I would submit, Sir, that while it may be a hardship in some cases to buy coal, as we sometimes consider it dearer than we would like to pay, we should not forget that the people of the great country to the south of us have pursued the policy which I am advocating. The people in the New England states have no coal, they have to receive their coal from the west and they pay a higher price than they would have to pay for Nova Scotia coal. Still, there is enough national spirit to induce them to bear with any little extras they would have to pay in order to develop in the west great coal centres and keep the trade within their own bounds. I submit that in the centre of Canada our people do not view with a proper spirit the necessity of developing the coal of our own country. The proper thing to do in Canada is to develop the coal resources of Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia so that they can be made available for the necessities of the people in the great centres of the west which are now being developed. We heard to-night of the necessity that exists for providing water for the people in the west. I certainly approve of any means that are adopted to bring to their doors those things which are necessary for the purposes of the great development that is now going on there, but if the settler must have water to boil the meal and if he must have water to drink he must also have fire with which to cook his meal, to keep warm his children and for the comfort of his household. It is necessary to have that and it can only be obtained by the proper development, the bringing of that coal to the doors of our people in the west. We have inexhaustible stores of coal in Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia and when the excellent railroads that they are building there with low grades and equipped with big locomotives are completed the loads that can be hauled will be simply enormous and something that we do not calculate upon to-day. For that reason I think it will be quite proper to direct our attention to furnishing fuel to our own people in the west from our own mines. We are expending a great deal of money upon our militia and the development of arms in this country. It is quite proper, but I want to know how long we could stand a war in this country if we had it in mid-winter without the capability of supplying our own people in the west with fuel. The Americans would starve us out in two days. There is nothing said about that. We are furnishing the militia and the arms, but we are making no provision for supplying fuel in winter to our people and we can imagine what would happen if our fuel supply in the United States were stopped in mid-winter. At no time in winter is there more than a two week's supply in the province of Ontario of the quality of coal which they get from the United States because they depend upon getting it on short notice, and if communication with the mines of the United States were suddenly cut off they would be in a position to which they have not given sufficient thought. I say, after deliberation and after having given the subject a great deal of thought, that I believe that with some attention to transportation we can send our coal from the east as far as Toronto, and I submit that with proper attention to the question of transportation that portion of the country west of Toronto can be supplied from the west. I say that as a country that expects to develop, that expects to be independent of the outside world, to as great an extent as any country can be, with reference to the question of power, as power is produced or generated by coal, and as far as everything that is produced or dependent upon coal is concerned, the wise policy on our part is to develop our own coal resources and coal trade and not depend upon the whims of any outside country. As far as Nova Scotia is concerned, so important was this question in 1897 that the premier of that province dissolved the legislature and asked the verdict of the people on the question as to whether or not they wanted the duty retained on coal in the Dominion of Canada. The verdict of the people was almost unanimous in favour of the retention of the duty. I believe that the same verdict would be rendered to-day if that question were to be submitted to the people there. It is important in Nova Scotia and it is also important in every other part of the country, in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Quebec, because of the great trade which we furnish to the people of Canada and if measures are not taken to protect this industry and to keep the prosperity which we have to-day it may not be so useful to the country as it is at the present time.

Now, I simply want to point out one more thing to the government and to the House and I shall consider that I have put this question, as far as I have any figures or facts at my disposal, before the House to the fullest extent. This government has undertaken to do some things for other industries in this country. A few years ago the steel industry in Canada was in such a position as to require care, protection and fostering at the hands of this government. The government was equal to the occasion and took steps to safeguard the capital that was invested in that great

industry and also to safeguard the people whose living and every day employment were dependent upon it. As the government has encouraged our steel and iron industry by bounties and duties for protection and assistance, and as we are paying out our good money to assist that industry, there is no reason why some steps should not be taken and even some sacrifices indirectly incurred in order to safeguard our coal mining industry. I have reason to hope that the government will be equal to the occasion and that this House will support the government in inquiring into the cause which is bringing about such a great influx of American coal into Canada to the exclusion of the use of our own Canadian coal, and that whatever steps are necessary to conserve to us our own markets and to exclude American coal shall be taken. I regret that I have been obliged to speak at such length but the question is a very important one. I am not presenting alone the case of the capitalists for whom I can assure you I have no retainer, but I feel that it is my duty as representing a large number of working men to bring their case as near to the foot of the Throne as I can, and so far as I am able to submit to the government and to the people generally that some measures should be taken to enable these working men to have employment every day and to earn sufficient money to support themselves and their families in comfort. I regret that this winter they have not been kept in continuous employment because of this displacement of Canadian coal in the home market by American coal. It is not at all necessary for one to call himself a labour candidate or to sit in this House as a labour member in order that he should put these issues before the House. Representing as I do a large number of working people, although I do not pose as a labour candidate, I believe that it is my duty to the best of my ability to present to the country and to the House the interests of these people, and to appeal for a remedy to the only institution in the land which has the power to provide a remedy which will relieve us from any further imposition of this kind, and which will hold the markets of Canada for Canadian coal which we are capable of producing just as well as they can produce coal in a foreign country. One more observation Mr. Speaker, and I have done. It has been contended that the price of Nova Scotia coal is too high, that we are making too large profits on it, and that the people who have to buy our coal in Montreal and other cities are obliged to pay too high a price for it. I do not know whether it is a popular suggestion to make or not, but I submit that if the day should ever come in Canada when there is any hardship on the Canadian consumer because of the high price of coal there is power in this House to put the regulations of the price of that commodity in a commission just as the value of other public utilities is regulated. I consider that the power that is in coal is a public utility, and if ever it should come about that the people of this country are imposed upon, this parliament has the power to protect the consumer so that none but a fair price should be charged. I have presented my views and these statistics to the House in the hope that the government will take into serious consideration the circumstances of those who are dependent on this trade for a means of livelihood as well as those who have had the courage and the enterprise to invest millions of dollars in the development of our coal areas in Nova Scotia and elsewhere in Canada.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) please tell the House the price of coal at the pit mouth in Nova Scotia and the price of the same kind of coal at the pit mouth in the Alleghanney Valley or in Ohio?

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not pose by any means as a coal expert and I only speak of the facts as I know them. I can, however, tell my hon. friend that for domestic use, at the pit mouth in Nova Scotia we pay $3 per ton, although I understand that those who buy in large quantities get it cheaper.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. As a purchaser of coal I can tell my hon. friend that the price of soft coal at the pit mouth in Pennsylvania is from 65 cents to 85 cents per ton.

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM. Run of mine?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Yes, run of mine. That coal comes in here and pays 53 cents a ton duty and it competes with Nova Scotia coal which you cannot buy at the pit mouth in Nova Scotia for less than $2.50 per ton. It is quite clear, therefore, that unless there is a reduction in the price of Nova Scotia coal to a reasonable figure or until there is a corresponding increase in the price of Pennsylvania coal, the Nova Scotia coal must necessarily be cut out of the Canadian market. I for one as a consumer of coal in Ontario feel that we would like to use Nova Scotia coal altogether even if we had to pay a trifle higher for it, but if we have to pay $1 or $2 per ton more than for Pennsylvania coal then it becomes another question altogether.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I do not imagine that my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) desires to divide the House on this question to-night, especially as there is a very slim attendance of mem-

bers present. I take it for granted that the purpose of his motion was to have an opportunity of presenting these very interesting statistics to us and to urge, if it be necessary to urge, the importance of this great mining industry. There will be no difference of opinion in that respect. We all recognize that the coal industry of the country, not merely in Nova Scotia but in other parts of the Dominion, is a very great industry and that whatever may reasonably be done to advance the interests of our Canadian miners should be done. It is, however, a very vexed question. It is a question on which there will not be by any means unanimity of opinion. I do not imagine that my hon. friend desires to-night to challenge an opinion, and I would suggest therefore that the debate be adjourned so that at a later date, when there is a better attendance of members, any hon. member who desires may continue the discussion.

Mr. LENNOX. Will it ever be reached again?

Mr. FIELDING. It may be.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. We are all prepared to support his motion on this side of the House, we are all protectionists.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) wants the price reduced before he says very much about that.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). I have been very much interested in listening to the remarks of my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) and I congratulate him upon having made a strong protectionist speech. Sometimes we on this side of the House are taunted by the Minister of Finance with divergence of views on a question such as this, but I think we never have made such a great departure from our political principles as the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie)) has made from his to-night. All I wish to say is that it has delighted me beyond measure to hear my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) free trader as he is make such a strong protectionist speech. It shows just how far a man can get right when his own interests are brought into question.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH (Stormont) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. May I ask the hon. leader of the House what the business for to-morrow will be?

Mr. FIELDING. We had in contemplation proceeding with the resolutions respecting the loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, but by arrangement that goes over till next week. In the meantime, with the view of expediting the passing of the estimates, both for the current year, which will expire in a few days, and for the coming year, the House will be moved into Committee of Supply. I understand that a motion is to be made in amendment, bearing on one branch of the public expenditure. I take it that will not occupy much time, and afterwards we will go into supply and take up the estimates of the Public Works Department and several items scattered through various departments.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 23, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called I would renew the inquiry I have so often made for the following returns : February 2, the House ordered a return of the different armouries; February 25, return for certain statistical publications; February 26, appointees to service under the Transcontinental Railway Commission; February 26, permanent loans and cost of the same; February 5, with reference to the Royal Mint; February 8, orders in council, correspondence, &c., re loans negotiated since January, 1907; February 10, with reference to the dredge industry.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). My deputy informed me this morning that he had told the Secretary of State that so soon as that portion of the return which was pertinent to the Department of Public Works was ready, the portion required from the Militia Department would be ready. He also told me that a similar return had been brought down last year or the year before, and he presumed it would be only necessary to bring the information up to date.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). One of the returns with regard to the loans will be brought down to-day or to-morrow; I will inquire as to the second one.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Out of the 26 returns which have been moved for from my department 13 have been brought down. There is a great deal of work involved in preparing these. As an illustration, one return asks for all the expenditure upon public works running over a good many years in New

Brunswick, Nova Scotia and British Columbia, and there is also a very lengthy return in regard to the county of Bonaventure. The clerks are working on these returns as rapidly as possible and in the course of two or three days quite a number will be presented.

Mr. FOSTER. I venture to say that any clerk in 20 minutes time could bring down everything in reference to the dredge industry.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These returns must come in turn and they require a great deal of care.

Mr. FOSTER. What care ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To have them correct.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In what department is that statistical return ?

Mr. FOSTER. All departments. The order was passed on February 25. The Prime Minister has not yet referred to the matter of bringing down the report of the Civil Service Commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I told my hon. friend some few weeks ago that the commissioners did not interpret the law, that they were bound to make a report this session.

Mr. FOSTER. The law exists requiring that report to be brought down within so many days of the opening of the session and that should be attended to.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). With regard to the employees of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, the delay is caused by the commissioners finding it almost impossible to get the residences of all these men; the other information is ready.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC LOAN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When may we expect the details relative to the proposal on the Order Paper as to the loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

Mr. FIELDING. The information was furnished me last evening but I found some errors which will have to be corrected. It ought to be ready to-day or perhaps to-morrow.

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the Minister of Finance is not now in a position to announce the probable date of the Budget speech, I would like to ask that the usual notice of its delivery be given a few days in advance.

Mr. FIELDING. Assuming that the Grand Trunk Pacific loan resolutions were to be taken up now I had purposed going on with the budget the first of next week, but the postponement of the Grand Trunk Pacific resolutions rather upset that plan a little. I will see that several days notice is given.

SUPPLY—THE NEWMARKET CANAL.

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

Mr. THOS. G. WALLACE (Centre York). Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes while I bring to its attention a matter of considerable importance, not only to the county which I represent, but to the Dominion of Canada in general. We have at present in this country a state of affairs in which the revenues are decreasing and the expenditures are not being correspondingly reduced. I think this is a good time for the government to cut out all expenditures that are practically useless. One of these is the expenditure on what is known as the Newmarket canal in the county of York. This so-called canal extends from Cook's bay to Newmarket, and is in two sections. The portion from Cook's bay to Holland Landing, is section No. 1, and the portion from Holland Landing to Newmarket is section No. 2. We understand, from the statement of the Hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that there has been no expenditure on section No. 1, which in my opinion is the only part that could be made of any particular use at all. Section No. 2 is the expensive part, and on this so far there has been expended nearly $200,000. The estimated cost of the canal is nearly $1,000,000, although as yet no accurate estimate of its cost has been made. In my opinion, the expenditure on this canal is an absolute waste of public money. I have spoken to a good many people in the county of York in regard to this canal, and every person to whom I have spoken is of the same opinion, that it is an utterly useless work. The hon. gentleman who represents that constituency in parliament (Hon. A. B. Aylesworth) disclaims any responsibility or credit for this canal, saying that it was instituted before he entered parliament. I understand that it was started in 1904, although no work of any extent was done on it until the year 1908, as expended previous to March 31, 1908, $31,444.26; expended since March 31, 1908, the following figures will show:

In April	$ 440 06	
May	10,330 00	
June	12,168 72	
July	10,073 26	
August	10,962 50	
September	26,986 50	
October	43,218 48	
November	22,145 73	
December	20,548 40	
		156,873 65
Total to December 31, 1908		$188,317 91

The first estimate of the cost of this canal made in April, 1905, was $291,249; the second estimate, made on June 19, 1908, was $967,814.50; and these estimates did not include reservoirs south of Newmarket for the conservation of the water to be used in the canal, which according to the reports of the engineers are necessary. We have no accurate estimate of the cost of these reservoirs. The hon. gentleman who represents North York said that there was only one opinion in that constituency in regard to this canal. In that I entirely agree with him: There is only one opinion, so far as I have heard, and that is that the canal is absolutely useless. Even if it were feasible, there is no business for it to warrant such a great expenditure by the government. There has been spent on the work already nearly $200,000, and the hon. gentleman who represents the constituency asks if it would be wise to throw away $200,000. I think it would be better to throw away $200,000 now than to throw away $2,000,000 in the future. My reason for bringing this matter before the House is entirely non-political. The constituency of Centre York, which never before, since 1867, elected a Conservative to parliament, has sent me here, by the votes of independent men, to give my best ability to looking after the expenditure of public money. There may be other parts of the Dominion where public money is being expended as lavishly and wastefully as it is in this particular work, but I do not know so much about them. I do know, however, about this work, and I ask the House to take into its serious consideration the expenditure of this large sum of money on a canal which, not only in my opinion, but in the opinion of every man who knows anything about it, is absolutely useless. For these reasons. I desire to move the following amendment:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed resolution be omitted and the following substituted therefor:

The original estimate of the cost of the proposed canal between Newmarket and Lake Simcoe, in the riding of North York, was less than $300,000; but that estimate has now been increased to nearly $1,000,000, which latter sum, according to the engineer's report, does not include the proposed expenditure for conservation of water south of Newmarket;

That the total cost of the said canal when completed is as yet unestimated and can only be conjectured;

That the said canal when so completed will be practically useless; that the expenditure thereon is wholly improvident and unwarranted, and constitutes a wanton misuse and waste of public money.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that some other gentlemen who I know are interested in this matter would have spoken on it so that I might have seen their point of view. However, it is not a matter that need occupy a great deal of time. It might not be out of place for me to say a word or two on the canals of the world generally, to show the important part they play in the transportation problem.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is well to talk about some other canals.

Mr. GRAHAM. There are others I could talk of. There is at least one, that, if my hon. friend is right, would be similar to this, but I submit it is not as useful as this will be. Here are the figures of the total canal mileages:—

France, 2,986 miles; Germany, 1,221 miles with about 774 miles of canalized rivers; Great Britain, 3,511 miles, exclusive of ship canals; Holland, 2,050 miles of navigable waterways, including rivers and canalized rivers; Belgium, 347 miles of canalized rivers, 454 miles of large canals, and 143 miles of small canals; Italy 549 miles of canals; Austria-Hungary, 217 miles of canals.

In Canada, we have some 19 canals, as follows:—

Name of Canal.	Miles.	No. of Locks.	No. of Dams.
Lachine	8½	5	
Soulanges	14	4 lift. 1 guard.	
Cornwall	11	6	
Farran's Point	1	1	
Rapide Plat	3½	2	
Galops	7½	3	1
Welland	26¾	26 lift. 1 guard.	
Sault Ste. Marie	1¼	1	1 moveable.
Grenville	5½	5	
Carillon	¾	2	1
St. Anne's Lock	⅛	1	
Chambly	12	9	

Name of Canal.	Miles.	No. of Locks.	No. of Dams.
St. Ours Lock	1	1	2
Rideau	6	34 ascending. 14 descending.	1
Tay canal	....	2	1
Trent (not completed)	Length about 212 miles.	25 2 lift locks.	14
St. Peter's	2,400 feet.	1 tidal, 4 gates.	
*Beauharnois Canal	....	....	
Canals completed	109⅛	....	
†Canals construction	212	....	
Locks	102	....	
Lift locks	36	....	
Guard	2	....	
Dams	20	....	
Dams movable	1	....	

* The new Soulanges canal having been completed, the Beauharnois canal is practically abandoned for navigation purposes. † Partly completed.

We have in Canada altogether completed 109½ miles and something over 200 miles partly completed. There are 102 locks. These do not include the lift-locks on the Trent. In these canals we have 20 dams.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be more in this.

Mr. GRAHAM. I mean dams for the retention of water. This question of transportation by water is of course a very large one, and one of great significance. My hon. friend talks of the expenditure on the Newmarket canal. He says it will cost a lot of money and that it will be useless. To his first proposition I agree, but from the second I dissent. The canal, if we are to take the word of men who ought to know as engineers, is a perfectly feasible proposition, and will, when completed, furnish navigation equal to the Erie, which for years has carried the grain trade of the west from Buffalo to New York

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is the grain trade of the west going through this?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend cannot tell what may happen, but to-day it is not, as the canal is not yet constructed. Regarding the water supply, some one has made merry over the possibility of the Minister of Justice and myself having to use a pump handle to get water into that canal. I think I have seen a cartoon to that effect. Well, it may be surprising to know that some of the canals in other countries are aided in their water supply by a pumping system from artesian wells. I want to call attention to a very important work on canals by Mr. Harcourt which deals with the question of their water supply. He proves that the majority of canals would be dry and useless were it not that their water supply is conserved by dams or other means. I ask the patience of the House while I read from this work on page 365:—

Mr. GRAHAM.

An adquate supply of water must be provided for a canal, to make good losses from leakage, evaporation, and expenditure of water in locking. Frequently this supply can be furnished by adjacent streams, or by the main river in the case of a lateral canal, or sometimes by a lake, springs, artesian wells or pumping; but when a constant supply is not procurable from these sources, which is especially liable to be the case at the summit level of a canal, an artificial reservoir must be formed, at a sufficient elevation, by placing a dam across the valley of a water course, which being filled in the winter, is able to furnish the necessary quantity of water to the canal throughout the dry season.

This is the principle which is being applied to the canal in question:—

The largest reservoirs, dams for impounding water in artificial reservoirs in the valleys of rivers, have been constructed for the water supply of towns and for irrigation, to which branches of engineering the formation of reservoirs mainly belongs. Nevertheless, many canals are partially supplied, particularly in their upper reaches, by numerous reservoirs which have been mostly formed by means of earthen reservoir dams placed across the valleys of small rivers at suitable points. Thus the Grand Junction canal is fed by eight reservoirs along the Tring, summit level, and by two reservoirs at the Braunston summit level, having a total capacity of 7½ million cubic yards, and the Leeds and Liverpool canal is supplied by six reservoirs with a capacity of 5¼ million cubic yards, and the Rochdale canal navigation by seven reservoirs with a capacity of 9½ million cubic yards. The Crinan canal draws its supply from nine reservoirs, having a capacity of 9½ million cubic yards; whilst the Caladonian canal is fed by the lakes through which it passes, and the Ellesmere canal by Bala lake as well as by two reservoirs.

Just another quotation from this work:—

The principal reservoirs, however, in Russia have been formed by dams across the upper portions of rivers, closed on the melting of the snow to provide water for navigation in

the river below during the summer. These dams, which constitute in reality draw-door weirs, are generally made entirely of wood, though sometimes masonry piers have been introduced, and the head of water retained does not exceed 17½ feet.

It may be asked why I quote from this work. Simply to point out to hon. gentlemen, who seem not to take the time to think it out along this line, that very few canals would be practicable were it not for a system of reservoirs as is proposed in the case of the Newmarket canal. The canal system, except in the case of canals along rivers such as the St. Lawrence, is based on the fact that there is water which can be conserved and forced into use either by power or by the use of dams. It would be impossible to have navigation to-day on the Trent canal, just as it would be in the Newmarket portion of that canal, if dams were not used. Every one who has gone through the Trent Valley canal must be aware of that. I can remember when men on both sides made jests, making light of the Trent Valley canal in any of its reaches, just as my hon. friend makes light of the Newmarket branch. When our Conservative friends were in office, the Liberal opposition pointed out that the Trent Valley canal was a mere ditch used more for mere political purposes than for practical reasons. And our friends opposite when in opposition, made the same references to that canal when it was out of their control. But owing to the scientific placing of dams and reservoirs there is going to be from Georgian bay to Lake Ontario a system of navigation which will be better than the Erie canal ever has been, which has carried the grain trade from the west to the east.

I think I speak with good authority when I say that the Newmarket section of the Trent canal will be as navigable in every part as the Erie canal is at the present time. Take the history of the work. As my hon. friend has pointed out, the estimate made was much smaller than the cost will be. But I think it is only fair to point out to him that the cost of materials and labour at the present time is at least from thirty to fifty per cent higher than it was three or four years ago, or perhaps, two years ago. In the construction of new works, where contracts are asked for, the Railway Department find that prices have risen, and when we make purchases we find that the prices are much higher than they were two or three years ago. Leaving aside that argument, and taking the mere fact that the cost will be more than the estimate, I want to say that the canal will be as practicable as any other portion of the Trent canal.

My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) has read the reports, but I have before me only a brief synopsis. On July 17, 1905, Mr. Walsh reports on the work and points out that he had investigated the question of the sufficiency of water supply for the operation of the canal, and that he had weir measurements taken of the main stream and its chief tributaries about Newmarket. He states that the measurements were made during the preceding winter—the winter of 1904-5—after a dry season of two months' duration, during which numerous wells and other sources of water supply had gone dry that, he was informed, seldom failed.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. As the hon. minister is dealing with that point, will he tell us what the estimated average number of cubic feet per minute will be?

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall come to that in a little while. If I leave this part of the matter, I may not get back to it again.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. That estimate of Walsh's is altogether wrong.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will come to the estimates that have been made. The result of Mr. Walsh's test showed an average flow of 30,420 cubic feet of water per hour. He further said that it was safe to assume that at no season of the year would the amount fall below this. He points out that to fill one of the locks would require about 28,000 cubic feet of water, and consequently a supply for the lock could be furnished in fifty-five minutes without damming or impounding water, but that he proposed to build dams at suitable places for storing freshet water and to have side ponds approximately close to the locks. It is the usual practice as I have stated, to supply water for the canals, except in the cases I have mentioned. Mr. Walsh goes on to give a computation of the drainage area tributary to Newmarket, and after making due allowance for loss through evaporation, &c., concludes that the available rainfall, which he takes at only one-sixth of the whole rainfall, would be 174,240,000 cubic feet. He concludes his report as follows:

In the meantime, I consider that sufficient data is afforded to establish beyond question the fact that the proposed canalization of the section of the Holland river between Newmarket and Holland landing, and the proposed improvements of the river between the latter place and Cook's bay is in every respect feasible.

That was the report of the engineer at that time, a report any department would be justified in proceeding upon, and that the House felt itself justified in proceeding upon. In the final report of Mr. Walsh, dated September 29, 1906, Mr. Walsh summarizes the question of water supply and states that the east branch of the Holland river above Newmarket has a drainage area of approximately sixty-one square miles, with an average annual rainfall from 1896 to 1905 of 30·67 inches. The annual precipitation of the whole watershed is, therefore,

3,921,259,584 cubic feet, and allowing for loss through evaporation, absorption by plants, &c., and, for this purpose deducting sixty per cent, he finds that the available water —which runs off to Lake Simcoe—for storage purposes is 1,568,503,834 cubic feet. The stream between Newmarket and Holland Landing has a drainage area of about fourteen square miles; it is not, however, thought necessary to consider this additional source of supply. The minimum flow of water in the stream above Newmarket was found to be 507 cubic feet per minute. This was ascertained by careful weir measurements taken at the very lowest stage of water, at the dryest season of the year and after a prolonged drought of two months' duration.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Now, would the hon. minister give the report of Mr. Grant on the same point, which he read here in answer to a question from myself some weeks ago?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am going to give them all before I get through. I have a synopsis here of the three reports. To ascertain the feasibility and cost of supplementing the water supply to which I have referred, extensive surveys were made at several suitable places on the watershed for establishing storage reservoirs. The tabulated report on this point has been laid on the table. Mr. Walsh selected Lake Wilcocks, on the height of land—known as 'the Oak Ridge'—between lakes Simcoe and Ontario, the source of the Humber river, as being the best additional source of supply should it be found necessary to resort to the same, but, in his opinion, not required. After discussing a number of other points as sources of supply, he concludes, on page 9 of his report, that it would be possible to lock through a total of 4,707 vessels, or about twenty per day during seven months of each year, providing all the sources named by him were used. He gives his estimate, which, as my hon. friend has pointed out, is too low, amounting to $354,536. The storage capacity provided for in his proposed plans aggregates 88,667,925 cubic feet.

Now, let me go a little more into the history of the work as it has proceeded, giving also a digest of Mr. Grant's findings. Let us take section 2, Holland river division. On February 12, 1908, Mr. Grant, who is one of the most efficient engineers in the whole department, after giving the results of the analysis, points out that the rainfall for 1907, which was a very dry year, was somewhat less than 30 inches, still showing that there was ample rainfall to operate the canal, if properly conserved. Mr. Grant himself has gone over the figures very carefully, and, in his report of 1907, although he finds that the rainfall was less than thirty inches, and less, than Mr. Walsh found it, there is still ample water to operate the canal. A good deal has been said about the necessity for conserving the water. I have discussed that point. As a matter of fact, we have to conserve the water on the Rideau canal, the Chambly, the Carillon and others—probably nine-tenths of the canals are run on this principle. The Erie canal could not exist but for the conservation of water by reservoirs and dams. Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to the traffic that may arise incident to this branch of the canal, or whatever differences of opinion may exist as to this work from a commercial standpoint, no doubt exists in my mind, and I think no doubt can exist in the mind of any person who bases his opinion on the statement of practical engineers, that there will be more than sufficient water to carry all the traffic that can be carried on the Trent Valley canal. I am not going to dilate on the trade of the county of York. Several gentlemen interested in trade not only in Newmarket, but in the city of Toronto, have spoken to me of the benefit to come to the city of Toronto if the canal were completed from the Georgian bay even to this Newmarket canal. I am not going to discuss that, because it is a question I have not gone into; I refer to it because one or two who are level headed business men have told me that I was free to say that in their opinion it would be a great benefit to the trade of Toronto to get water navigation direct north after a few miles of railway haul to join the Trent Valley system to Newmarket. The county of York is perhaps one of the most important counties in the Dominion of Canada. Not to impress my hon. friend with the fact of its greatness or with its traffic, I took some pains to gather statistics to find out the business done in the county of York. I find that the value of lands and buildings in that county is $30,000,000; field crops, $4,000,000; fruits and vegetables, $465,212. These figures are taken from the last census, the products of the county have largely increased since then. Value of animals killed and sold, $1,343,369 in the year the census was taken. I find that the total manufactures in the county of York amounted to something over $14,000,000. That does not include the city of Toronto, but the region of the county outside the city of Toronto. I merely call attention to these figures, to point out the importance of that county. I wish further to say that if the building of this canal to Newmarket, or to any other point in the centre of that thriving and prosperous county where there are manufacturers as well as agricultural industries would tend to cheapen freight rates in any way, and bring to the people a lesser rate of freight for their goods coming in or their products going out, I think it would be sufficient benefit to warrant this

great outlay, because all the many millions we are spending throughout Canada on transportation has that one object in view.

The country is committed to building the Newmarket canal. It has cost a great deal more money than was estimated. In that particular regard it is not alone because nearly all the great works that are undertaken, either by private individuals or by public corporations, have cost a great deal more than their first estimate. If any of my hon. friends have undertaken to build even a modest house, they must have found that out. But in order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the cost—and I say this on account of the resolution of my hon. friend who states that it is only a conjecture—I may state that the cost as estimated by Mr. Grant is, as my hon. friend has pointed out, nearly a million dollars. Mr. Butler has estimated that the reservoir will cost $80,000; I think that will fully cover it. The canal itself will cost in the vicinity of a million dollars; it will be a benefit, and will be promoted as a means of transportation for any boats that can go through any other part of the Trent Valley canal system. These being the circumstances of the case, I think my hon. friend, while I disagree with him as to the cost, is altogether wrong in asking the House to vote for the resolution which says this canal will be practically of no use whatever. I submit to the House that it will be of use, that it will be of as much use as any other branch of the Trent canal; and in conclusion I must ask the House to allow us to proceed to its completion and make it, as I believe it will be, an important branch of the transportation system.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the minister concludes, will he give us an idea of the probable tonnage that will go over it?

Mr. GRAHAM. As I told the House the other evening, I have made no estimate of the tonnage.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE (North Ontario). As this Newmarket canal is being constructed in a constituency that adjoins the one I have the honour to represent, I desire to trespass a few minutes on the attention of the House to speak in support of this resolution. It is not my intention to follow the minister so far afield as to ascertain and calculate the canal mileage of the world. The minister in his statement to the House, agrees that the canal is going to be a very costly undertaking; he also says it is going to be feasible. But that is a very flexible word; what is feasible may not be expedient or desirable in the interest of the country. The main question, in my opinion, is whether the canal is going to serve any useful public purpose. If it is not, then it is not in the interest of this country to incur such a large expense, particularly when the times are so stringent that it is necessary to curtail the expenditure of the country. When the minister was reading about canals which could only be made navigable by adopting an artesian well or a pumping system, I drew a picture in my mind's eye of a thousand electors in North York working pumps at election time at $2 a day to fill this canal. The Minister of Railways and Canals also stated that the original estimate was laregly exceeded, that the original estimate was something around $300,000, but that subsequent estimates which largely increased this amount were due to the increased cost of materials. I think he placed the increased cost of materials at from 40 to 50 per cent. But he failed to inform us that the original estimate had been increased some 300 per cent. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is an absurd comparison, to compare a canal that is connecting Cook's bay at Lake Simcoe with a dead end at Newmarket, with a great canal such as the Welland or Erie canals. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals also took pains to gather statistics in regard to the great industrial prosperity of the county of York. It is a wonder that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, before they initiated this project which is going to cost between a million and two million dollars, did not collect some statistics to show what the possible tonnage might be on this canal. You would think, Mr. Speaker, that the first consideration of the hon. gentlemen opposite, before embarking upon an expenditure of this kind, would have been to calculate the possible tonnage that would utilize this waterway.

But, Sir, this unique canal has certainly a very interesting history. It was first mooted prior to the general elections of 1904. It was initiated on the petition of nine electors, only nine electors of North York. They petitioned merely for the deepening and straightning of the Holland and Black rivers. So that it started as a very small and insignificant undertaking; but like the proverbial snowball it gathers in proportion and momentum as it goes along. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that no person within a radius of thirty or forty miles considers it other than as a political undertaking, certainly not a commercial undertaking. North York, as we know, is represented by the hon. the Minister of Justice; prior to his advent to this House it was represented by Sir Wm. Mulock, and it always had a normal Reform majority of 700 or 800. But when Mr. Lennox, a young Conservative, captured the constituency for the local legislature, consternation seized the Liberal workers. Something had to be undertaken in order to hold the seat for the Dominion House. Consequently a council

of war was held to consider ways and means of spending the public money in the interest of the party. No person pretended to suggest that it would serve any useful public purpose. But the main object and purpose was to devise some means whereby the public moneys might be spent in North York in such a way as to save the constituency to the federal House. For all the good the canal is, they might have suggested building a railway to the moon, because no person considers seriously that it is of any commercial utility whatever. But they proposed the building of this canal, no doubt because it will cost more money, and the present generation will certainly not live to see its completion. No doubt, in the view of those who initiated this foolish project, it will be a never-failing source of income to generations of young Liberals yet unborn.

What are the cold facts in connection with this canal? The distance from Lake Simcoe to Newmarket is 10½ miles. The difference in elevation between the town of Newmarket and the water in Lake Simcoe is 45 feet. The whole project is based on the report of an engineer dated March 17, 1905, in which he says:

> This canal would, in my opinion, prove of great advantage to the towns of Holland Landing and Newmarket and the country tributary to those, and more especially to the latter town, where there are several thriving industries which should be a valuable feeder to the main Trent canal.

The engineer talks about the town of Holland Landing. I endeavoured to ascertain where the town of Holland Landing is situated. I looked up the list of mayors, boards of trade and directories, but I could not find any trace of the town of Holland Landing. I looked up the post offices and ascertained that Holland Landing consisted of 79 houses and 446 persons. The town of Newmarket has a population of 2,125, and a postal revenue in 1908 of $5,297. The real estate assessment of Newmarket is $714,865, and the real estate assessment of Holland Landing is $66,249, for a total real estate assessment of $781,114. These are the important commercial metropolises that this great canal is to serve. The expenditure on the project will exceed the assessed values of the two towns mentioned by the engineer. When the engineer drafted that report he knew he was deliberately misleading the authorities, and the authorities should have made further inquiries before embarking on such an undertaking. The estimates of expenditures on public works always show great elasticity when prepared by government engineers. The estimated cost of this project as given in an estimate dated March 17, 1905, was $291,249.86. On July 11, 1905, a few months afterwards, the expenditure was estimated at over $300,000. On February 20, 1909, the estimated expenditure was $967,814.50. In addition to that last estimated expenditure the engineer puts a rider:

> The above estimate does not include any sum for conservation of water south of Newmarket, and I do not know what this item will cost as no plans or estimates have yet been prepared for storage reservoirs.

The steady increase in the estimated cost of this work shows the utter incapacity of the engineers and indicates that no reliance should be placed on their reports. Then there is no estimate for land damages, which will amount to thousands and thousands of dollars. I would suggest that the First Minister should take a trip into North York and see what an undertaking this is, how much damage is being done to the land and how many thousands we are paying for lands in addition to the real construction of the canal. There are four different road crossings to be provided for, and they will be overcome by overhead crossings with concrete abutments and steel superstructures. Then there are to be 4 or 5 locks between Holland Landing and Newmarket, and there must be dams and storage reservoirs to impound sufficient water to make the canal navigable. Houses for lock tenders must be constructed at considerable expense and the land damages will be very heavy. The annual upkeep must also be high. Interest charges at 5 per cent on the total cost will amount to about $100,000 per annum. In addition to that there are wages of lock-tenders and expenses of operation coming to at least $5,000, so that the annual upkeep or expense to the country for the canal after its completion must not be less than $105,000.

The question naturally suggests itself: what public utility is this canal going to serve? There are in my opinion two insuperable barriers to its successful operation: In the first place there is no water and in the second place, if there were water, there is no traffic for which the canal could be used. I am not surprised that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), when the estimates for this work were being put through, refused to defend this in a vigorous and whole-hearted manner. He called upon the Minister of Justice to defend this peculiar expenditure which is to be made in his constituency. The Minister of Justice shifts the responsibility on his predecessor, the late Postmaster General; each endeavours to shift the responsibility on some one else. The Minister of Justice is so legal and judicial in his temperament that he does not like to be bothered with embarrassing questions of fact. We saw that yesterday in connection with the Canada Life Bill. When there was a simple question of fact to decide he shifted the responsibility to the Banking and Commerce Committee and

said he would accept their dictum. The other day when defending this estimate, he said: I rely upon the engineers; they ascertain as a question of fact whether it is feasible or not and I accept their dictum. The rest of us are confronted from day to day by embarrassing questions of fact and we have to find a solution for these questions of fact; I do not see why the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) does not apply a little common sense to these matters and decide these questions of fact for himself. I desire to say with all seriousness that this canal is an object of great curiosity in North York. There is no use side-stepping these questions, the construction of this canal is a political and not a commercial undertaking, it is useless to consider this question without calling a spade a spade. The residents of North York themselves say that it is ridiculous; the newspapers are a unit in denouncing this gross, wanton and useless extravagance. The people for miles around drive to see it as a curiosity. As the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) so well said, when the government are curtailing expenditures in other departments, why do they go on with the extravagant expenditure in connection with this work? Take the estimates for agriculture. You will find that the miserable sum of $931,000 has been appropriated for that industry, the staple industry of this country. The appropriation for this year was cut from $130,000 to $98,000 for experimental farms, a reduction of $30,000 and yet hundreds of thousands of dollars are being squandered on the North York canal. So with the votes for the development of the fruit industry, the encouragement of the growing of pure seed, the encouragement of the raising of live stock, and experimental farms, health of animals, There is a total reduction in the votes for agriculture this year of $585,500, and yet we see hundreds of thousands sunk on this waterless ditch. There are only $98,000 for experimental farms and there are $1,000,000 for the North York canal. There is a reduction of $585,500 in the estimates for the most important and staple industry in this country and $1,000,000 for the canal which will be of no use unless the government can devise a means of making water run up hill, in defiance of the laws of gravitation. One million dollars would accomplish a great deal in the encouragement of the agricultural industry. It would establish 40 experimental farms at $25,000 each or it would establish and equip 20 hospitals for the treatment of preventive diseases at $50,000 each. I say that it would be in the interest of the country and to the credit of the government if they would take a sensible and proper stand upon this question and stop all operations on that so called canal. Let them put up for sale the land they have expropriated and let them discontinue this absolutely useless scheme. Such a stupendous undertaking as this should not have been lightly entered upon by the government, and the conclusions that should have moved them to initiate it were twofold, namely: was the scheme practical and if practical was it expedient? Certainly neither of these could have influenced the government or otherwise this work never would have been commenced. No words are too strong to criticise this bizarre and fantastical undertaking because it is nothing else. It is an insult to the intelligence of the electors of Canada to have hundreds of thousands of dollars squandered on this ridiculous project. I agree with the concluding paragraph of the motion which says:—

That the said canal when so completed will be practically useless; that the expenditure thereon is wholly improvident and unwarranted and constitutes a wanton misuse and waste of public money.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT (Muskoka). Some two or three years ago when this project was first proposed to the House it was described as the Holland river and Newmarket canal, and we all knew what we were voting for, but for some reason or other later on the government hid it in a general vote for the Trent Valley canal, a proceeding which was unfair to the members of the House, because I know there are many hon. gentlemen here who would have entered a strong protest against it last year were they not deceived by the new title it got in the estimates. When the scheme was first proposed I protested and I expressed the opinion that the House was wasting time in discussing the question of the water supply, because this canal would be just as valuable dry as it would be wet, I pointed out that there never would be any vessels to navigate it and if it was to be used at all it would have to be used for some other purpose than a canal. What moved the government to undertake this is more than I can understand. We know that prior to 1904 the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) ran in the county of Durham as a Liberal candidate and he had a mouth for the Trent Valley canal in that county and another mouth at Port Hope or some place else. It would appear that one of these mouths must have got lost and that it travelled up the Trent Valley canal and got into Lake Simcoe and in searching for an outlet it happened to discover the mouth of the Holland river and it dug itself into the bank and that was the end of it. If the expenditure on this work were trifling it would not require so much attention from parliament, but when there is $1,000,000 to be wasted it is time for hon. gentlemen to enter a protest and to declare that it would

be in the interests of the country to cut out this appropriation altogether. Many years ago the Trent Valley canal proper—of which of course the Holland river scheme is no part at all—was undertaken by the country and both parties were committed to it. The Minister of Railways has told us this afternoon that when the Trent Valley canal is completed it will serve as useful a purpose to Canada in carrying the grain trade of the west as the Erie canal does in the state of New York. I hope that is true, and if it be true, then it behooves the minister to use every available dollar he can get for the completion of the Trent canal instead of squandering the money in this Holland river ditch. Those who are conversant with the Trent Valley canal project know it is intended to connect the Georgian bay and the great lakes with Lake Ontario and if that canal can be made a useful factor in the great transportation problems of this country then we would be justified in building it, and in completing it at the earliest possible moment. Instead of wasting the money in this useless Holland canal project it might far better be expended in securing an outlet for the Trent Valley canal either on the east or on the west. We know that so far nothing has been done between the Simcoe lake chain and the Georgian bay at the westerly end, and neither has anything been done as far as I know in opening out into Lake Ontario at the eastern end, so that at the present moment although we have spent millions of money upon the Trent canal it is practically useless for the great purpose for which it was designed. I think it was commenced in the wrong way in the first place. I think it should have been commenced from either the easterly end or the westerly end, but whatever may have been the mistakes of either or both governments in the past it is the duty of the present Minister of Railways to complete that canal at the first moment the finances of the country will permit. It is his duty now to stop construction upon this useless Holland river undertaking and to open up either the easterly or the westerly end of the Trent Valley canal proper. We know that the government is spending large sums of money at Tiffin, and at Midland and at other Georgian bay ports, so that large steamers can convey the grain trade of the west from the head of the lakes to these ports. In the fall the elevators at these ports will be filled with grain and we know that in the rush season there are not sufficient facilities to transport that grain to the sea-board. We know that if the Trent Valley canal proper were completed vessels could load at Tiffin and Midland and other ports so as to relieve the pressure at the elevators and allow the grain to move expeditiously. Looking at it from that standpoint and realizing the necessity for completing the Trent Valley canal at the first moment possible I deprecate this useless expenditure of money on the Holland river. Every one in that section of the country knows that it is an absolute waste of public money to construct this canal in the first place, and that its upkeep will entail a future waste of money for all years to come. If the Minister of Railways and his predecessors had considered carefully all the conditions surrounding this Holland river canal there would have been no necessity to discuss the water supply because the canal never would have been undertaken. I do trust that the government, even at this late date, will take the money that it is intended to waste on this ditch and put it into the Trent Valley canal proper so that it may be completed and available for the accommodation of the trade of the west. Again I deprecate the hiding of this vote for the Holland river under the general vote for the Trent canal, because there are members in this House who would wish to continue the Trent Valley canal but who at the same time desire to stop this wasteful expenditure on the Holland river. In conclusion I enter my most vigorous protest against the carrying on of this useless work.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (North York) Mr. Speaker, as I took occasion, when this matter was under consideration in Committee of Supply some three weeks ago, to express myself with regard to it, I should have contented myself with what I then said except for the circumstance that, as this particular public work concerns more intimately than it does any other part of the country, the riding which I represent, I suppose something is expected from me upon this occasion. I do not want to repeat what I have already said in this House on the subject, though perhaps what I have to say may be to some extent an amplification of what I said before. It is charged that this undertaking is not of commercial character, but is purely political. I thought that I had disposed pretty effectually of that contention in what I said on the subject three weeks ago. I suppose I was mistaken, and I suppose that as long as we have politics in this country, and as long as it is thought that some political advantage can be gained by attacking an opponent upon the ground that this is a political undertaking, we shall have that line of attack continued. But every member of this House must be perfectly aware of the fact that, as far as I am personally concerned at any rate, I have no right to claim any credit in connection with this undertaking, and am not on my defence in regard to it. I would willingly, I would gladly, claim the credit of it if I did not feel that I should be an imposter in so

doing. This enterprise was initiated months before I was a member of this House, and months before I had the remotest idea that I should ever be the representative in parliament of the riding of North York. Four years ago and more a deputation from the constituency of North York came to Ottawa to urge on the government that this work should be undertaken. The deputation was of absolutely non-political character. It is possible that in the very large number of men who came from North York to Ottawa upon that occasion and upon that business there were more Liberals than Conservatives. I do not know how that may be; but as there are more Liberals in the riding of North York than Conservatives, it is very possible that the like proportions were maintained in the delegation. I gave to the House three weeks ago the names of half a dozen or more of the most prominent members of the Conservative party in the riding who took part in the proceedings of that delegation. I could supplement those names if that would be of any use by an equal or greater number of additional names of men who are leading men in the county, well known and recognized life-long Conservatives, who attended on that occasion as members of the delegation to assist in urging on this government that it should undertake that work. The delegation seems to have been an unusually large one. It certainly was a fully representative one, having on it men from every municipality in the constituency. It came accompanied by resolutions of every municipal council of every township, every town, every village in North York, which were presented by the secretary of the delegation and read to the members of the government who received the delegation. Now, I need not say that there are municipalities in that county in which there are majorities of Conservatives as well as others in which there are majorities of Liberals. I do not know what the political complexion of the various municipal councils of the riding at that time may have been, but I find the names of men who are most prominent in the Conservative party in the county as appearing on that delegation and as taking a most active part in the proceedings. I mentioned three weeks ago particularly the name of a most respected gentleman who at the present time occupies a high official position in the local Conservative organization for the riding, Mr. T. H. Brunton, of Newmarket, who appears to have been the secretary or official spokesman of the delegation on that occasion. I referred to the reports which appeared on the following day in the Toronto newspapers; and that I may do nobody an injustice in that regard, I want to read to the House some extracts from the report which appeared in the Toronto 'Mail and Empire.' The delegation attended here apparently on the 22nd of February, 1905, and on the 9th page of the 'Mail and Empire' of the 23rd of February, 1905, appeared half a column under date of Ottawa, February 22, describing what then took place in these words :

A deputation from York county on behalf of the Trent Valley Canal Extension Association, waited on the government to-day, asking for the widening and deepening of the Holland river.

Then, after going over the statement of the matter which was made by the delegates, the report in the 'Mail and Empire' goes on in this way—and I ask the attention of hon. gentlemen to it, in view of statements which were made in the House three weeks ago by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) :

Haughton Lennox, Conservative M.P. for South Simcoe, gave his cordial endorsation to the deputation's request, and said that although opposed politically to Sir William Mulock, he was proud of him as the member for North York and one of the Premier's ablest colleagues.

That is the summary of that hon. gentleman's remarks on the occasion of the visit of the delegation, as contained in the 'Mail and Empire' of the following day.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say that this is the first intimation I have had of such a report having been made. I was requested by the hon. Sir William Mulock to attend and hear what was said, and I attended and remained for about ten minutes. Except to speak to some persons with whom I was acquainted, I never opened my mouth, and the statement that I endorsed the action of Sir William Mulock or said anything in praise of him is absolutely and wholly untrue. On the contrary, I said specifically and definitely in this House to Sir William Mulock that I thought the thing was wholly unjustifiable, and I have never changed my mind.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Of course, I know nothing as to the fact; I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman on the subject, whatever it may be. I can but call attention, as I have done, to what he was reported in a not unfriendly newspaper on the occasion in question to have said on this subject. In an account of the same occasion which is given on the same 23rd of February, 1905, by the 'Globe' newspaper it is stated that :

The secretary, T. H. Brunton, presented petitions in favour of the work from the municipalities of Bradford, townships of west and east Gwillimbury, the town of Aurora, township of King and Whitchurch, village of Holland Landing, town of Newmarket, village of Sutton, and townships of north Gwillimbury and Georgina—

thus mentioning individually every municipality in the riding of North York, with the exception of the town of Stouffville, which is in the extreme south-west corner, and half of which was in the constituency of East York for local purposes.

The account in the 'Globe' goes on to say:

The various speakers impressed upon the government the advantages the improvement would bring to the large and populous district which would be given the boon of competition in rates by water carriage. The Holland river, it was pointed out, was already navigable a large portion of the distance. It was stated that manufacturers would save a large portion of the cost for fuel, and that there would also be large savings to the farmers for carriage of their grain through water competition.

I have no knowledge of what then took place or of what considerations moved the government of that day to recommend the undertaking of this work, but that recommendation was made to parliament during that session, before I was a member, and parliament passed a resolution devoting an amount of money to this project. The House of Commons at subsequent sessions provided from year to year for that work by voting additional sums to carry it on. There has not been any occasion, during the time I have been a member of this House, for me to speak on the subject by way of defending or supporting a proposition to appropriate money for this work, but if there had been, I should have been very ready at any time to do so because I am satisfied that this is a work for the benefit particularly of the riding I represent and which will also be for the general advantage of the rest of Canada, indirectly it is true, but in the same sense as any similar work is an advantage to the whole country.

A good deal of joking has been indulged in with regard to the possible insufficiency of the water supply for the canal when constructed. I stated practically everything I had to say on that point when addressing the Committee of the Whole House three weeks ago. It is an engineering question, of which I know nothing. If I were to sit down and examine for hours the reports of the engineers I should know no more about it when I finished than when I began. All I know is that two or three years ago, when the first hint of insufficiency of water was made in a newspaper, I asked my old friend Mr. Butler, as an engineer, whether there could be any question in that connection. He said there was none and I have relied with perfect confidence on that opinion from that day to this. I do not suppose that Mr. Butler made personal examination, no doubt he relied on the reports of the engineers who made such examination, but I do suppose that he applied to those reports his knowledge as an engineer of eminence and experience and that, speaking from the facts those reports disclosed, he was in a position to say that there is no question about the sufficiency of the water supply. I am content certainly to rest upon that, and I do not think the hon. gentleman could find any better foundation for an opinion on a subject of that character.

With regard to the benefits which this work will give to the people, in the first place, of the immediate locality, and through them to people who are further away, it seems to me that the considerations which have been advanced in general terms by my hon. colleague, the minister in charge of the department, ought to be satisfactory and conclusive. I suppose that for every one there is no place like home. I suppose that every member of this House thinks his own constituency is the finest. I certainly have that opinion of mine. When I was a younger man, I used to think that nowhere in this country were farms to be found equal to those of Ernesttown and the Fredericksburghs and Adolphustown. I have changed my mind since, and I say—speaking with as much knowledge in a general way of the province of Ontario as any man here—I do not believe there is any section of the province of Ontario or of the whole of Canada, in which superior farms, better farm buildings, or more prosperous, thriving farmers are to be found than in the county of North York. If this constituency is one in which prosperity abounds, if it is a fine agricultural country and has the advantage of manufacturing establishments, the equals at least of those which any other community of the same size enjoys, what reason is there, when the advantage of water communication can be secured to the heart and centre of that territory by the digging and widening of a stream for a distance of some three or four miles, why that should not be done?

But the question to-day is not whether or no this work should be undertaken. The question before the House is ought we to discontinue it? Should we, by adopting the resolution proposed, condemn the government of four years ago and of to-day for recommending the undertaking of this work? Ought we now to abandon the work and lose the amount of money we have put into it? Facing that question and with the necessity of saying by our vote whether or not we want to censure the government and abandon the work which has been undertaken and upon which a large amount of money has been spent, I cannot see how any hon. gentlemen can hesitate to vote against the resolution. We have undertaken this work, we have committed ourselves to it, we have no reason to doubt that it will be efficient when competed, and we have as satisfactory reasons for believing that it will be beneficial to the community in which it is situated and, through that community, indi-

rectly to the remainder of the country, as we have with regard to any other commercial undertaking which this country is now concerned in as a public work. I can understand the local jealousy which might cause people, who reside at some little distance, to think that their own personal peculiar interests would be injured by the completion of this work and to seek to prevent its completion. But when we are told that nothing of that kind exists, that it is absurd to suppose there is any kind of local jealousy on the part of the great city of Toronto, into which millions of the people's money have been poured in the past and to which the voters and ratepayers of North York have contributed their full quota, I cannot see why this enterprise should be singled out as one to be condemned and abandoned when I am convinced, on the reports of scientific men and my knowledge of the local conditions, that it will be of great benefit to the people of that locality and through them to the people of the whole surrounding country.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, this question has been before the House in several forms during the present session. Objection has been taken to the form in which the vote for the Trent Valley canal appears in the estimates. The vote is in one lump sum of $1,000,000 without division. That matter has been briefly referred to by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright). I think that his ground is well taken; for we find that in the Supplementary Estimates, for instance, there is a vote for the Prince Edward Island Railway—a vote relating to this same Department of Railways and Canals—but it is divided into items with the amount specified for each. Throughout these estimates from end to end, we find the same form quite common. But, whenever there is a high-smelling item that is to be carried through, it is always coupled with two or three others and we are asked to swallow the pills, box and all. Many hon. members of this House support the continuation of work on the Trent Valley canal but they would like to see some effort made to complete the system, and are not satisfied with the prospect held out that our children's children and not they will pass by this outlet into Lake Ontario or Georgian bay. And of those that favour expenditure on the Trent Valley canal, many are prepared to vote down this expenditure on the Newmarket canal. The Minister of Railways and Canals, in his effort to defend a very bad case, has wandered far afield. He has quoted masses of statistics showing the number of canals to be found in the older countries of Europe, but he forgot to say that eighty per cent of those canals were built long before the days of railways, and that since the advent of railways very few small canals of this description have been constructed. Any one who knows anything about the United States knows that canals of this kind were built through Pennsylvania and Maryland years ago, and you can see them there now choked with weeds and unused because the work for which they were designed is now better done by the railways.

Let me point out where this Newmarket canal is and what it is. One has only to look at the map to see where Lake Simcoe is. Lake Simcoe lies at an altitude of about two hundred feet above Lake Ontario. Of course, it has a natural basin with its own drainage system on all sides, and it empties into the Georgian bay by way of the Severn river. A number of small rivers empty into Lake Simcoe from the south. The greatest of these is the Holland river, and, a few miles from its mouth, the Holland river branches into what is called the east branch of the Holland river. The Black river runs a few miles to the east and empties into the lake at Jackson's point. Each of these rivers covers, in its course, a distance of from ten to twenty miles, and, at one time, they were navigable for two or three miles from their mouths for canoes and the batteaux used by the Hudson Bay Company and the settlers of the old days. Each river has its source from a height of from thee hundred to six hundred feet above the level of Lake Simcoe, making the fall in a distance of from ten to twenty miles. The Holland river rises only a few miles from Wilcocks lake, the source of the Humber. The east branch of the Holland river, from about Newmarket, runs through its own valley, and, to reach the main river from Newmarket westward you have to overcome a rise of probably 150 feet. To reach the Black river on the east side you would have to cross another divide about equally high. So, the only territory tributary to the east branch of the Holland river, lies along the Northern Railway. The drainage area of the branch of the river is stated at 61 square miles, which means, roughly, a territory ten miles by six. All the figures given us by the hon. minister relative to the tonnage of the county of York has no bearing on the question, because this tonnage nearly all travels in a different direction. That in the valley of the Holland river travels to the Canadian Pacific Railway and down to Toronto by Kleinburg. That on the east side goes to Toronto by the valley of the Don over the old Midland railway. None of that tonnage could be brought to this waterway because of the expense. The greatest extent of country to be served would be twenty miles by six miles.

I have been at great pains to go through the papers relating to this matter and learn why this ditch was begun. A petition

was presented—no date given—signed by several gentlemen. One hon. member who spoke said that it had been signd by gentlemen in North York. A number of those who signed it were from Barrie and other places. And what did they ask? Simply for the dredging of the mouths of the Black river, the Holland river and the East branch as far as Holland Landing to clear out the weeds and allow the barges that come through the Trent Valley canal system to go to Holland Landing, for their cargoes. In other words, they asked that these places be made harbours, like Barrie, Jackson's Point, or Beaverton, and not that a canal should be built. The section between Cook's bay and Newmarket is ten miles. From Holland Landing to Newmarket four and a half miles—the latter is all the country that has need of canalization. That is all that is to be covered by the canal. The rest is merely clearing out silt, and dredging out sand bars and other obstructions. But now, let us see the genesis of this work. The first mention of this canal was immediately before the election of 1904. Some time in October, 1904, Mr. Walsh, an engineer of the department, was hurriedly called from Orillia to that section of country to make a survey of this particular branch. There is a considerable vote around Newmarket and Holland Landing He had to ascertain if something could be done to make a canal or bring about the building of some public work there. Mr. Walsh goes down to that country, and in a few days every loose fish in Newmarket is driving stakes and eating his dinner at the country's expense.

By the way, it was just two or three weeks before the election, and every voter that could possibly be put to work was put to work on the job, and within a very short time they blew in $25,000 of this country's money in making these surveys. Bear in mind immediately before the election. Now you have the whole secret of the purpose of this canal. It was designed for a political purpose. It was so intended by the then Postmaster General, Sir Wm. Mulock, to enable him to carry that constituency, which was gradually going to the bad. Politically we find at the same moment that the hon. gentleman who succeeded him, as Postmaster General, and who is now the Minister of Justice, was carrying on an election down in Durham. The question of the Trent Valley canal was made a burning question in Durham. The hon. gentleman being new to politics, thought that he would enter political life with a bludgeon, and he decided the easiest way to secure a majority of the votes was by offering and promising large public works to his constituents. At the same time a gentleman by the name of R. R. Gamey appeared in Durham. Apparently there had been some differences of opinion between the Minister of Justice and Mr. Gamey previous to that Durham election, and Mr. Gamey and the present Minister of Justice had it out in East Durham, with the result that Mr. Gamey succeeded in landing his man, and the Minister of Justice was defeated.

The next we hear of this work was this great deputation that came down to the government asking to have this work carried on. They found out that although they had got the surveys, the thing was beginning to get a little cold, either that, or the retirement of the Postmaster General, then the Hon. Mr. Mulock, was in contemplation, and it was necessary to make that riding sure for his successor. The gentleman who was to succeed him did succeed him. Bear in mind that the election was in the fall of 1904, this deputation came to see the government on the 22nd of February, 1905. The agitation was kept up during that whole period until away along in the fall of that year, when, on the 16th of October, 1905, the present Minister of Justice was appointed Postmaster General. It was well known at that time that Mr. Mulock had made himself possibly too busy with the question of public utilities, and that his views along the same lines as those of the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) running in parallel grooves, did not meet with the approbation of the leader of this government. He was going to retire, his health being very poor at that time. Subsequently it got better when he became a judge. But this constituency must be kept in a ferment of excitement so that there might be a loyal supporter of the government appointed. The matter was carried on in that way. The Postmaster General, now the Minister of Justice, went up for election on November 22, 1905, against a farmer by the name of McCallum, and in spite of this canal agitation, no work having been done at that time, in spite of the surveys he carried the constituency by a reduced majority of 149. The minister says it is a great Reform riding. It is not a great Reform riding apparently, from that majority. Now, succeeding that, Mr. Walsh was asked to make a report. Mr. Walsh is the engineer of the government, who is apparently ready to make a report on anything at a moment's notice, and so far as his figures in this connection are concerned they are misleading in every respect. I do not think the Minister of Railways and Canals will rise in his place and say to this House that any single figure that has been given by Mr. Walsh to him as the responsible minister in charge of that department, in connection with this work, has been within 200 per cent of what the work actually cost, or of the estimate that was made by the responsible man, Mr.

Grant. We have had Mr. Walsh's report quoted to us. Mr. Walsh said in his first report that the amount of damages for the right of way to Newmarket would be $6,000. What is the amount of damages so far? $27,000 actually paid and the work is not all finished yet. Mr. Walsh also said that the original work would cost something like $300,000. His first report was made to Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, in which he placed the amount at something over $300,000. He made a subsequent report on the 17th of March, 1905, which the minister did not quote, and the amount was $291,249.86. With that report in their hands the work was divided into two sections, the lower section or the Holland river section, that is to say, from Cook's bay to Holland river, or Bradford road, and the upper section of the Bradford road up to Newmarket, four and one-fifth miles further on. Tenders were called for the first section. There were four or five tenderers, and the successful tenderer was the Lake Simcoe Dredging Co.,in which Mr. Cane, a very prominent Liberal of Newmarket, was a leading member, assisted by Dr. Spohn—I do not think he is a Conservative, he lives up in Penetanguishene, and used to be in charge of the government asylum at Orillia. This Lake Simcoe Dredging Company built a scow and placed a dredging apparatus on it. They took the contract for $46,497.10, and commenced work. As a result of their operations, in a very few months they discovered that their dredge would not work, and it is very amusing to read the comments of Mr. Grant on the apparatus they had there at work. He calculated there was some 270,000 cubic feet of earth to be removed, and although they had been at work dredging all the summer and fall, all they got out was 3,500 yards. You can calculate how many years it would take them at that rate to finish the work. Mr. Cane wrote letters to this government calling on them for the love of everything good to send them a cheque, that they were hard up. Even when there was only something like $1,500 coming to them, he had the modesty to ask the government to send them $10,000 or $15,000 to help them out. However, nothing was done so far as that is concerned, with the result that this company, not having carried on its work, lost the contract and a new tender had to be called for. New tenders were prepared and were called for. The matter was taken hold of by Mr. Grant, and he made another estimate for the second tender. He estimated No. 1 section for the department at $131,239. I wish the House to note these figures particularly, they were the figures of the department. Tenders were called and a gentleman named Riley was one of the lowest tenderers. His figure for that work was exactly the same as the government estimate, except that in the hundreds column he changed the two into a three. His tender was $131,392, and he added 65 cents. That was a very strange coincidence. However, that contract was not let. The first tender was some $41,000, and after that section had been revamped and looked over on the very same drawings, the lowest tender was $131,000. The gentlemen who tendered were all returned their checks and No. 1 section, which common sense would have suggested should have been the first portion to be constructed, was neglected and nothing has been done upon it since. Why? Because the bullfrogs of Cook's bay have no votes. There was nobody living on that section who had a vote. Immediately an election loomed upon the horizon, it became necessary that something should be done where there were voters and an estimate was made, tenders were called for and the contract let for the second section of the canal. Mr. Walsh made several attempts or bluffs at an estimate on the second section but Mr. Grant, who is without doubt a very experienced engineer, made an estimate of that work which was far short of the lowest tenderer. Mr. Grant's estimate on section No. 2 was $596,826, and the lowest tender received in answer to the call founded on that estimate was $652,009.50. That tender was by this very same Mr. Riley. When the government called on Mr. Riley to accept and sign his tender, he began side-stepping and correspondence went on for some months on this contract—and strange to say some correspondence of W. M. German appears on the files to aid Mr. Riley out of what was apparently a difficult hole. A syndicate was formed which finally took over the work from Mr. Riley and the work is now being carried on by this syndicate or company.

The lowest tenderer on No. 1 as revised, that is the tender by Mr. Riley, although there were six or seven responsible tenders, was $131,392.65. The present tender for No. 2 section is $652.609. The money blown in on surveys previous to the election of 1904, amounted to $25,000. There has been paid out for the right of way, so far, $27,102.90. A strange thing in connection with these payments for right of way is that a gentleman named Widdifield appears as a partner in about 50 per cent of the transfers of land made in and around Newmarket for this canal. I am told that Mr. Widdifield is a defeated candidate in that riding and a very close friend of our hon. friend the Minister of Justice. I cannot see why the government could not buy these lands direct from the owners without having a partner appear in all transactions. In addition to the right of way there will be heavy expenditure for bridges. I need not point out that there are steel bridges

in connection with this work. Of these two must be steel swing bridges of 88 feet span each, one of 49 feet and one of 64 feet. Any one who knows anything about steel construction will say that you cannot build a steel swing bridge at less than $500 or $1,000 per foot, and the cost, instead of being the $91,000 in the estimate, would be nct far short of $150,000.

Then there are the land damages and the work at Wilcox lake. No one has made an estimate on that work except our good, Christian friend Walsh who says $41,000. Mr. Walsh estimated at $290,000 work which has now reached $900,000 so if he says that this work will cost $41,000, we are safe in saying that it will cost not less than $150,000, which with the land damages to be paid, farms expropriated, &c., will bring the total cost of the conservation up to at least $250,000. That would make a grand total for the work of $1,236,104.55—we will drop the 55 cents for the benefit of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham).

Now let us come to the vital point. The one string harped on by hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to the canal is the feasibility of this work. Any one who knows anything about engineering will tell you that there is practically no engineering problem that cannot be solved. We all know the point to which engineering science has reached, so that to bring into the argument at all the question of the feasibility of the work is to treat us as a lot of children. The great question should have been, not the feasibility, but the commercial value of the work as a public undertaking.

I have pointed out to you how the various lines of traffic parallel each other in the county of York. I have pointed out that the only basin that could be served by this canal is something like 60 square miles in that portion of York. The distance to be saved is about 4 1-2 miles, because I eliminate from the question the amount necessary to dredge the mouth of the river. It is really the 4 1-2 miles that is costing the $1,000,000, as there is a lift of 45 feet in that distance. I have also considered the tonnage arising in Newmarket. I do not believe there is over 60 tons daily all the year around of tonnage in and out of Newmarket. Of that amount 50 per cent will go south to the city of Toronto and the greater portion of the balance will go north of Newmarket so that the total in and out tonnage of Newmarket on which the freight charges could be reduced by this canal would not amount to 20 tons a day. What would the reduction be on 20 tons a day? You can haul a ton 4 1-2 miles on a wagon for a dollar; that is a fairly good price. Therefore, this canal will at most save the people in the immediate vicinity of Newmarket about $20 a day, and as the canal will be opened for about 200 days in the year the saving would amount annually to $4,000. But, we will give good measure and we will double that amount and we will suppose there is a saving of $8,000 a year to the people of Newmarket and its vicinity.

Now, Sir, if we take the total amount that that canal will ultimately cost and figure it at the rate of 4 per cent., there will be a charge on the people of this country of $40,000 a year. Added to that, at the very lowest estimate there will be a charge of $10,000 a year for the maintenance of the locks and for lock tenders, and you therefore have $50,000 a year that the people of Canada will have to pay by reason of the construction of this canal in order to save $8,000 a year to the people of Newmarket and its vicinity. Does any sane man think that that is a good business proposition? I think political economists would say, considering the conditions of this country at the present time, that if the government proceeds to spend say half a million dollars on any given work it should be ranked as a national enterprise, and before such a work is undertaken it should receive the most careful consideration. The question should be asked: will this work be of such a nature that it will serve the people of the country as a whole and not merely the people of a small section? Now, I challenge any man on the government benches to state that the building of this Holland river ditch will cheapen by the smallest fraction of a cent the cost of hauling grain from the wheat fields of the west to the sea-board. As a matter of fact the direction of the canal is north easterly, and as everyone knows the traffic of the west would naturally seek the opposite direction as an outlet. The one million dollars which this canal is going to cost if spent in carefully devised improvements at the terminals on the great lakes would appreciably reduce the cost of freight and to that extent benefit the farmers of the west and the people of the country generally. The Minister of Justice declared this afternoon that Toronto was jealous of the expenditure of this money in his riding. What nonsense. Why, the aggregate annual business done in that section of the riding that would be served by this ditch would not equal the business done in one city block in Toronto in the course of a year. But, whenever the Holland ditch is mentioned the Minister of Justice flies into a passion, and he seems to think that a political attack is being made on him. Sir, this is not a personal matter; it is a far graver question, of national concern. The Minister of Finance tells us that there is great difficulty in financing on the money markets of the world at the present day, and that there are small clouds

on the financial horizon which forbode danger. That being so, is it wise for us to spend such a vast sum of money for the mere sake of constructing a political work for the benefit of a single minister of the Crown? To my mind the Minister of Justice should be broader; he should not take such a narrow and sectional view of his interests. The Minister of Public Works told us the other night that expenditure was curtailed this year, and that even a great many necessary public works in his riding could not be proceeded with because the country could not afford it. Why does not the Minister of Justice try to get into the same frame of mind. He cannot; he looks at every thing in a narrow partisan spirit; he is like the man who lived all his life in a political barrel and knows nothing except what he sees through the political bung hole. Let me urge the government once and for all to stop operations on this canal. We have been told that the country is committed to the project, but what has been done already had far better be lost than that additional useless expenditure should be incurred. Sir, this is a political work and nothing else. It may suit the Minister of Justice in his own particular constituency to have us condemn this work, but I can assure him that if he forces it on the country it will not add anything to his political prestige in the rest of the province of Ontario where public works are urgently needed and with regard to which we have with great forbearance agreed to their postponement for this year. It shall afford me great pleasure to vote for this amendment. A political job costing $5,000 or $6,000 is wrong in principle, but when the cost runs into the millions and when it means a charge of 25 cents on every man, woman and child in Canada, it is a political crime.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to remind the House at this stage that in my opinion this discussion is irregular. The estimates contain item 103 for the construction of the Trent canal, and I find from 'Hansard' that this item was being discussed before the committee on the second of March, and that it remains open for discussion again when the House is in Committee of Supply. This debate seems to have proceeded so far by consent of both sides but under the circumstances it is irregular. If the House is willing to allow the discussion to proceed I am prepared to submit, but I think it my duty now to remind the House that in my view the procedure is irregular.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand). I listened with a great deal of attention to the speech of the Minister of Railways and I thought he deserved the sympathy of the House in his laboured attempt to justify the expenditure on the Newmarket canal. Since the Minister of Railways came to the House I have always admired him for the candid manner in which he has given us information and for the frankness with which he has discussed questions relating to his department. But to-day we witnessed the most laboured effort he has ever attempted here. He has our sympathy as no doubt he has the sympathy of his friends. We have seen in the press of the country amusing cartoons in reference to the Newmarket canal, and the Minister of Justice has been portrayed as pumping water out of a well to furnish the canal with a water supply. I thought at first that was only a joke, but it seems the Minister of Railways takes it seriously and he actually informs the House that it is possible to pump water to supply that canal. It would seem that the hon. gentleman thinks that such will be the ultimate result and that water must be pumped from artesian wells to enable the canal to float anything.

Therefore in his efforts all the way through he had the sympathy of the House. One of my reasons for speaking on this matter is that there is in my riding a canal somewhat similar to the Newmarket canal, that is, the Welland canal feeder. That was originally built for a good purpose: for a good many years it supplied the old Welland canal with water drawn from the Grand river. That continued until the Welland canal reached the Lake Erie level, and from that time it has got its water supply from Lake Erie. That canal feeder extends for twenty or twenty-two miles from Dunnville or Port Maitland on the Grand river to Welland, through a good section of country, with Port Maitland at one end and Port Colborne at the other. That is a rather important canal, and one might naturally suppose that it would be of a great deal of service and benefit to the section of country through which it runs, but let me tell the hon. minister and this House that apart from the original purpose for which it was built, that of supplying the Welland canal with water, it is of little practical value to the people of that section of country. In fact, it is never used. The Minister of Railways and Canals tells us that he has been told by prominent citizens of Toronto that manufactured goods might be shipped from Toronto to Newmarket, transferred there to the canal, and transported to the Georgian bay. I think every one of us knows that that is absolutely ridiculous. You could not do that and make it pay. I believe that that canal of ten miles or more, which is now being built at a cost of between one and two millions of dollars to the people of this country, will be just as useless when completed, as the Welland canal feeder, for the purposes of transportation. It will be of no benefit whatever to the farmers of

that particular section. The Minister of Railways and Canals tells us of the great extent of the farm products of the county of York. One would suppose that he expected these to be transported over this canal. He could apply the same argument to the counties of Haldimand and Welland through which the Welland canal feeder passes. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that there are practically no farm products whatever passing through that canal. A short time ago I put a question on the Order Paper with reference to the Welland canal feeder, asking among other things how many vessels had passed through it during the last five years, and what their tonnage was. The question and the answers were published in the local papers of my county, and created a good deal of amusement, because it was stated that 700 vessels had passed through it in the last five years, when the hon. gentleman would have been nearer the mark if he had said seven. I believe the Newmarket canal will be just as useless to the people of the county of York as the Welland canal feeder is to the people of the counties of Haldimand and Welland for the purpose of transporting farm products or manufactured goods. The day has gone by for little branch canals. They never can be made to pay, because nobody uses them. We want through canals, and as a member of this House I am prepared to support any reasonable transportation project which the government may bring forward; but I am not doing my duty to the people of the county of Haldimand, whom I represent, if I do not on their behalf protest against an expenditure of nearly two million dollars which I believe is absolutely wasted. The people of my county must contribute their portion of that money, and on their behalf I protest against this expenditure as being unwise and not in the public interest.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, at the outset I may tell the Minister of Railways and Canals that I am in favour of main canals, and I am in favour of branch canals where there is any possible excuse shown for their construction. What are the facts concerning the Newmarket canal? Newmarket stands at an elevation of 770 feet above sea-level; Lake Simcoe stands at an elevation of 717 feet; so that there is a rise between Lake Simcoe and Newmarket of 60 feet. The distance from Newmarket to Lake Simcoe is 6·7 miles. The distance from Newmarket to Holland Landing, where navigable water is found is 3·6 miles; and the country is asked to vote an expenditure for a little canal for this distance, in order in the first instance to secure the election of the then Postmaster General, and later on to secure the patronage for the succeeding Postmaster General, now the Minister of Justice, at a cost of $1,000,000. If this were a through canal or if it were to connect with a through canal, some excuse might be made for it. We find that grain is brought in transit by rail to the country towns, where it is ground, and then it is sent on to the sea-board on a through rate by train; but there is no such thing as a through rate for part water carriage and part land carriage. If this canal had the excuse of being on a through route, so that the grain could be brought in barges, ground, and then shipped on to its destination on a through rate, there could be some excuse for its construction; but there is no possible excuse for the construction of this canal. In the three and a half miles from Holland Landing to Newmarket there is a rise of sixty odd feet, and the water supply is absolutely inadequate, unless, as the minister suggests, reservoirs are constructed to catch the rainfall, or unless he sets all the boys in the country around pumping water with their house pumps. I know of no expenditure in the country more wasteful than this expenditure. I can direct the minister's attention to a part of the country where he might have a proper expenditure. Balsam lake is 838 feet above sea-level. Extending northward from it is the chain of waters which supply the Trent canal system with water. With one lock at Coboconk, one at Norland, one at Elliott's falls, there would be communication for thirty miles inland. All that thirty miles is a timber and an agricultural country in which the farmers have no proper access to the markets, and there are many more farms along that thirty miles than there are along the three and a half miles between Holland landing and Newmarket. The country along those three and a half miles has two lines of railway, one on one side of that little stream, and one on the other. In fact the distance between the railways in some places and the creek is not much more than the Minister of Railways could have taken in a jump in his young days. There is no trouble crossing the stream at any time, and both the electric and steam railways are close together so that the people are absolutely served in every respect. If the people of Newmarket want to bring up any logs, they can do so by rail at a through rate, but they cannot bring them partly by water and the rest of the way by rail at any such rate. I venture to say that the hon. minister can take one-tenth part of the sum he admits this Newmarket canal will cost, and with that money have a canal built for 30 miles north of Coboconk and by the construction of a trestle north of Minden to Mountain lake and a dam between Mountain lake and Horseshoe, which would raise the water sufficiently to give 30 miles additional navigation; that by an expenditure of less than $250,000, 60 miles of naviable water could be added to the Trent system, and that would go through a country not served by

any railway or even by a decent wagon-road. There are so many ways in which this money could be better expended that I have never been able to see the first motive for building this Newmarket canal. There is not enough water to feed it and there is no need for it. Three and a half miles is a short distance from a town to a port, and if Newmarket were to grow in size it would be down to Holland landing in a short time, and there would be no need to bring this canal up to the mill of a strong supporter of the government. For the life of me, I cannot conceive any justification for this expenditure, and I do not see why the present minister is carrying it out. I regret I was not present when he made his explanation, but with all his astuteness I am satisfied he could not give any justification for this, and I believe that in his heart of hearts, he would be delighted to see this canal wiped out of existence and no part of its construction proceeded with. But even supposing there is a grain of justification for the construction of this canal, the work should have been delayed until the ends were constructed, or in other words until the Trent canal is completed from the Georgian bay to Lake Ontario. There is no need for this Newmarket canal. There is no timber on Lake Simcoe to bring to this man's mill and no goods to bring to Newmarket. The canal never should have been begun; but if the government are determined to construct it, its construction should be withheld until the Trent canal is completed from the Georgian bay to the Bay of Quinte. Its construction should also have been given second place to the branch canal I have referred to running up to the lakes in Haliburton county, where there are thousands of settlers who have to drive miles to the nearest railway and where there are millions of feet of timber which cannot be hauled long distances to railways. This timber is not floatable and can only be got to market when a canal is opened. I trust that the hon. minister will reconsider his decision. In the first place I object to the item appearing as part of the Trent Canal system. That system has enemies enough. It has taken a long time to educate public opinion up to the point of considering the Trent as a useful waterway, but to have the Newmarket canal placed in the estimates as part of the Trent canal is adding insult to injury.

Mr. FOSTER. How far is Cook's bay from any other portion of the Trent canal?

Mr. SAM HUGHES. The Trent canal runs into Lake Simcoe. That part which is at present constructed runs from Heeley's Falls to Balsam lake which is the height of land and onward down the waters of the Talbot river into Lake Simcoe. It is further navigable from Lake Simcoe into Lake Couchiching. This million of dollars which is being squandered on this Newmarket canal would go far to open up one of the ends of the Trent canal not yet completed. But in place of doing this and giving the traffic of our great northwest easy access to market, the minister is frittering away the public money on little side issues such as the one under consideration. I would not object if there was any use for this Newmarket canal after it is constructed, but it would pay the government forty times over to take this sawmill of this supporter of theirs for whom they are building this canal, and bring it down to Holland landing rather than squander the public money as they are doing. I give the minister warning that with all his dams and reservoirs, he will never have sufficient water to navigate this ditch in the summer season; and I trust he will see his way clear, before the item is passed, to withdraw any reference whatever to its being part of the Trent Canal system, and let this item stand distinct under its proper name of the Newmarket canal. It is not a canal, it is not even a decent ditch. In dry seasons, not more than a pail of water a second runs down that stream just below the town, I trust the minister will see his way clear to withdraw this vote.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). I am glad to be able to add a few words of protest against this proposed expenditure, because I am thoroughly familiar with the district in which this work is to be built. I should like very much to see the first report advocating this canal and the reasons it gives in favour of the work. With regard to the water supply, I think enough has been said about that, because no man who has been in that country year after year but must laugh at the suggestion that there is to be a supply of water for this canal except by artificial means. But I would not worry much about that, for there will be quite enough water for all the purposes for which this canal will be required. In the sixties, seventies and early eighties, Lake Simcoe presented a very busy sight. Steamers and tugs innumerable were on the lake. Going out at night, during the sawing season you were never away from the sight of a mill, while rafts were constantly being towed about the lake. I have lived there in summer for the last twenty-two or twenty-three years, and have seen the tugs towing the rafts. About fifteen years ago, I and many others witnessed the melancholy sight of the last tug and raft on Lake Simcoe. The logs that had drifted to the shore had been carefully picked up and a raft made, and it was towed to Bradford. Bradford is a very enterprising village, about one-third the size of

Newmarket. It has perfect water communication up the Holland river. There used to be enormous saw-mills there. Logs were towed up that river until there were no logs tributary to Lake Simcoe. The mills were burnt or torn down and the mills at Belle Ewart had been abandoned years before. Not for fifteen years has anything larger than a small gasoline boat gone up to Bradford. For years, as a resident at Roach's point, I used to take a party of youngsters up to Bradford every year to play cricket. There is perfect navigation there, unless the stream is over-grown with weeds. But there is not a stick of merchantable timber on Lake Simcoe. Nor is there a carload of bark. Newmarket has two factories and a tannery and they cannot get a stick of timber or a carload of bark for the factories and tannery from the waters tributary to Lake Simcoe. I am as certain as that I stand here that there will not be a ton of freight offered on this Newmarket canal; the work will be absolutely and entirely useless. There are wharfs on different parts of Lake Simcoe. The old Northern Railway built a very extensive wharf at Belle Ewart. The railway had a very prosperous branch while there was business on Lake Simcoe. When the mills were burned down, the Northern Railway took up its tracks running from Lefroy to Belle Ewart, a mile and a half and abandoned the wharf. A few years ago, the railway re-tracked that line because large ice-houses had been put at Belle Ewart. I do not think there is a more melancholy sight than that one sees when one goes down to the old abandoned wharf there. It has rotted and there is no timber, but the stones are there, and on either side are the wrecks of tugs and boats that plied on Lake Simcoe when business was done there. There are the hulls of five or six tugs and two or three passenger boats. There is only one passenger boat on Lake Simcoe, and it is run because they take excursions now and again in the summer. But there is no business to be done, and not a possibility of any business on this canal. And the expense of it will be about a million and a quarter of dollars. Now, the ministers of this government are trustees for the people, and they are wasting every dollar of the people's money that is put into that canal just as completely as if they threw it into the river; in fact, it would be better for them to take that money and throw it into the river, for that would end the expense, whereas, spending it in this useless canal, there will always be more or less expense of maintenance. I passed that ditch yesterday. I went up to my summer place for the purpose of trying to get the facing for a wharf there—not a wharf for commercial purposes but only for bathing purposes. And I could not get even enough timber there to face that small wharf thirty feet long. The timber has to be brought from Toronto by rail to build that little bit of a wharf. The wharf that the government built there three or four years ago has been of great service. It is spoken of very highly by all the summer outsiders, and I was told yesterday that as many as twelve black bass had been caught by the boys off the end of that wharf last season. The bass are getting very scarce.

Mr. FOSTER. By and by they will be gone.

Mr. OSLER. They are nearly all gone now. Bradford is probably a more important point than Newmarket so far as grain is concerned. It is a large grain-buying centre. But the idea of buying grain at Bradford and shipping it by canal never entered the head of any sane man. I think, in all fairness, that a million dollars is a good deal of money, even in flush times. This government did not seem to think so when times were good, but now, I should think with the revenues in a less satisfactory condition, even they would look upon a million dollars as an amount of fair importance. Before spending the money on this work, it would be well to get a business man—not an engineer, he does not report on the business—but get one or two business men to report on the possible business for that canal when it is built. On the trolley cars, going up yesterday, this work was discussed by almost every one, and the general talk among those going in and out of the car was that the work would not go on any further. The thing was a laughing stock; one after another as he came in said, 'Well, I guess that is the last money that will be spent there.' The government will do wisely to have a report from a business standpoint and carefully reconsider their position. Then, let them have the boldness to say that they were mistaken in what they have done and cut it out, because this money will be lost just as surely as it is put into this work.

It has often been a matter of remark and wonder that there seems to be so little feeling of the responsibility of trustees on the part of the government in regard to these matters. It has been remarked in my hearing over and over again, and I think it is generally recognized, that there is a great want of the responsibility of trusteeship in our public life. Now how can we expect anything else if the trustees for the government recklessly, deliberately throw away a million or a million and a half of the people's money without the first shadow of excuse for doing so? I make the assertion that that canal when built will be absolutely useless, that never a ton of freight will go up or go down it. There is one saw-mill, or factory, there, which uses lumber, but it uses nearly all hardwood. Now there is no hardwood on Lake Simcoe

or on any tributary to it, indeed there is no timber of any sort. Even cordwood has reached such a price that it is cheaper for the farmers to pay freight rates on coal. They have to pay now $5.75 a cord for wood. I speak of what I know, and I appeal to the minister and to the government to reconsider this project and to save the country a million dollars.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish to say a few words with reference to this before the debate is closed. It seems to me that in considering whether it was wise or not for the government to expend this great sum, they ought to have had some estimate of the tonnage that was likely to be hauled over that canal. So far as regards any information disclosed to this House to-day, we have had no such estimate. No engineer seems to have estimated for the government the amount of freight that is likely to be hauled over that canal. The question was asked the Minister of Railways, but either he did not deign to give the information, or he did not have it. Now in view of the fact that there was no information, what justification can the Minister of Railways give to the House for going on with such an unwise expenditure? We ask ourselves, we who have some knowledge of the locality, what kind of trade is likely to spring up? The hon. gentleman behind me (Mr. Osler) said that there will not be a ton of freight carried over it. I would not go that far. There is one grist mill in Newmarket. The time might come when grain would be delivered from the Northwest at Victoria Harbour, and if small boats could go down the Trent Valley canal into Lake Simcoe they could bring a portion of the grain from Lake Simcoe into Newmarket. That is the only way of bringing in freight from the outside. With regard to the possibility or probability of handling the trade of that great and rich county of York, and the Minister of Railways seems to think there was a possibility when he spoke of its immense wealth, I think that might be well left out of the question entirely. Why? Because the trade of that whole county of York goes to the great city of Toronto on the south, and the canal is away in the north. He said it was likely to cheapen freight rates. How could it cheapen freight rates, how could it come into competition with railways that are carrying trade from that county to-day? The only way to get trade for the canal would be to go round nearly 200 miles to carry freight that is carried on the railways to-day to Toronto from Newmarket, which is only 25 miles. What kind of competition would you have if you had to carry freight over 200 miles where the railways can carry it only 29 miles? There would be no competition at all. The thing is so absurd that no one who knows the geography of the country and the direction of the trade of the country, would consider it for a moment. What other enterprise is it going to serve? Mr. Cane was the man who was chiefly instrumental in getting that enterprise started by the government. I think there is a fatality about it in some way or other, because we are told that he took the contract for dredging at $46,000, and after he had worked at it for a length of time, the contract had to be taken off his hands. The very man that was instrumental above all others in getting the government to build it is the man who is now going to suffer for it, and for what purpose? To bring in logs for his saw-mill From where? The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) says there is no timber, practically, around Lake Simcoe. He is correct. Forty years ago there was lots of timber, when the 'Emily May' was running on Lake Simcoe, and the 'Ida Burton' and other small boats; there was timber all around it. But the timber has all been taken away, and there is no trade left in that line.

But there is one line of commerce that the Minister of Railways did not mention, and only one that is at all probable or possible. That is a trade that was carried on very successfully between thirty and forty years ago by men living on that marsh where this canal is going. What was it? Catching frogs and sending them down to New York. That trade is going on yet, and there may be some freight carried in that article of commerce. I think it is capable of great development, because that marsh is a very extensive one, it is a marsh where the frogs grow to a very large size, and the business is likely to afford a permanent trade, and the only trade that the canal is likely to find. They used to carry the frogs by stage from Keswick to Newmarket, and ship them from there to Toronto, and thence to New York. Now they can swim the frogs down the canal and take their heads off at Newmarket, and ship them from that place, that will save something in transportation for at least a portion of the distance. That is the only permanent trade that will be found.

Now in regard to the water supply. I have jumped across that creek, I venture to say, hundreds of times—if I said a thousand times, I think I would be within the mark. That will give you some idea of the water supply. The minister said that 507 cubic feet of water passed over that per minute. Where under Heavens did it come from? I dont know, nor can any man imagine, who has ever lived in that locality. I have lived there, and crossed it a thousand times. When you talk like that, why, it is totally absurd and totally incomprehensible for any one to think of it. It reminds me of a story that was told in the west, when some one was asking

who were the three greatest liars in the world. He said they were in the west, that a certain man was one liar, and he was the other two. I think the Minister of Railways and Canals must be the whole three. He must have had water on the brain, or a very fertile imagination. I say the expenditure of this money cannot be justified. Not only will it be a living monument of folly, but it will stand to the discredit of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and of every hon. member who supports it, and of every one who takes part in the expenditure of that money.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 79) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—Mr. W. McIntyre.

On section 1,

Mr. RUTAN moved:

That subsection (a) of clause 1 be struck out and the following added as a subclause:

The line of railway described in subsection (a) of section 3, of chapter 74 of the Statutes of 1907, shall be commenced within one year from the passing of this Act, and at least 30 miles of said line shall be completed in each year thereafter until the whole be completed.

Mr. NEELY. As this line of railway, in reference to which the Canadian Pacific are applying for a renewal of its charter, has a direct interest to the people in the district I represent, I wish to strongly support the amendment, which I believe should receive the support of this House. I understand that a similar amendment was suggested in the Railway Committee, but for some reason it was not accepted in that committee. There can be no objection to the passing of this amendment as the Canadian Pacific Railway are in a position, so far as I know, if they have the wish and the will, to commence operations on this branch line of railroad within the next twelve months. Unless it is the intention of the Canadian Pacific Railway to undertake this work in the immediate future, we should not grant an extension of time. Between the main line of the Canadian Northern Railway and the most northern branch of that railway, which ends at the city of Prince Albert, there is a distance of 80 or 85 miles. That section of the country is well settled; every homestead quarter-section is taken up and farmers living in that part of the country are to-day hauling their grain from 35 to 40 miles in order to reach a market. If this branch line of railway from township 32, range 21 or 22, to the city of Prince Albert, were built, I have every confidence that it would be a paying line of railway, right from the date of its completion. Objection has been taken to the imposing of great restrictions on the granting of these charters. In some cases that argument, I think, is good, but I do not see any reason why we should not place this restriction on the granting of charters to the Canadian Pacific Railway. We know they are in a position financially to construct these branch lines of railroad that are asked for in this Bill. We have evidence of their strong financial position in the recent issue of $50,000,000 of additional capital stock.

I am strong in my support of this amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Rutan) because I have a lurking suspicion that the Canadian Pacific Railway do not intend to carry out their proposals as contained in this charter for which they are asking. They have had this charter for the past two years and they have done practically nothing in the way of commencing operations. Why should they seek for a renewal and for an extension of time if they do not purpose going on with the road? The answer to that question is that there is a suspicion in the minds of the people of the constituencies of Prince Albert and Humboldt that the Canadian Pacific Railway's policy is to blanket that territory so as to hamper the construction of branch lines by other railroads. The Canadian Pacific Railway did practically no railway construction in northern Saskatchewan until the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific was carried through the central part of that province and then we found the Canadian Pacific Railway pushing forward the construction of their Kirkella line, which, east of Saskatoon for some 75 miles and for a great many miles west of Saskatoon, parallels the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Just as soon as the Grand Trunk Pacific commenced building the Canadian Pacific Railway got busy with their Kirkella extension. Now, the people of the constituency of Humboldt and of Prince Albert want this branch line constructed from or near the town of Lanigan in the district of Humboldt to the city of Prince Albert. We have no reason to believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway actually intend to build this line; in fact I have it on good authority that the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway was interviewed recently by some persons who were very anxious to see the road built and he gave no assurance whatever that the company would undertake its construction either next year or in the year following. We have a suspicion, nay we have a belief, that the Canadian Pacific Railway are simply asking for this renewal and extension of time for the purpose of covering that territory by this charter and that being so we ought to insert the restrictions called for by the amendment.

Some may argue that the granting of this charter to the Canadian Pacific Railway does not tend to keep another railroad from building through the same territory but to my mind that is not a convincing argument because, just as soon as another railway obtains a charter through the territory and commences operations the Canadian Pacific Railway is in a position to step in ahead of them and effectually cut off the other company from constructing. We have reason to believe that a branch line can be obtained from the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific right over this same territory and that aid can be secured for such a branch line from the government of Saskatchewan. But, if this House grants this charter to the Canadian Pacific Railway without restriction as to time, then, just as soon as the Grand Trunk Pacific commences work on the line they might propose to build, the Canadian Pacific Railway can step in and parallel them every foot of the way to the city of Prince Albert. On behalf of the people of those districts who are asking for railroad communication and better transportation facilities I strongly support this amendment. To prove conclusively that the Canadian Pacific Railway are conspiring to blanket that country with these branch line charters I may say that they also have a charter which they obtained through the taking over of the Manitoba and North Western and which enables them to build some considerable distance east of the line for which they now ask an extension of time. That runs through the Fishing Lake country east of the Great Quill lakes and also north easterly to the city of Prince Albert. By another Bill, they are asking for an extension of time on that branch line although they have had that charter since 1893. For 16 years has that charter been in possession of the Canadian Pacific Railway and they have done absolutely nothing to carry out its terms. These two branch line charters into the city of Prince Albert; the one under the Manitoba-North Western charter and the one contained in this Bill, practically cover the only two available routes into Prince Albert from the south and east, connecting with any of the main lines of the great trunk railways. The fact that they are also applying for an extension of time on this other charter is evidence that they are simply trying to cover this territory by charters so as to prevent any other railroads from being built. On behalf of the people of the constituency I represent and who require this line to be immediately constructed I very strongly support the amendment of the member for Prince Albert.

Mr. LAKE. This question has been raised in the House and in the committees during the last few years, amendments have been moved on the lines of the present amendment and the whole question has been thoroughly discussed. But, the question for us to consider now is whether any good result is likely to come from the passing of such an amendment and whether if passed it would result in any of these railways being built any the quicker. I suppose there is no member from the north west who has not received constant protests against the renewal of charters, not only of the Canadian Pacific Railway but of the Grand Trunk Pacific branch line company, and of the Canadian Northern Railway Company as well. I have received such protests couched in the very strongest language asking that this parliament should not renew charters unless definite guarantees were given that the lines would be built in the very near future. I have a protest in my hand from a meeting held at a place called Wiggins, Saskatchewan, protesting against the renewal of the charter for the Moosjaw-Lacombe branch, which is included in this clause, and I would ask the Minister of Railways to state whether he has taken any steps to endeavour to remedy the grievance which the people of Wiggins feel they are suffering under; whether he has approached the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and asked them whether they are prepared to undertake the building of this branch in the near future, and whether he has used any argument with them to induce them to do so. I think it is up to the Minister of Railways to show that he has taken some such step. There is no doubt that the people of that section of country are suffering under a great sense of injustice in having been induced to settle in that country far away from the railway. The government is in a position, in dealing with the three great companies that have lines in the Northwest, to bring some pressure to bear upon them to build branch lines where they are most needed. For instance, in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we have been informed that the government have given their consent to the issue of common stock by the company at a rate which is generally conceded to be far below its real value. That, I take it, is a concession to the company, and when these great companies come to the government asking for concessions, the government have it in their power to endeavour by negotiation to induce them to give something in return. I would therefore ask the Minister of Railways whether he has had a protest from Wiggins, the one which I have in my hands states that a similar one has been addressed to him--and whether he has taken any steps to endeavour to procure for these people the building of the railway which, no doubt, they were promised in the

past, and which, it is to be hoped, they will receive at some time in the near future.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF. I wish to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Rutan). That hon. member and the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), the two members representing the people in that part of the country through which this short line of about 130 miles will run, should be in the best position to know whether this charter should be renewed or not. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat says that it is a question whether the passing of such an amendment will increase the building of railroads in the country. Perhaps it may not; but speaking from the experience of my own district, I can say that where we cannot get the roads built, the people are unanimously in favour of the charters not being renewed; and if the representatives from that part of the country who know what the people want, ask for a certain thing, I think it is up to this House to pass the amendment they propose.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I also agree with the previous speakers to this extent, that I think the government and this House ought to exercise serious control over the great roads in the west. It is a fact that there are large districts there which have no railroads, and the people in those districts are very anxious to have railroads; but it is also a fact that the great railroad companies, instead of devoting their attention mainly to giving to the people the accommodation they require, are engaged largely in a kind of strategy one against the other. I contend that the Minister of Railways has sufficient power to control the situation, and if he exercised that power he would see that none of the plans of these railroads which are for the mere purpose of strategy should be approved of while roads which are necessary for the settlers are not being built. The government should see that the funds of these companies are not wasted in building parallel lines merely to compete with existing lines. That is not opening up the country; it is only enabling these companies to play a game the one against the other. It is time that all that was stopped, and that any money which any of these companies have for the construction of new lines should be applied in opening up roads in new districts and giving a service where there is none at the present time.

Mr. BRADBURY. I am surprised at the action of the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Rutan) and the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), and I might say the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). A few days ago when we had another question similar to the present one before the committee, an amendment was moved by my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Glen Campbell) to compel a railroad company to build 25 miles of road during the first year. That amendment was carried by the committee, though it was opposed by all of these gentlemen. The very same arguments which are put forward to-night in support of this amendment were put forward at that time by the hon. member for Dauphin and myself in support of the amendment he moved, with regard to the Winnipeg and Northwestern Railway Company. That company had four or five alternative routes, practically blanketing the whole country. The hon. member for Dauphin had petitions from every municipality in his district, asking the government not to grant an extension to the company without compelling it to build a certain number of miles every year. We carried that view in the committee, but when the Bill came before the House the gentlemen promoting it had it referred back to the committee, and it became practically a political question. Every hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House was arrayed against the amendment, and defeated it, though it was entirely similar to the amendment moved to-night. Consistency ought to be the rule of this House, and I am surprised that a member can take one attitude in the committee and an entirely different attitude in this House. I have no brief from the Canadian Pacific Railway; I have no reason for having a brief from that company. In my own county the Canadian Pacific Railway Company last fall stopped work on a railroad which was very much needed, and just in the midst of the political campaign, allowed my opponent, assisted I believe by the Canadian Pacific Railway engineers, to put on a large staff of men in the effort to compass my defeat. I mention this to show that I have no brief from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I would like to see consistency in the House, and I am not prepared to support this amendment because I believe that the men who have moved as they did in the committee and did not succeed do not deserve any better success on the floor of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not going to detain the House at any length. I simply want to bring to its attention the fact that various gentlemen who have spoken to-night have shown the utmost inconsistency. I am not going to refer to the other Bill, which has been referred to by my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), further than to say that it seems with certain members in this House, to make a very great difference whose ox is gored. Those same gentlemen took a very prominent part in fighting against the wishes expressed in the petition of the men who sent me down here to represent them, and then they ask us to pay some attention to what their own people want. I wish to point out that it is certainly the people of the districts

through which these railways are to run, who should know what they want, and they have expressed, through their representatives in this House, what they do want. They want railways, but they strongly object to charters for hot air lines being granted, and long experience has given them good reasons for their objection. These charters have done more to retard settlement than anything else, and it is but right that this committee should pay attention to such expressions of opinion, coming from the people who are directly interested. If the Canadian Pacific Railway intend to build those branch lines, it is no great hardship to ask them to show their good faith by building 20 or 30 miles the first year. The committee should certainly pay great attention to the message sent them from Prince Albert.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is easy for my hon. friends to ask this government to straighten out all these things.

Mr. LENNOX. This is the place.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a place called the Railway Committee where attention should be paid them. We have a duty to perform as representatives as well as members of the government. I shall not have to make any apologies for the position I take on this Bill because I have taken it on other Bills as well. I take it that what the petitioners want in these various localities is a railway as speedily as possible. I may be wrong, but in my opinion to pass an amendment in this line will rather injure than hasten the prospects of getting that road. To say to the Canadian Pacific Railway that they must construct so many miles this year is only repeating in another way what we do say in their charter, and that is that they must begin operations in two years and build in five. If this amendment were going to hasten the building of the railway, it would be different, but it is more likely to defeat the object which hon. gentlemen have in view. This question does not come up only in the renewal of this charter but comes up regularly in the railway committee in the renewals of many charters. To place a clause of that kind in the charter would simply mean that these people would be back sooner for another renewal. If they are ready to construct the line, and if it be in their interest to do so, they will construct. But if we put in a more stringent clause, it will mean that the Canadian Pacific Railway will not build any more quickly but will come back in twelve months instead of two years, and ask for a renewal. Our object is to get railways into these parts of the territories that are not now served by them. I understand thoroughly, as the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has said, that there are many instances where these companies spar for situation or location, not having, for the time being, any great desire to build, but rather to keep some other line from building; but on the whole, the course we have pursued has been reasonably successful in getting lines built as rapidly as settlement required. It is a fact that many people have gone into remote parts of the west, and are in very needy circumstances so far as railway lines are concerned. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) handed me a petition, of which I think, I had already received a copy. My usual plan, on receiving a petition, is to make an extract from it and call the attention of the railway company concerned to the fact that I have received it, and urge them to do everything to grant the prayer of the petitioners. Suppose we put the provision asked for into this charter, we will have to put it into every charter for a branch line in the Canadian Pacific Railway. But it is impossible for any railway company to cover all the territory which requires a railway. It stands to reason that where the most people are found, the greater necessity exists and the greater traffic there will be for the line, and it is natural for a railway company to build where it will get the most traffic. Consequently, the places most needing railways will get them first. I am anxious to see this line extended, but I do not think the placing of this in any charter will help one iota to get a railway constructed but will rather have the opposite effect. In the Railway Committee, I have taken that ground. I have asked the committee on several occasions not to place such a clause in the Bill and I must ask the Committee of the Whole House to take that ground. I make that request in order to be consistent and for the further reason that I do not believe that the insertion of such a provision in any charter will facilitate the building of the road but will rather retard it.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TURRIFF. I beg to move that letter G, clause 1, be struck out. This letter G refers to a short line of about 100 miles from the town of Estevan in a northwesterly direction. I am not going to ask this House to put in a clause providing for the building of 25 miles this coming year, simply because my experience during the past five years makes me understand thoroughly that it will not be carried. But I believe that I represent absolutely the views of the people in that part of the country where this charter exists, and consequently I move that that clause be struck out alto-

gether and the charter cancelled. If we cannot have a railway built in the near future, we do not want that charter on our statutes, because, so long as the charter is there, the Canadian Pacific Railway will not take any steps to go on with the building of the line, but will stand as a block in the way of others building it. That country has been settled the last 18 or 20 years and well settled, and the farmers there have to draw their wheat from 30 to 40 miles, if they draw it to a Canadian town and 10 to 20 miles if they draw it to the American town of Ambrose, in North Dakota. Last year, about 150,000 bushels of wheat was drawn from that corner of my constituency into North Dakota and shipped over the Jim Hill system. As I have said before, I want the Minister of Railways and the government to understand that unless some change is made in the handling of these railway companies, unless they are ocmpelled to do better in the future than they have in the past, the strongest effort will be made on the part of the people in the southern portions of Alberta and Saskatchewan to have the Hill system brought into the country. And if conditions continue as they are, while I should be sorry to see the traffic go out of the country and through the United States, yet, I, for one, will welcome any change in the state of affairs, and I know that ninety-nine, if not one hundred per cent of the people I represent will take the same position. I know, also, that in asking the committee to strike out that clause I am representing faithfully and correctly the views held by my constituents. And whose views should carry in this matter—the views of the Canadian Pacific Railway who have had charters for fifteen or twenty years for roads which they have not built, or the views of the farmers? Whose views should we in this committee consider? I am not asking for any favour of building twenty-five miles a year, but I am asking that that clause be struck out, so that other companies may be given an opportunity to come in and build these railways.

Mr. LAKE. I would support, as I did last year, the motion to place in all charters and all renewals of charters provisos that a railway company should commence to build its line within a reasonable period of time. But I do not think it is quite right to make exceptions in these matters.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am not asking to have any of the other charters interfered with. This is the only one in which I am asking to have this clause dropped, and the Bill we are discussing now covers other branches.

Mr. LAKE. That is just the case; the hon. gentleman is asking that the renewal of one particular charter be refused.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. Thus making an exception in that case. I think we should treat all cases alike. The hon. gentleman has taken very strong ground with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that is the only company we ever heard him speaking against in connection with these matters.

Mr. TURRIFF. That is the only one in my constituency.

Mr. LAKE. Only last year the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company, asked for a renewal of their charter, a charter given them three years before, blanketting an immense area of country for the construction of branch lines, not a single one of which had they started to build. Yet this House decided that their charter was to be renewed. I do not think that we should make fish of one and fowl of another. Until this House decides, as I think it ought to decide, that a provision shall be put in all charters requiring the company to begin and complete its work within a reasonable time, I think we should go on as we have gone on in the past, practically allowing free trade in charters.

Mr. STAPLES. It is somewhat amusing to me to note how jealous the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) is of his own We have been fighting in the committee and in the House for just what he proposes in this particular case—we have asked that no charter should be renewed except on the condition that the company shall construct a certain portion of the line within a certain time. We had a case of this kind before the committee a short time ago and got such a provision put in the Bill. And what did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) do? He got up at the next meeting and asked to have the Bill reconsidered, and then we found him voting down the amendment we had already carried in the committee. He seeks to make that limit in his own constituency. But the Bill I have just referred to related to my constituency. I am quite willing to guard the interests of his constituents, but I would like him to reciprocate by assisting us who are just as anxious as he is to have railways constructed to serve our people. The hon. gentleman is very emphatic in that. He wants to get on the floor and make a little spiel that it may go to his constituents showing how strong he is on this subject. I am prepared to support the hon. gentleman notwithstanding his attitude on the general question.

Mr. NEELY. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and some other hon. members of this House, myself included, are charged with inconsistency in the position we take on this charter and on a certain other charter that came before the Railway Committee and before this House some time ago. So far as I am concerned, I do not feel that charge. I do not intend to speak for the hon. member for Assiniboia or the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Rutan) or any other hon. member. But it seems to me that every case ought to be taken on its individual merits. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) knows that this is not a similar case to the other.

Mr. STAPLES. Explain the difference.

Mr. NEELY. The hon. gentleman knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway is in a position financially to go ahead with the construction of these branch lines for which they are asking extension of time. He knows that they could, within twelve months, build twenty-five miles on these branch lines if they wished to do so. But he knows that in the other case referred to, the company was not in a position to go ahead. If any leniency is to be shown, it ought to be shown to new companies, for they have their organization to complete, their financing to do, and other preliminary work to get through with. But the Canadian Pacific Railway has its main lines constructed and also has money to build these branch lines. The cases are not parallel, and the charge of inconsistency made by the hon. member for Macdonald and the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) are not well founded.

Amendment (Mr. Turriff) negatived.

On section 2,

Mr. HERRON. I would like to have an assurance from the minister that he will give the people ample time to be heard before he accepts the route laid down by this company. There was an amendment passed in committee in reference to this clause, we inserted the words 'High river' in the charter. I would like the minister to consider the distance these people are from the head office at Ottawa, and that he will allow them, I should say, thirty days. It is sometimes important that these people should have ample time to take these things into consideration. I think the minister told the committee they would have at least two weeks. I would like an assurance that they will get ample time.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not like to be put in a position to define ample time. We always give sufficient time, or what we think is sufficient time for all parties to be heard. That is the rule of the department. My hon. friend says thirty days. It strikes me that would not be necessary. However, we will telegraph to the people in those localities that we are going to have a hearing at such a date, perhaps a little less time than he mentions. However, we will see that they get adequate time.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—THE NEWMARKET CANAL.

House resumed debate on motion to go into Committee of Supply and the amendment thereto.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I want to say a few words on this motion before it comes to a vote. Primarily the motion affects the locality in which the work is situated, but it is that kind of a motion which I think, if we are attentive to our duties and mindful of our responsibilities, challenges the attention of every member who has a seat in this House. It is a case of the expenditure of a million dollars of the public money for a work in a locality the grounds for which are altogether inadequate. The discussion well illustrates three positions: First, the way in which the money is sometimes appropriated—I wish I could say 'sometimes,' I think I ought to say in which the money is very frequently appropriated by this government; in the second place, it is illustrative of the way, after the money is placed in the hands of the responsible ministers, it is used for the work; and lastly, it has been illustrative of the methods by which ministers undertook to defend, if you can call it a defence, a vote of this kind, appropriated in this way, and carried out as this has been carried out. Now I made a motion for the papers, and one of the cardinal points I made in that motion was this: I asked for all reports, or papers, or documents which had regard to the commercial foundation of the transaction. After all, ought that not to be the basis and the beginning of the whole thing? Surely it is not enough to say that you will appropriate money because an engineer tells you that what you want to build is feasible and can be properly built? The foundation of the whole thing is this: Is it a necessary or an advisable work? Is it in the interest of the development and commerce of the trade of the country; and if it is not a military necessity, if it is not a national necessity, there is no other ground upon which to place it than that it is a work necessary and advisable, and for which that amount of money is not too much to appropriate. Now, when these papers were brought down, what did I find? —or rather what did I not find? I did not find one syllable from the beginning of the papers to the end showing any attempt by anybody to find out whether there was a commercial basis for this transaction, not one. The only thing that is given with reference to the commercial side of it, if you

can call it such, is that the petitioners asked in the first place, not that a canal should be built, and that the Holland river and its branches should be deepened and straightened and made serviceable for the purposes of the districts through which they run. That would not have been an unreasonable request. It may have been very questionable whether a large amount of money should have been expended for that purpose. But that would have taken comparatively a small amount of money. The petitioners commenced with that, and that is the only allusion made to it. The other allusion is made, not by commercial bodies, not by any representative trade bodies, but there is an allusion in the report of the engineer whose business is to report upon the feasibility of the proposition, that he thinks it would help the trade of Newmarket and of the town of Holland Landing. Those are the only two allusions made.

Now, when a government, headed by the Prime Minister who sits opposite to me, collects the people's taxes out of hard-earned wages and puts them in the strong box and becomes the trustee for these, sworn to expend them in the interest of the people, when they are asked by anybody, I do not care whether they are reeves of townships or wardens of municipalities, or any one else, to go into the strong box and take one million dollars of the taxes so collected and put them into any work, I think it is a duty incumbent upon them to find out whether there is a commercial necessity for that work. There is not on record a scrap of paper showing that the government, or any minister of any department, ever made any inquiry into that direction, and there is not in the papers a single writing or representation with reference to that matter. What happened was that a deputation came. Why, the Minister of Justice this afternoon in arguing the question gave the whole thing away. He showed with what particular care the thing had been worked up so that from every municipality, the smallest in the county, there should be a resolution asking that this improvment be made—not asking that this one million dollar canal be built, but asking for the improvement of the Holland river and its branches so as to make it serviceable. This deputation appeared here as deputations do from all municipalities asking for improvements or public works—whether it is engineered from a party point of view or whether it starts among the people themselves,they come here and press that claim; but is that an argument that the claim should be granted and the expenditures made? Not a syllable, not a word, not a single scrap of information as to the necessity of the work in a commercial or development point of view seems to have been asked for or produced. That is the way money is appropriated. In this case it was first voted to give a boost to the then sitting member, one of the members of the cabinet, and in the second place to give a boost to another, the present Minister of Justice, and you have the sorry spectacle—I am bound to use these words—of a Minister of Justice in the present case, and in the other case of one of the greatest sticklers for economy in the public service we have ever had in this country, so far as his professions in parliament went, the former member, both pressing for and defending in this House the expenditure of one million dollars on such a work as we heard explained this afternoon. We have the Prime Minister of Canada sitting in front of these two defenders of the project, and of the Minister of Railways—such a defence as they did put in—listening to their arguments. I would like to get inside of the brain of my right hon. friend for a moment, and see if I possibly could what were the thoughts running through his brain when he heard the defence, such as it was, given by the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Justice this afternoon for going into the strong box and taking a million dollars to put into a work of that kind. The speech of the Minister of Railways—I say it kindly—was made up of two parts. First there was a burlesque and afterwards there was the semblance of an argument degenerating into farce. The burlesque was pleasant, but the argument to my mind was not an argument. He took a Zeppelin airship and made a world-wide trip, sailing through all countries. He sailed past the Suez canal, the Panama canal and all other canalized systems in the world, and then he came back to Newmarket and Holland Landing and said: See our brothers and sisters in the world's great canalization system. Did he think he would canonize this ditch by placing it alongside all the great canalized systems of the world? He did not himself feel that he was doing anything else than jollying the House away from looking at the main points of the proposition. But when he came down to argument he showed his wisdom by devoting as little time as he could to this question.

Let us look at one of his arguments: This is a great county, the farmers of York are good farmers, they actually kill so many cattle every year and therefore they ought to have a million dollar canal from Newmarket to Holland Landing. If he had been addressing a public meeting and a small boy had held up his hand and asked him: Now, Mr. Minister, of all those cattle killed each year in that county, how many will be carried on the Newmarket canal out to the waters of Lake Simcoe, what would

he have said? You could apply the same question to every county in Canada and say that because the farmers raise and kill a certain number of cattle every year they ought to have a million dollar canal. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) was on much the same plane. The Minister of Justice may be a good lawyer and he may gain his cases, but I am certain if such an argument as he used this afternoon before this House, if used before a judge or the Supreme Court, would not meet with such success. What was his main argument when he left the persiflage? It was: Can any reason be given why this work should now be stopped after it has been commenced? Why should the government go back after it has put its hand to the plough? Is there any reason why North York should not have this million dollar canal? These are not arguments why the canal should be built. These are simply interrogatories in the way of declamation which a man uses when he has no argument to make positive proof. What is the traffic that is going to come in and out by this canal? What are the interests that are to be served? There are 25,000 good people in North York, here is one little town of 400 and here is another little town of 2,100. The very fact that they are there, the Minister of Justice says, entitles them to a million dollar canal. Can any one give a reason why it should be given to them if those are the circumstances? The thing to do, it seems to me, when we dispense $1,000,000 of public money, is to know that the country is going to get value for it. What business is there for this canal to do? Did the Minister of Justice make an argument which should convince this House when he said he had a report of an engineer to the effect that they could pump water enough in there to pass 4,400 vessels through these locks in seven months? The thought that came to me was, where under Heaven will the 4,400 vessels come from to be sent through the locks? We listened this afternoon to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) who is a business man, no one will deny, and a man of wide experience in that section of the country, which he knows well. We heard him in a very few plain words rapidly describe that section of the country and Lake Simcoe out of which they propose to draw the traffic. Any one who understands the facts as he stated them will surely find it most difficult to conceive where the traffic is to come from. Here you have a canal running from Newmarket to Lake Simcoe. What is it to carry out? What is it to carry in? At the town of Newmarket you have a factory or two. Can they get their lumber out of Lake Simcoe? If they get it out of Lake Simcoe, can they get it there economically? The facts are, and the Prime Minister has heard them this afternoon, that the kind of lumber they use does not grow around Lake Simcoe and consequently there is no supply of lumber to come out of Lake Simcoe for that comparatively small concern. What will come out of Lake Simcoe up to Newmarket and Holland Landing? Will none of the ministers take upon himself the duty of telling us what is to come out of that region as traffic for that canal? Will the Minister of Railways instead of going to the Suez canal and the Panama canal and the canals of Belgium and Holland; will he stop at home and tell us what traffic is coming out of Lake Simcoe over that four or five miles of canal with five locks, which would justify the expenditure of one million dollars? On the other hand what is to go out of that canal into Lake Simcoe and where is it to go? The minister told us that business men in the city of Toronto had said to him they thought there would be great gain because merchandise could be taken from the city of Toronto up to Newmarket, transhipped to the canal boats and taken through five locks in four and a half miles and then sail out on Lake Simcoe. To what port would it sail, to what consignee would it go? Business is not done in that way nowadays. The man who wants to get his goods from Toronto to Parry Sound will ship direct by rail and not through the devious paths of this canal. I have passed up and down along that place time and again and I have never yet heard on the train a single word but of ridicule at the project and deprecation of such waste of good money.

Mr. HUGHES. Did you ever see the creek?

Mr. FOSTER. I have looked for the creek but I have not seen it yet. Now, as to the engineering part of this work, I ask the Minister of Railways if under the circumstances surrounding it he thinks this House or the country can have any confidence in his enginering department. What are the facts? The canal is divided into two sections and one section takes you from Lake Simcoe to Holland Landing, that being the improvement of a waterway and not the building of a canal. That is the first section, and the one which one would suppose it would be economical to build first. But what happens: the Minister of Railways sent his engineer and told him to make his examination and give an estimate of what it would cost to put it in shape and the engineer gave him an estimate of $46,000 and the contract was let for $46,000. For two years the contractors held that work and did absolutely nothing. Under what rule did the department leave that work in the hands of the contractors—some of them their own friends and very near and strong friends and influential in the constituency—by what rule were they en-

abled to hold that for two years without doing any work? The contractors had a pumping machine, the engineer was on the ground, he had no faith in the machinery from the first. After the contractors had been at it a year and done practically nothing he wrote to the department that he had no more faith in the machinery and their capability of doing the work than he had a year before and yet the work remained in the contractors' hands, they doing nothing. But the gravamen of the charge against the railway department is that when it came to a second letting of the contract and the making of the second estimate, the engineer of the department estimated the work to be worth not $46,000 but $131,000. What reliance can we place on the engineers of a department who will take the very same piece of work under the very same conditions, with a lapse of two years, and make such a difference in the estimate. But up to this date not a stroke of work has been done on this initial part of the undertaking. That was dredging work and nothing could work on it but a dredge and the few men engaged on the dredge. It did not distribute the patronage sufficiently and the election was coming on in October, and instead of going on with the first part of the work the department gave their energies to the second part of the work where they could multiply the employment of men and teams and spend $150,000 or more during the few months preceding the elections. What happened? The minister's engineer made the first estimate of the cost of the whole canal at $291,000, and that was the estimate we had when we first voted money for this; in fact I think we were told it would cost less. A little while after the engineer made another estimate and it came up to about $328,000; he afterwards made another estimate of the whole thing, and it came up to $354,000, and a short time afterwards another engineer of that department went on the very same ground and put on it an estimate of $596,826. How are we to reconcile operations of that kind with a well conducted department and a competent set of engineers. Tenders were called for and the lowest tender was $652,000 and the contract was let at that price, which was $50,000 or $60,000, more than the estimate. And now, at the very last we have dragged out of the department that this work which at first was to cost about $300,000, entered into by parliament on an estimate of $291,000—is now estimated to cost about $970,000, not taking into consideration the water conservation which is necessary, and which will bring the total cost up to about $1,200,000. In that way we were led by misrepresentation, absolute misrepresentation, and whether by the engineer or the minister matters very little to this House. I challenge any man to show a business foundation for that undertaking. What does it mean? $1,200,000 taken out of the people's taxes and put into that place, when all over this country men are starving for railroad facilities in the west and in the east, and cannot get a dollar for development because of such expenditures as this. The other day, in the far east, a much desired and long promised bit of railway was pleaded for by members on both sides of politics. It would cost altogether some $300,000 or less. What was the plea for not building that railroad? 'These are times of financial stress; we have not the money, and we cannot go on with the work.' To-day we have coming from every portion of the great northwest, where the hardy sons of the older provinces and the men we have invited from other countries have gone and taken their lives in their hands, and with their small families have settled in advance of the great lines of transport, appeal for transport facilities; and you tell them that you cannot raise the money to subsidize railways; but you can find a million dollars to put into a ditch at the request of our Minister of Justice who must be buttressed by things of that kind. How much is there to be done in this country? What forest conservation is there staring these men in the face, and how little are they doing to come up to their responsibilities in that respect; it cost money; but a million dollars can be found to put into this place in North York, and the Minister of Justice has nothing better as a plea than to say, with his accustomed modesty, that he does not want to take the credit of having originated the work, but he would be proud if he could take that credit, and anyway he stands up for it.

Mr. Speaker, I only wish we could have in these galleries the taxpayers from every part of this country, to listen to this discussion of what I am sorry to say is but a sample of the many ways in which their money is wasted. We are not charging any graft; we are not charging any dishonest work in the department or with the contractors in this case. There may be graft; we do not know it, and we are not charging it. This case rests entirely on its business merit. It is cheap logic, very cheap logic, for the Minister of Justice to try to turn the point when the argument is against him, by saying that it is the jealousy of other constituencies, or party zeal, that is urging this discussion. For my part, party does not enter into it, nor do I believe that it does in the case of other gentlemen who have spoken on the subject. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is painful, absolutely painful, to see the waste of money in such a place and on such a construction and to see it going through this House apparently

treated in a spirit of light comedy by the responsible minister, and with absolute indifference by the other ministers of the Crown. Will any of them stand up and give us a reason for it? Let them show to the representatives of the taxpayers, who if not here to-night, may hear something of this by the only voice we have to reach them, the voice of the press, how they can justify this expenditure. We have dug things out in the province of Quebec that have been shameful, in the Public Works Department and in other departments; we have dug things out in other provinces which have been shameful; but for sheer, wanton, absolute waste, I do not know anything that equals this case of a million dollars of the people's money thrown into a profitless ditch.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, in the course of his observations, did me the honour of saying that he would like to know what was passing in my mind when I was listening to the debate. I am glad on this occasion to be able to gratify the curiosity of my hon. friend. What was passing in my mind, when I was listening to my hon. friend and to some of his associates, was that this motion was a fair sample of how scandals are manufactured.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry that you had not anything better than that running in your head.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow we shall have in the press the speech of my hon. friend, the gist of which, coming after the other speeches to which we have listened, is that the government are corruptly spending $1,000,000 for the purpose—to use the elegant language of my hon. friend—of boosting a minister of the Crown.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am glad to find that I interpret correctly the sentiment that prevails on the other side of the House. This is the reason we have now another scandal. The scandal in this instance is that we are spending $1,000,000 for the purpose of boosting a minister of the Crown. The minister of the Crown at that time was a gentleman who was much respected in this House while he was here, and who is much respected in the position he now occupies—Sir Wm. Mulock. For my part, I do not believe that any man in Canada who knows Sir William Mulock will believe that he ever tried to encourage any work in his constituency for the purpose of boosting his own political fortunes. I think the reputation of Sir William Mulock is above any aspersion that can be cast against him by my hon. friend or anybody else. I think his reputation is above any such argument, if I can dignify anything of that kind by calling it an argument. But, Sir, how did we come to undertake this work? If it was for the purpose of boosting the election of my friend and colleague at the time, Sir Wiliam Mulock, how was it that it was the opponent of Sir William Mulock who came here and asked the government to undertake this work? My hon. friend said, in almost the last words he pronounced, that he would be glad if we had in this room the taxpayers of the country to see how their money was wasted. Why, Sir, if there is any wasted money in this instance, it was at the instance of the taxpayers of this country. We had a delegation here of the sound electors, the best men in the riding of North York. We had the mayor of the town of Newmarket, and the leading citizens of that town and its vicinity. They were not party men, not political friends of Sir William Mulock coming here to boost his election, but men who came in their capacity as citizens, laying aside all party differences, and asking us, in the interest of the town of Newmarket and the riding of North York, to undertake this work. I remember that delegation very well; it was one of nearly one hundred, certainly more than fifty. So large was it, at all events, that there was not room in the ordinary rooms of ministers to receive it. We had to get the use of the Railway Committee room for the purpose, and there man after man rose up and told us that this was not a party question, but that they asked us, in the name of the town of Newmarket and the riding of North York, to give them that improvement.

Now, is the Holland river to be improved? If a boat is to be taken from Lake Simcoe to Newmarket it cannot be taken any other way than the way contemplated by the present work. My hon. friend tells us now that all these representations made to us by men of his own political persuasion were ridiculous, and if I am now to take the word of Conservatives in the House of Commons, the Conservatives in the town of Newmarket and the riding of North York are not trustworthy and their representations are to be treated with contempt. This is the position after all. My hon. friend told us we had not taken any precaution to ascertain whether or not there would be any business for that canal when built. That is not fair. We had the representations of these men all. My hon. friend told us we had not treated their statements with the contempt with which my hon. friends opposite now treat them. We treated them as the representations of honest men, but my hon. friends say no, this whole thing is ridiculous. We complied with the requests of these men, and are we to be told that we did a corrupt action because we took their statements and representations as those of honest men? Yet that is the

position hon. gentlemen opposite are taking in order to make a point against the government. These gentlemen are ready to throw contempt on men of their own political persuasion in order to make a point against us. What was our answer to the petition presented by these men? We did not tell them it was ridiculous. We told them it was worthy of consideration and that we would send an engineer to investigate. We did send an engineer, and he reported that the work could be done for some $300,000. Well, we thought that if we could have that useful work done for the town of Newmarket and the riding of North York for an expenditure of $300,000 we ought to do it. It turns out, however. that the work is costing more than was expected. That is not unusual in works of this character. My hon. friend says it is going to cost a million dollars. But even if it should, even if there be a mistake, that is very different from a corrupt act. My hon. friend, however, will not make that distinction, and says it is a useless waste of money. That is not the impression I gathered from the debate. I was not present when my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) spoke, but I remember a speech he made some two or three years ago on this same question. I admit that he then opposed the grant, but he also stated that there would be work for the canal, and the ground of his objection was that there would be no water for it. This is what he said on the 12th of July, 1905:

> There is a very extensive manufacturing concern in Newmarket but there is no guarantee that that factory will remain there a month. Any one conversant with business knows that if that factory at Newmarket had to be located again, it would not be located at Newmarket. It is not a town that is suitable for a factory such as this, and there is no guarantee that it will remain there.

That was all the exception he took, namely, that there was no guarantee that the factory would remain there. He did not say that there was no work for the canal, but he was not sure that the enterprise would remain where it was. But if the factory be still there, I presume there is a fair amount of work to be done.

Mr. OSLER. I think I said a great deal more than that. Senator Campbell, who then represented North York in this House, said the canal would be used to bring lumber up to that mill, and I said that the logs were hard wood and would not float. He, however, said they would float.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That was work to be taken to the town, but the products of the factory are to be taken out of the town, and all my hon. friend had to say was that he was not sure the factory would be there for ever. But if he was sure it would be there for ever. I take it for granted he would be satisfied.

Mr. OSLER. I can quite understand why the minister and his government have gone into this canal if he assumes that by my statement that is what I meant.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that is another evidence that we are not to trust Conservatives when they address us, whether as members of the House or as a delegation. If a delegation should ever again come to us as Conservatives and represent that what they want is not a party question and is for the advantage of the locality they represent, and if I should be still in the position I enjoy to-day, I shall profit by the lesson I have just learned and will tell them: You say now it is no party question, but you will make it one as soon as the work is done.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But before the vote was cast in this House, did the right hon. gentleman not hear from Conservatives that this work was perfectly useless?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then why did you go on with it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That was after we had listened to the Conservatives in North York and made up our minds and brought down the estimates.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Had there been any money spent on this work before that delegation of Conservatives and Reformers waited on the government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is my hon. friend serious? I tell him very seriously there was none.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. There was $25,000, as my right hon. friend will see if he will look up the record.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am satisfied there was no money spent until we heard of the project from that delegation.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. $25,000 was spent on surveys in October, and the delegation waited on the right hon. gentleman in the February following, after all this work had been done.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There might have been a survey, but I do not understand that a survey is the work itself. What is the trend of this motion? It is that while this work is going on we should stop it. Why, even if a mistake has been made it would be a greater mistake not to go on. It is sometimes a mistake to do certain things, but once a thing has been undertaken it is best to follow it to the end. In this matter we have the Con-

servatives of the county of North York and of the House of Commons at variance, and I am disposed to listen to the voice of the Conservatives of North York.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has accused us on this side of the House of unworthily casting ridicule and contempt upon this work which had been advocated by a delegation, which, as he says, was composed partly of Liberals and partly of Conservatives. He seems to be seized with amazement that any opposition to what we regard as an absurd expenditure should be offered by us in this House, considering that some Conservatives were members of that delegation. That certainly is a remarkable view to take of the duty of hon. gentlemen on either side of this House. The right hon. gentleman may establish that criterion, if he likes, for the members of his own party;—I do not now know how many of them will be prepared to accept it ; but if he supposes that hon. gentlemen on this side will refrain from criticising an unjust expenditure, simply because it is advocated by Conservatives as well as Liberals in the particular riding affected, I desire to tell him that he has absolutely mistaken the temper and disposition of hon. gentlemen on this side. He tells us that ridicule and contempt have been cast upon this undertaking by the lack of defence on the part of himself and his ministers. His concluding words declared that because $200,000 had been expended already on this manifestly absurd and useless undertaking, therefore we should go on and spend $800,000 or $900,000 more. To state the argument is to refute it. The severest condemnation of this undertaking is the reply of the three ministers who have spoken. The argument in defence of this proposal is two-fold. In the first place, the argument is that this work is feasible. Feasible ? Of course, it is feasible. If you spend $10,000,000, no doubt, you could build a canal in a portion of the country that now has no water communication at all—and the work might not be worth $10 when completed. If you spend enough money on this undertaking, I suppose you can construct the canal under discussion, unless the absolute lack of water stands in the way. Next the defence of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) and of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) is that Conservatives and Liberals have asked for this work. Well, perhaps you could embark upon many expenditures in different ridings in this country that would receive the support of some Conservatives and a great many Liberals. But does that absolve—the prime minister seems to think it does—the government as trustees for the people from all responsibility in connection with the expenditure of the public money? Does he lay down as a doctrine to be accepted by this House and by this country that, if you can get Conservatives and Liberals to demand a certain expenditure, and if you convince yourself that the undertaking can be carried out within the revenues of the country, the government, without further consideration, should embark upon it ? I ask the Prime Minister, as I asked the Minister of Railways and Canals this afternoon, what estimate is he able to give to the members of this House as to the business to be done on that canal and the tonnage to be carried over it in one year? Is the Prime Minister prepared to offer an estimate?

As the right hon. gentleman remains silent, his silence when that question is put to him across the floor of this House is an absolute condemnation, not only of the enterprise itself, but of the conduct of his government in entering upon it. Have we so much money in this country that we are ready to put a million or a million and a half into any enterprise, provided that money will carry it out, and provided that some Liberals and some Conservatives go to the government and ask for it? Yet, I leave it to hon. members who have listened to the Prime Minister and to the gentlemen who preceded him, whether there has been any defence of this undertaking other than that I have just mentioned. The right hon. gentleman seems to hint that it is a reproach to us for attacking this unjustifiable expenditure that three or four or half a dozen Conservatives advocated it three or four years ago. He seems to forget that what that delegation asked for, as I have understood it, was not the construction of a canal at a cost of a million or a million and a quarter of dollars, but the dredging of the Holland river; and, as pointed out by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. J. A. Currie) I venture to think that the enterprise had been already engaging the attention of the government, because it appears they had spent some $25,000 in surveys before that delegation was brought down. It looks very much as if the delegation had been brought down for the purpose of the enterprise, and that it did not initiate the enterprise in the mind of the government.

Mr. LENNOX. That is perfectly correct, as I know.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Without knowing the facts, that is what I should be inclined to think the true explanation of this case. So far as this expenditure is concerned, there has been absolutely no defence worthy of the name made in this House to-day. There is no estimate—there never has been an estimate—of the traffic to be carried on the canal. When all parts of this country, as my hon. friend

from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said, are clamouring for the expenditure of public money in aid of transportation, the government, in their flush times, when they used to ask from their supporters throughout the country applications for the expenditure of public money, handed out a million and a quarter of dollars with no more benefit to the people than if they had thrown it into the sea—with less benefit, indeed, because, as the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has said, not only will the money spent in the work be wasted, but if it is attempted to maintain the canal, from $20,000 to $40,000 a year must be taken from the public revenues for that purpose. I do not desire to prolong this discussion. There has been no defence of this expenditure from the mouth of any minister. The right hon. Prime Minister tells us that he has given us his mind in this case. Perhaps he has. But I venture to think that if that is all that has been in his mind about it, he quite justifies the boast he made during the late election campaign, that he could not be troubled with so small matters as questions of proper or improper expenditure of the public moneys, that his soul—as he quaintly expressed it—is turned to higher things. I do not know whether that is a very great advantage to the people of this country after all. It seems to me that if his soul, on this occasion, could have been turned to the question of the traffic that would probably go over that canal, if his soul could have been turned to a consideration of the business aspects of this enterprise, that would have inured more to the true interest of the people than some of these eloquent phrases which we hear from the right hon. gentleman both in this House and on the public platform. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the expenditure is absolutely undefended. If a judge in a court were addressing a jury on the arguments pro and con in connection with this expenditure, he would be obliged to tell the jury that it was an absolutely undefended case. That is the way it stands before parliament and before the people of this country to-day. No minister of the Crown has ventured to say that there was the slightest estimate or consideration of the traffic that would go through that canal. The Minister of Railways and Canals told me that very frankly across the floor of the House this afternoon. When I asked the Prime Minister, after he had spoken upon this question and endeavoured to justify this expenditure, if he could give me the slightest idea as to what traffic will go over those four and a half miles of canal, he sat silent in his seat and returned no answer whatever. And yet the Prime Minister tells us that it was not a purely political enterprise. Under these circumstances I venture to submit that the resolution which has been proposed in this House is a proper one, and that, to use the words of that resolution, this is an absolutely 'wanton misuse and waste of public money.'

House divided on amendment (Mr. Wallace).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Ames,	Lancaster,
Armstrong,	Lennox,
Arthurs,	Lewis,
Barker,	Lortie,
Barnard,	Macdonell,
Barr,	Maclean (York, S.),
Beattie,	McCall,
Blain,	Magrath,
Borden (Halifax),	Middlebro,
Boyce,	Nantel,
Bradbury,	Northrup,
Broder,	Osler,
Burrell,	Paquet,
Campbell,	Perley,
Chisholm (Huron),	Porter,
Clare,	Rhodes,
Cowan,	Roche,
Crosby,	Russell,
Crocket,	Schaffner,
Crothers,	Sexsmith,
Currie (Simcoe),	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Doherty,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Donnelly,	Smyth,
Edwards,	Staples,
Elson,	Stewart,
Foster,	Taylor (Leeds),
Fraser,	Taylor (New Westminster),
Goodeve,	
Gordon (Nipissing),	Thoburn,
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Thornton,
Henderson,	Wallace,
Herron,	White (Renfrew),
Hughes,	Wilson (Lennox and Addington),
Jameson,	
Kidd,	Worthington,
Lake,	Wright.—71.
Lalor,	

NAYS.

Messieurs

Allen,	McCraney,
Aylesworth,	McGiverin,
Beauparlant,	McIntyre (Perth),
Béland,	McKenzie,
Bickerdike,	McLean (Huron),
Black,	McLean (Sunbury),
Borden (Sir Fred'k.),	McMillan,
Boyer,	Major,
Brodeur,	Martin (Regina),
Brown,	Martin (Wellington),
Bureau,	Mayrand,
Calvert,	Meigs,
Carrier,	Michaud,
Cash,	Miller,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Molloy,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Murphy,
Congdon,	Nesbitt,
Conmee,	Neely,
Currie (Prince Edw.),	Oliver,
Delisle,	Papineau,
Demers,	Pardee,
Dubeau,	Parent,
Dugas,	Paterson,
Ecrément,	Pickup,
Ethier,	Proulx,
Fielding,	Prowse,
Fisher,	Pugsley,

Fortier,	Rankin,
Fowke,	Reid (Restigouche),
Gauvreau,	Richards,
Geoffrion,	Rivet,
German,	Robb,
Gervais,	Ross,
Girard,	Roy (Dorchester),
Gordon (Kent),	Roy (Montmagny),
Graham,	Rutan,
Guthrie,	Savoie,
Harris,	Schell,
Hodgins,	Sealey,
Hunt,	Seguin,
Knowles,	Sinclair,
Kyte,	Smith (Middlesex),
Lachance,	Smith (Stormont),
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Stratton,
	Talbot,
Lapointe,	Templeman,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tobin,
Lavergne,	Todd,
LeBlanc,	Tolmie,
Loggie,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Lovell,	Turcotte (Quebec County),
Low,	
Maclean (Lunenburg),	Turgeon,
MacNutt,	Turriff,
McAlister,	Warburton,
McCoig,	White (Victoria, Alta),
McColl,	Wilson (Laval).—112.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Blondin,
Macdonald,	Maddin,
Lemieux,	Haggart (Lanark),
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Sifton,	Sproule,
Emmerson,	Monk,
Sutherland,	McCarthy,
Smith (Nanaimo),	Daniel,
Carvell,	Bristol,
Clarke (Essex),	Marshall,
Marcile (Bagot),	Forget,
McIntyre (Strathcona),	Owen,
Law,	Stanfield,
Chew,	Meighen,
Clark (Red Deer).	Price.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Trent canal construction, $1,000,000.

Mr. WRIGHT. How much of this vote will be devoted to opening out the two ends of the canal into Lake Ontario and the Georgian Bay?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways) As a matter of fact the contract for the western end into the Georgian bay has not been let at all and no money out of this vote will be spent on it. The outlet to the Bay of Quinte has been let to Larkin & Sangster.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the whole work of connecting the navigable waters of Rice Lake to the Bay of Quinte been placed under contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are two contracts not yet let.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is it not the intention of the minister to go on with the opening of the western end at once? It would seem to me to be the most important part of the work. Until the ends of the canal are opened up the canal will be useless for the purpose for which it was designed.

Mr. STRATTON. When does the minister expect to place under contract the section between Lake Simcoe and the Georgian bay?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have had two surveys made and the report on one of them at least has not yet been placed before me in its entirety.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Were there not three surveys?

Mr. GRAHAM. One by the Severn river and the other by Kempenfeldt bay. No decision will be arrived at until my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) will have full opportunity to come down with a deputation of his friends and advocate what he thinks is the better route.

Mr. FOSTER. If the deputation has both Liberals and Conservatives on it I suppose the thing will go?

Mr. GRAHAM. As I said at Barrie during the last campaign, whichever the engineer thinks the more feasible route will be accepted.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. When the minister referred to this matter in Barrie during the last campaign the people living along the valley of the Nottawasaga river inferred from his remarks that the canal would surely be built along the valley of that river. As a matter of fact the county of Simcoe has appointed a committee on canals to take the question up, and the chairman of that committee has written to me to know if I could ascertain whether there has been a survey and a report made. If the question is considered on its merits it will be found that the canal can be built much more cheaply via Kempenfeldt bay and the Nottawasaga river than by way of the Severn river, because there is nothing but sand and gravel and clay on the western route whilst on the eastern route there will be a tremendous amount of rock cutting, and as every engineer knows one yard of rock cutting will cost about twelve times as much as a yard of gravel. I strongly urge that the minister give favourable consideration to the western route. Notable engineers of the past who have surveyed these routes unhesitatingly give their opinion in favour of the Kempenfeldt bay or Barrie-Nottawasaga river route. I strongly urge the advisability of completing the report as soon as possible so that I may

have the opportunity of bringing down here a lot of good Reformers to interview the minister, and incidentally I suppose I may be allowed to bring a few Conservatives who are also interested in the matter. There is no doubt but that the western route is the easiest and the best route. It was the route followed by the early voyageurs; it was the war route in 1812, and from an engineering standpoint in the present day it is undoubtedly the most acceptable. Then, I would urge upon the government that they should seriously consider the advisability of making it a modern canal from Lake Simcoe on and not have it in the same category as the canal on the Trent route. The cost of making the locks larger and the waterway deeper would be comparatively small once the plant is erected there, and what a magnificent idea it would be to have these large freighters coming into Lake Simcoe and discharging their cargoes at Beaverton or at this dock at Holland Landing. The minister will be well advised if he does not give the preference to the Severn river route, although during the last campaign a supporter of the government was elected in that riding. This canal has been a political question for so many years that it is time for us to call quits and turn it into a business enterprise at last.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. The Lake Simcoe Dredging Company had a contract dated April 7, 1906, which they were in default with respect to. Did they get back their deposit of $4,649?

Mr. GRAHAM. No; we forfeited it.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Did they get the balance of $750 which they claimed?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not yet.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Are they still claiming it?

Mr. GRAHAM. They still claim and the matter is under consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. Did they get anything?

Mr. GRAHAM. They got about $1,600 on progress estimates for work done.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Is that all they are going to get?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so; the $700 is under consideration.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. On July 15, 1908, tenders were called for a second letting and the lowest was $94,960 and the highest $167,023. Why was not the contract let on these tenders?

Mr. GRAHAM. The figure was so much larger than the original contract that——

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. 'Your Engineer's' estimate was $131,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not say the estimate; I say the figure was so much larger than for the other contract which had been cancelled that I did not consider the matter so urgent that I should not look into it thoroughly. I had not the engineer's estimate with me at the time as I was away from the department and I would not accept it without inquiry.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. It never was accepted?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. If the approaching elections had anything to do with it, I would have let the contract immediately to get men to work.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. My information is from prominent men in Newmarket, that political friends of the hon. gentleman's party were interested in the contract, and that they dare not let it to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. GRAHAM. Nonsense.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Will the hon. gentleman explain in what way Mr. Widdifield is identified with almost every lot that has been taken and paid for in damages there?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Widdifield, a lawyer, is the agent of the Minister of Justice, and as such passes the titles when we take possession of the lands. We do this, not directly, but through the Department of Justice, which has an agent at each of these places.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Does the minister know whether or not Mr. Widdifield has any personal connection with or interest in these lands?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know. The business is not done through my department.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. The reason I ask is that there are some lots in which neither Widdifield nor the other agent appears, but the parties deal directly with the department.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think there is any case in which there is no agent. There must be a legal agent representing the Department of Justice.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. There are two cases in which there is no agent.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed that they cannot be for that.

Mr. HUGHES. Is each of the parties who is indemnified for drowned land paid the full amount of the cheque issued to Widdifield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. HUGHES. There was a question about it many times. We have had many instances in which the farmer who was being indemnified had 20 per cent commission taken from the amount of the cheque for party purposes.

Mr. GRAHAM. In any of these cases?

Mr. HUGHES. In none of these cases, but there was a case only a few years ago.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. What is the name of the other agent?

Mr. GRAHAM. Williams. He is also an agent of the Department of Justice.

Mr. STRATTON. I may say, for the information of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) that in all cases in which damages were paid in the county of Peterborough, the full amount was paid to the people who had the damaged land. There was no deduction in any case.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Was the cheque a joint cheque?

Mr. STRATTON. Yes, but there was no such deduction made as the hon. member for Victoria alleges. The Department of Justice itself paid for the legal work done by the solicitor.

Mr. HUGHES. The instance to which I had reference was an old one. I referred to the drowned land around Cameron lake, in which the agent of the government, part of the time, took 20 per cent commission from the people. But we discussed that, and I presume the practice was stopped. I desire to ask the minister about the surveying of the drowned land. I happen to know that at the present time in the county of Peterborough an engineer is surveying the drowned land and that he does not start from any known level of the canal or waterway, but just goes by the water mark on the trees. I am not finding any fault with him, because he is one of the most honourable men in the country; but it strikes me that there should be some datum point from which to take the level.

Mr. GRAHAM. The chief engineer informs me that that is done in every case.

Mr. HUGHES. Then, the man who is doing it does not seem to know that. Will the minister give us the data concerning the dam being erected at Lindsay? Is the water going to be higher than before, or lower? Is it going to be maintained at an even level, or is it going to be allowed to fall to five or six feet below the top of the dam? Are there fish slides in the dam and passages for small launches?

Mr. GRAHAM. The intention is not to raise the water, but to keep it at a level. The question of fish slides is one on which there is a difference of opinion. Within the past ten days I have discussed that question with a deputation that came to see me on other matters, and their opinion was that where there were locks a fish slide was not necessary or satisfactory. The fish pass through when the locks are opened, while the fish slides get clogged up in a few weeks. With regard to small launches, there is no provision beside the ordinary locks.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister promised that he would provide a small lock or something of that kind.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have considered the question of putting in intermediary gates, but we have not decided on it yet.

Mr. WRIGHT. What size of boat will the locks accommodate?

Mr. GRAHAM. Six feet in depth and 122 feet in length. All the details are in the report.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How many acres of land have been taken for this Newmarket canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. The amount paid so far is about $27,000. I cannot tell the number of acres. That is worked out elsewhere. The hon. gentleman will find it in the report page 97—134 x 33 x 5.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Have you settled all the land damages at Newmarket down to Cook's bay?

Mr. GRAHAM. Nearly all settled. There may be two or three cases yet to be settled.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The lock-master at Fenelon Falls has for a number of years been in the habit of raising and lowering the waters. Sometimes there would be a difference of two feet between the extreme high and the extreme low water caused by the eccentricities of this young gentleman. Consequently for weeks at a time, the water will be up on the shore and when winds come along those who own lands on the shore occasionally see portions of them floating down the lake. In other words considerable damage is done along the shores of that lake owing to the high waters. Is the minister paying damages caused by that class of irregularity? There are a number of gentlemen there who have claims of that nature. Has he paid similar damages elsewhere? I understand damages have been paid at Stony lake and also Rice lake.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have paid damages for raising the permanent level of the water on Stony and Rice lakes but not in any case such as my hon. friend mentions.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You should.

Mr. SEXSMITH. What amount is to be spent on the eastern end of the Trent Valley canal now under contract ?

Mr. GRAHAM. There will not be more than $200,000 spent on the Holland river and the balance will be spent on the main canal.

Mr. WRIGHT. I understood the minister to say that there were a couple of sections not under contract on the eastern portion of the canal. What amount will be required to build them, and how long will it take to provide an eastern outlet into Lake Ontario?

Mr. GRAHAM. I should imagine it would take four years. I could not tell what would be the cost of those sections as they are not let.

Mr. SEXSMITH. When do you expect to let the contract for the Healy Falls section and the one outlet at Rainy Falls ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is difficult to say. I am not getting as large appropriations for the canal this year as I would like. I tried to have the amount doubled but was not able. The Healy Falls contract might possibly be let during the autumn, but no work will be done this year and I would not like to make a promise that it will be let. I want to go on as rapidly as the finances of the country will permit.

Mr. HUGHES. The finances of the country are all right. What is wanted is more energy. This thing has been dawdling on since 1833, and it is just wasting money to have it go on as it is. I had hoped that the minister, having come here full of vigour and energy, would have set an example and if he had not been given his way in getting this work completed, he would have resigned and brought on a crisis in the cabinet.

Mr. GRAHAM. That would not help it.

Mr. HUGHES. I am not so sure. We are told that the cabinet was brought to time by a minister threatening to resign and also by the Finance Minister in like manner.

Mr. GRAHAM. My resignation would not have that effect.

Mr. HUGHES. I would not take that line until all other means had been tried and failed. The minister should first try his persuasive power in order to get this thing completed. In its present condition it is an eyesore, having a long complete stretch in the centre but the two ends unfinished. I want to draw attention to two things—the lighting and the opening of the locks. The department has a very good system of lighting by acetylene gas buoys. Along this canal you could have a number of piers constructed on which these automatic buoys would be placed, and in that way the waterways could be lighted. There is a great deal of travel on these waters at night, and it is an immense advantage to have them well lighted. A part of the line around Lindsay and Fenelon Falls could be lighted by electricity. But between Lindsay and Sturgeon lake and above Lindsay to Port Perry, which could not be lighted by electricity, these piers could be readily constructed. There is another point to which I wish to draw attention. The locks are very burdensome to operate. You use the old winch system which came down from the time of Moses. I would suggest to the minister that he should bring that part of his department up to the 20th century and get a proper system of opening the locks along the line. All it requires is a little energy. The minister has a deputy who is willing, and if he will set his energy at work, he will not allow this old fashioned system to continue.

Mr. STRATTON. I think the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) is quite right with regard to the improvements that might be made and on the modern locks that are being constructed. So far as I can observe, the department is dealing with that aspect of the case. I would like to point out that the lakes might be better buoyed and lighted. I was going to Lindsay one night last fall myself, and stayed out nearly all night, not being able to find the way. It would be much better for the passenger boats if the lake were buoyed, and there is no doubt that the passage into Lindsay and up the Scugog is dangerous, and should be better lighted. And, now that there is sufficient power to light by electricity, I would be willing to support the hon. member for Victoria in advocating the proper lighting of these channels.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Has it been decided what kind of locks are to be put in at Healy Falls? It is a great pity that the minister has not included in the estimates this year enough to complete the lower end of this canal. It is a very important work. The minister, when asked when we might expect it to be finished, said in about four years. He knows that the Healy Falls portion is a very difficult one. I think that, even if he lets the contract next year, it will be many years before it can be finished. The same is true of the portion just below the village of Campbellford at Raney's Falls. Had the money devoted to the work that was so long under discussion this afternoon been expended on these portions of the canal, it would have been of much greater benefit to the country. I do not pretend to be very well posted on this subject beyond the information we have gathered in the discussion to-day, but considering the defence made by the ministers

one can hardly come to any other conclusion than that the money spent on the Neymarket canal will be practically thrown away. There has been a good deal of speculation as to just where this canal is going to run. I would like to ask the minister to tell us if he has yet decided whether it is to follow the river at Raney's Falls, and what kind of locks they intend to place at Healy Falls?

Mr. GRAHAM. At Healy Falls, we will follow the river with the ordinary lift-lock. I think my hon. friend will see that it would not be wise, in the public interest, to announce what we are going to do at Campbellford at this time.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Some Campbellford people tell us the canal is going to follow the bed of the river, while others say it will go along the bank.

Mr. HUGHES. They will not follow the bed of the river at Campbellford. I desire to draw the attention of the minister to two branch canals, of one of which, the Haliburton branch, I have already spoken. The minister has never been up that route. In order to impress the officers of the department with the importance of keeping the water up to a certain level, I got two of the officers in a boat out in a lake and succeeded in running them aground. Fortunately, or unfortunately, a very violent storm arose. There was no chaplain aboard, so I had to officiate in receiving their final confession, because they thought they were going to kingdom come. If we could get the minister or deputy minister to come up there, I promise I will look after their safety. But I would like the privilege of showing them that the Haliburton canal is an absolute necessity and that it may be easily constructed. The waterway is there and the construction of six locks would open up sixty miles of navigation. It would assist in developing a very fine country and bringing out valuable hardwood timber, such as maple and birch now so largely used in the manufacture of furniture, and bringing it out in the only way possible, because no railway will be put in there. But I have already spoken on this subject, and will not detain the committee now. Another point to which my attention was drawn by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright) was this: Muskoko lake and Lake Couchiching are on nearly the same level, and a little work would open up the connecting link between these waters, that is between the waters of Severn river and Muskoka lake, and so bring Bracebridge, Gravenhurst and a large area of country into water communication with the outer world, that is, if this canal is ever to be completed. Now, I would like to ask if the minister has looked into the Haliburton canal? I may say that we have ways and means of directing the attention of the government to these things. This is a new parliament, and I am giving the hon. gentleman a preliminary canter on this subject this session. But I promise him that next session, if something is not done meantime, we will make it considerably more interesting, and will continue in that way until we impress upon the minister, even better than a deputation of Grits and Tories could do it, that something ought to be done in this matter.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not paid much attention to these branch lines that have been mentioned several times. To be frank with the committee, I do not feel inclined to undertake more branch lines than the present, nor until we get the main line through. When that is done, I think it will be reasonable to discuss some betterments to connect with other places.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Is it the intention of the department to dredge between Trent bridge and Hastings, or between Hastings and Rice lake this summer? I had the privilege of taking a little trip there last summer, and like my hon. friend from Victoria, we did not know whether we were going to get back the same night or not—ran on the rocks. That part of the river is used to a considerable extent during the summer, and it would not be a very difficult or expensive proposition to have the work done.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it is under contract.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I am very glad to hear that.

Patent Record—further amount required, $9,000.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is there really any good purpose served by printing that large pamphlet called the 'Patent Record'? I think all the members receive it, and I was wondering whether there was any necessity for getting so many of them printed. Possibly it could be done away with.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The expenditure is largely due to the cuts of the different patents. It is a book that inventors are anxious to have, as without it they would have no record of inventions, and they might be working on an invention which had been already recorded. It is sent to all the public libraries in the country. The total cost is $17,000 or $18,000 a year. This year we have to pay up a lot of arrears. It costs $1,800 or $1,900 a month. At the beginning of this year we were in arrears some nine months, now we are in arrears only three months.

Year-book—further amount required, $4,600.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How many Year-books are printed and distributed every

year, and how many are the members allowed to have for the purpose of distribution?

Mr. FISHER. There are 11,000 printed each year, 7,000 in English and 4,000 in French. I am told that 5 or 6 are sent to each member.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What proportion of them are bound in cloth and what proportion in paper? When bound in cloth they make a very nice book for a library.

Mr. FISHER. I am told there are about 4,000 bound in cloth, and these are chiefly sent out to libraries and places where we know they will be preserved. Those bound in paper are sent out for ordinary distribution.

Further amount required for the development of the dairy and fruit industries, and the improvement and transportation of, and the promotion of the sale and trade in food and other agricultural products, $13,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What is the whole amount of which this is supplementary?

Mr. FISHER. The whole amount last year was $125,000. The reason for this vote is almost entirely due to some arrears of accounts with the railroads for the refrigerator cars.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Will the amount be less another year?

Mr. FISHER. We will ask for the same amount as we ask for this year, without these arrears.

Mr. D. A. GORDON. I would like to ask the minister if he has considered the advisability of including in some such estimate as this, a sum sufficient to erect a cold storage warehouse to experiment in the handling of apples. I may point out that Kent county has the greatest number of apple trees I believe of any county in the Dominion, but, our orchards are going to waste seemingly because the farmers are not in a position to handle their crops to advantage. I believe it is largely owing to the fact that the cold storage warehouses are not in the vicinity of the orchards, and there has not been sufficient development along that line to induce people to invest in building them. I think an experimental warehouse for that purpose is absolutely essential, and I hope the minister will promise that a sufficient sum will be included to make a testing station, and let us see if we cannot handle the apple crop to better advantage. To-day, although there are so many apple trees in that vicinity, you cannot get an apple at any price, whereas in the city of Ottawa apples at $8 to $9 per barrel are coming in from the eastern end of the country where they are properly handled I presume largely owing to assistance offered by the Dominion and local governments.

Mr. FISHER. The proposition the hon. gentleman makes would more naturally come under the vote for cold storage warehouses. That vote is under a statute, and the statute does not provide for such an experiment as the hon. gentleman talks of. I have no doubt myself that one of the most important necessities for our apple trade is a means for cooling apples immediately, or very soon after, they are picked, and before they are shipped. The fruit, if cooled down as low as possible without being frozen, will keep much better afterwards than in ordinary storage, or in ordinary cars for shipment. No doubt one of the main improvements which the apple trade must look to is cold storage facilities close to the orchards, where the fruit can be cooled as soon as possible after it is picked. I have not in my vote for the coming fiscal year any provision for such an experiment as my hon. friend has outlined. I had hoped that the provision for cold storage warehouses under the Act would be sufficient to meet the necessities which my hon. friend has alluded to. It is possible that the circumstances and conditions in the fruit districts are not such that the people are able to fully take advantage of the provisions of the cold storage Act and if so perhaps it would be well to amend that Act or to provide other facilities which would meet the necessities of the case. But in the estimates for the coming fiscal year I must say there is no provision for such an experiment as my hon. friend outlined.

Mr. D. A. GORDON. I believe the sum required will not exceed $12,000 or $15,000 for one station of that character. I would not hesitate, realizing the importance of this work, to recommend in the strongest language possible that a movement be made to introduce an amendment at once for the purpose of this experiment. As I understand we have to be educated as to the methods that we must adopt in order to take care of the crop in a proper way, and the only way that we can ascertain the best method is by having an experimental warehouse. Personally I feel like adopting a much more comprehensive method but it may be well to go slowly under the circumstances and take up the matter in this way as suggested. I hope the minister will not allow the opportunity to go by, because I am satisfied our farmers are not getting 25 per cent of what they should for their apples. Last fall I know apples were marketed at prices ranging from 8 to 25 cents per hundred simply because there was no provision whereby they could care for the apples and market them as the country would be prepared to absorb them and pay the price. I believe the House is convinced

that if the apples can be kept in proper condition and be delivered in the fall, winter and spring in good condition that people will not only demand them but pay the price. Matters of this kind are so important that we should not neglect the opportunity to assist this industry. In one night we passed military estimates aggregating $6,000,000 and if we are satisfied that cold storage is the proper means for the handling of the apple crop, so that the greatest advantage shall accrue to the farmers, we should not hesitate to undertake the expenditure of a small sum for that purpose. I trust that the resources of the minister will not only provide the funds but will also indicate the best way in which to put this system into operation.

Mr. U. WILSON. A farmer in my county who has a large apple orchard has built a cold storage warehouse at his own expense to handle his own apples and those of his neighbours. If the suggestion of the hon. member is carried out, will that man receive fair treatment and have a fair proportion of the expenses to which he has been put refunded to him ? If he does not receive a refund, I think all should be treated alike. If one part of the country builds its own cold storage warehouses I do not see why we should help others. I have sometimes thought that these are things that should be left very largely to the people themselves. A great deal has been done in this work and I feel that anything that can be done to help our farmers—I do not mean the agriculturists, the men who work the farmers—will be liberally supported by this House.

Mr. BARR. I am very glad to hear the remarks of my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. D. A. Gordon). I consider this one of the most important questions that we could consider in this House. There is no question that the apple crop this year was good in most parts of the country, but owing to want of cold storage, the farmers have not received the remuneration they should have received. The result is that many orchards throughout Ontario are not cared for as they would be if it was a paying business. The agriculturists and fruit growers do not receive the consideration in matters of this kind to which they are entitled. We spend millions on the militia, we pass these items without consideration, whereas it is exceedingly difficult to obtain any substantial assistance for the farming community. I hope that the remarks which have been made will receive consideration and that next year the estimates will contain a substantial amount for the encouragement of farmers to build these cold storage warehouses. We may have enterprising men such as the gentleman mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. U. Wilson) who will build such warehouses, but they are few, and I do not think the farmers are called upon to pay for cold storage warehouses. I think they should have assistance from the government.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I am pleased to learn that Lennox county contains men who have gone so extensively into the fruit growing that they are able to build cold storage warehouses for themselves. I agree with the hon. member for Kent (Mr. D. A. Gordon) that this is a very important question and that the very small amount spent in the interests of the farmers in the past might be doubled or trebled and still the farmers would not be getting anything like their fair share of public expenditure. If we had as the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Gordon) suggested, even one proper cold storage warehouse at some point where it could be utilized and where the farmers would be able to experiment with it, we would be in a position to know the full value of such assistance. Hundreds and thousands of dollars worth of fruit go to waste every year. At present we have a system of co-operation in many parts of the province where the farmers ship their own apples. Where that system is in vogue, if we had what the hon. member for Kent (Mr. D. A. Gordon) suggests, a cold storage plant to which the farmers could ship apples and keep them properly until the market developed, it would be a great advantage to the farmer and I think the minister might well consider this question. What amount did the government pay last year for refrigerator car service ?

Mr. FISHER. I have here accounts for 1908 amounting to over $9,600, and we paid something during the summer. I would think the total amount would be from $13,000 to $14,000, speaking from memory.

Mr. SEXSMITH. That is not a very great donation.

Mr. FISHER. That has served the purpose.

Mr. SEALEY. In Wentworth a co-operation plan has been organized and the details pretty well arranged to construct a cold storage warehouse for apples in particular, and while under the general Cold Storage Act this establishment would come in for some encouragement it seems to be the pretty general opinion that perhaps that encouragment could be increased in an experimental way and as no vote could do more in the general interest of the country than something to encourage an improvement along agricultural lines, the consensus of opinion seems to be that if this vote could be increased, it would be generally approved and result in great good not only in the counties of Wentworth

and Kent but in other places, particularly in two or three of the large fruit and apple growing centres.

Mr. BARR. It is a question of so much importance that the House should impress on the Minister of Agriculture to increase the grant in this respect.

Mr. FOWKE. It is impossible to overstate the influence that the Department of Agriculture under the present minister has had on the creation of wealth in this country. Any real addition to our national wealth must come from our natural resources, and I know from personal contact wth farmers that they appreciate very highly the Minister of Agriculture as their representative in this government. I am fully in accord with every proposition that has proceeded from the government so far in relation to the important matter of affording cold storage for the perishable products of the farm, and I should be glad if we may witness a large extension of that part of the work of the Department of Agriculture. The suggestion from the hon. member from Kent (Mr. Gordon) is well worthy the attention of the minister, and I sincerely hope that the gentlemen who have spoken on this question will have the satisfaction of learning that there will be a larger measure of cold storage in future than we have known of in past experience. In the one item of apples alone I find that in my own county there are more bushels of apples produced annually than the total quantity of barrels exported from this country, which would seem to indicate that large quantities of apples go to waste for want of proper attention. I trust that the Minister of Agriculture will see his way clear to devise some method by which in a good many localities in the province of Ontario, in the fruit season, the people may be able to avail themselves more fully of the advantages of cold storage.

Mr. FISHER. The Act under which bonuses are given to cold storage warehouses covers such as would be required for the apple trade. I know that some people have felt that another arrangement of the bonus than that provided in the Act would be more likely to encourage the building of cold storages for this particular trade. I confess that I have been considering somewhat whether the terms of the bonus may be modified to meet the particular necessities of this kind of cold storage. I shall be very glad to arive at a favourable conclusion because I am very anxious that ample cold storage facilities should be provided. The trouble with cold storage for apples alone is that while a building is very necessary during the short season of the apple crop, apples are bulky and take up much space, and the profit on the venture has to be made in a very short period of the year. That makes it a difficult problem. I shall be glad to further consider the question of changing in some degree the conditions of the cold storage bonus for such a cold storage warehouse, for I have closely at heart the providing of warehouses for the apple trade. The organization of the fruit growers' asociations was initiated by the officers of my department and I believe that sort of co-operation is one of the best means of handling our apple crop. These associations have done excellent work and have set a good model for the country at large.

Further amount required to pay for the construction of branch of the electric railway to the Central Experimental Farm, including cost of fence, $10,500.

Mr. BARR. Is this road on the farm or to the farm?

Mr .FISHER. The road is double-tracked, about a mile long within the farm and it is only the part within the farm that we had anything to do with.

Mr. BARR. What is it used for?

Mr. FISHER. Thousands and thousands of visitors come to the experimental farm every year, and before this arangement was made they had to drive in cabs or walk about a mile and a half. As a result of insistent demands from the public I made an arrangement with the electric railway company that if they would build to the boundary of the farm we would build the road within the farm.

Mr. WRIGHT. What is the total cost?

Mr. FISHER. $39,889. The estimate of cost was made and approved of by the chief engineer of the Railway Department who drew the plans. The electric railway company constructed it on that estimate.

Mr. WRIGHT. It seems to me that this is a very large amount for constructing a mile of railway and if there be such a large number of visitors to the farm the road ought to pay for itself. Should not the electric company have built this road themselves in view of the profits they would receive from it, or at least should they not have paid half the cost? Do they give a service in winter?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Do they give a five cent fare to the general public and the servants of the farm?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and they also carry the mails free to and from the farm. This has been under discussion for years; the service was very strongly demanded by the visitors to the farm and it was only when we agreed to this that the railway would build to the farm boundary. I venture to think that during the coming summer it

will repay for all the outlay and a good deal more.

Mr. BLAIN. Who did the work?

Mr. FISHER. It was done by the Ottawa Electric Railway Company on the estimates and under the supervision of our own Railway Department.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Does the government own the road?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. What proportion of this item will be expended on the fencing?

Mr. FISHER. About $600. We have to fence both sides of the track, because it runs through the field where the cattle are and through the orchard. The only part of the road we are paying for is that which runs through the farm.

Mr. BARR. Does this complete the payment?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Quarantine — further amount required, $14,000.

Mr. BARR. What was the total amount expended this year?

Mr. FISHER. The amount voted in the main estimates was $100,000 and we ask for this in addition. In the year before about $125,000 was spent.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. We shall continue the work in Supply, and will be likely to take any of the items of the supplementary estimates for the current year. If we get into the main estimates, there are a few items of civil government to be dealt with, and after that the Public Works estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.40 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 24, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

ALBERTA TIMBER LANDS.

Mr. HERRON asked:

What was the total revenue due and payable to the government from all sources, exclusive of bonuses, in respect of the timber lands in the province of Alberta under lease, permit, or limit, during the twelve months ending 31st March, 1908, and how much of the above has been collected?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Amount due and payable, $34,634.24; amount collected, $34,300.61.

EAST POINT LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. FRASER asked:

1. Has Lauchlin McDonald resigned his position as keeper of the East Point, P.E.I., lighthouse? If so, what is the date of his resignation?
2. Has any one been appointed in his place as lighthouse keeper of said light? If so, what is his name?
3. Upon whose recommendation was this last appointment made, and what is the date of the appointment?
4. Who are the securities of the new appointee?
5. Have any complaints been made to the department during the last year concerning this light?
6. Were there any other applicants for this position? If so, who were the applicants?

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

1. Yes. June 4, 1908.
2. Yes. Ronald John McDonald.
3. On the instructions of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. July 1, 1908.
4. No securities are required.
5. No.
6. No.

GEORGETOWN, P.E.I., MARINE AGENT.

Mr. FRASER asked:

1. Who is the marine agent at Georgetown, Prince Edward Island?
2. How much is he paid and what are his duties?
3. What position is held by Scoby Johnston?
4. How much is he paid, for what services, and what are his duties?
5. How are his duties distinguished from those of the agent?

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

1. Mr. John A. McCormack is subagent at Georgetown, Prince Edward Island.
2. $100 a year. He is acting as subagent at Georgetown and looks after the freight, also winter mail service when government vessels are calling at Georgetown.
3. He is acting as timekeeper.
4. Thirty cents an hour while in the service of the government. He looks after local freight and keeps time when the men are loading and unloading the vessels.
5. His duties are limited to time keeping and looking after the freight while the duty of the agent is to look after the expenditure and revenue for that agency.

ONTARIO METEOROLOGICAL STATIONS.

Mr. THORNTON asked:

1. How many meteorological stations are there in Ontario, and where are they situated?
2. Which of these were erected in 1908?
3. At whose expense were they erected?
4. What is the object of these stations or towers, and what service do they render?

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

1. Agincourt, Aurora, Birnam, Bruce Mines, Bancroft, Chatham, Clinton, Cockburn Island, Cowal (Dutton), Ennismore, Guelph, Georgetown, Haileybury, Huntsville, Kingston, London, Lindsay, Lansdowne, Meaford, Midland, Madoc, North Gower, Ottawa, Orillia, Oliver's Ferry, Port Hope, Point Clark, Port Dover, Port Burwell, Peterborough, Parma, Renfrew, Southampton (Saugeen). Stony Creek, Sarnia, Sydenham, Uplands, Ursa, Woodstock, Windsor, Wiarton, Wallaceburg, Collingwood, Port Colborne, Deseronto, Sault Ste. Marie, Kincardine, Cobourg, Alton, Beatrice, Brantford, Barrie, Coldwater, Cottam, Calvin, Croydon, Emsdale, Gravenhurst, Goderich (Lighthouse), Haliburton, Hamilton, Hubrey (Westminster), Kinmount, Lucknow, Lakefield, Listowel, Moose Factory, Montague, North Bruce, Owen Sound, Otonabee, Orangeville, Port Arthur, Parry Sound, Port Stanley, Pelee Island, Paris, Princeton, Rockliffe, Rat Portage (Kenora), Stratford, Sunnyside (Wooler), East Toronto, Toronto, Uxbridge, White River, Welland, Watford, Westport, Fort William, Bayfield, Oakville, Picton, Tobermory, Port Credit.

2. Barrie, Rouville (Fox Point P.O.), Lake Temagami, Wesley, Lake Side Home (Toronto Island), Judge, Kakabeka Falls, Lorne Park, Copper Cliff.

3. The cost of installation of these stations is defrayed by the Dominion government Department of Marine and Fisheries

4. The object of meteorological stations is to have observations taken of the temperature, barometric pressure, direction and velocity of wind and other atmospheric conditions. These observations are compiled at the Central office, Toronto, from whence are issued weather predictions for the use of mariners and the public generally.

GOVERNMENT SHIPS.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE asked:

1. Were representations made to the Customs Department by any person as agent for the Dominion Marine Association, urging the government not to impose a duty on repairs made to Canadian ships in certain cases? If so, what are the names of such persons?

Mr. BRODEUR.

2. What ships have been purchased by the Dominion government from British shipbuilders since 1896?

3. What are the names of the shipbuilders who built each ship, and the purchase price of each ship?

4. Were any tenders received for the building of these ships from Canadian shipbuilders? If so, what were the amounts of the Canadian tenders for each ship, and the names of the tenderers?

5. What amount of money was spent on each of these ships for changes, improvements, additional equipment and repairs since they were taken over by the government?

6. Who were the Canadian agents or persons representing each individual British shipbuilders of any ships for the government of Canada?

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

2. The Department of Marine and Fisheries have purchased the following vessels: 'Druid,' 'Minto,' Lady Laurier,' 'Montcalm,' 'Champlain,' 'Canada,' 'Lady Grey.'

3. 'Druid,' Fleming & Ferguson, $110,960.00; 'Minto,' Gourley & Co., $185,317.14; 'Lady Laurier,' Fleming & Ferguson, $184,933.33; 'Montcalm,' Fleming & Ferguson, $265,233 33; 'Champlain,' Fleming & Ferguson, $90,033,33; 'Canada,' Vickers Sons & Maxim, $181,284.28; 'Lady Grey,' Vickers Sons & Maxim, $208,994.11.

4. 'Druid'—Tender of Collingwood Shipbuilding Co., $170,000; tender of Polsons, $173,000. 'Lady Laurier—Tender of Collingwood Shipbuilding Co., $235,000; tender of Polsons, $298,900.

5. 'Druid', $61,865.50; 'Minto,' $61,282.32; 'Montcalm,' $118,377.22; 'Lady Laurier,' $138,514.86; 'Champlain,' $68,304.09; 'Canada,' $43,436.79; 'Lady Grey,' $9,966.33.

6. The Department of Marine and Fisheries dealt directly with the builders in all these cases.

MAIL ROUTES TO AHMIC HARBOUR AND TROUT CREEK.

Mr. ARTHURS asked:

1 Who is the contractor on each of the following mail routes, (a) Burks Falls to Ahmic Harbour, summer and winter routes, and (b) Loring to Trout Creek?

2. Were tenders called for the above services?

3. What is the amount paid each of the contractors?

4. When do the contracts expire?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The services to Ahmic Harbour are, during the season of navigation, performed by the Magnatawan River and Lakes Steamboat Company who are paid $7 per trip for the regular summer service, and an additional $2.50 per trip for a special service during the months of July and August. Tenders were not invited for

this service, but only a temporary arrangement made with the above company. During the winter Ahmic Harbour is served in connection with the Burk's Falls and Dunchurch route, the contractor for the service being R. A. Creaser, who obtained his contract as the result of public tenders, and is paid at the rate of $4.50 per trip for the whole route. His contract expires on the opening of navigation, 1911.

The contractor for the service between Loring and Trout Creek is Mr. John Kyle. Previous to October, 1904, there were two services known as Loring and Stopping Place and Trout Creek and Stopping Place. The total cost for both services amounted to $625 per annum.

It being considered in the public interest to have both services performed under one contract, they were combined, and a contract entered into with Mr. Kyle at the rate of $600 per annum, which contract will expire on 30th September, 1912. Mr. Kyle was formerly the contractor for the Loring and Stopping Place section.

ST. JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BARNARD asked:

1. Has the government made any arrangement with the persons in charge of St. Joseph's Hospital at Victoria, B.C., whereby such hospital is in future to take charge of sick mariners?

2. Is it the intention of the government to close the present marine hospital?

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

1. No.

2. There is no such intention for the present.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the interest on the sums of money advanced to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal for the construction of grain elevators and other terminal facilities, during the period of construction of the said facilities—such period to terminate as of such date as the Governor in Council shall fix and determine—should be charged to the capital account of the commissioners, and be paid out of the sum to be advanced to the commissioners under authority of chapter 30 of the Acts of 1907.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General recommends this resolution to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

LORD STRATHCONA— GIFT TO THE DOMINION.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to bring before the House a matter of considerable importance. A few days ago, when the militia estimates were under discussion I had the honour of bringing to the attention of the Committee of the Whole a branch of the subject which I considered of great interest to this country. In doing so, I used the following words :

On several occasions in this House I have had the honour to bring up this matter, and to say I hope the time will come when, in all the schools of Canada, there will be undertaken by the respective provincial governments, which of course control education, a uniform system of physical training for younger children, of elementary drill for the older ones, and of rifle shooting for those still older. I am happy to say that this policy, if it may be dignified by that name, has been very generally discussed throughout the Dominion; and so far as I have observed, all the best newspapers which more correctly indicate the trend of public opinion, have favoured this idea almost without exception.

I went on to say that I had reason to believe that all the provinces throughout the Dominion would follow the example set by the province of Nova Scotia and enter into an arrangement with the Dominion government by which this system of physical training and elementary drill in the schools might be carried out by mutual co-operation between the Dominion government and the provinces. Yesterday I had the honour to receive from Lord Strathcona—an old friend of Canada, who delights to call Canada his home, and who has on frequent occasions shown his deep interest in the development of this country—a letter which I shall read to the House, as it expresses his own views better than any language of mine could do :

28 Grosvenor Square,
13th March, 1909.

My dear Sir Frederick Borden,—You will recollect that, when we met in London during your recent visit, I was greatly interested in the account you gave me of your efforts to get a system of physical training and military drill, including rifle practice, introduced into the public schools of the Dominion.

I have long entertained the opinion that such training as that you are striving for is of the highest value in developing the moral, physical and intellectual qualities of children, as well as that valuable quality known as patriotism, and I am anxious to take part in the good work which is being done in this direction.

I write, therefore, to inform you that I am prepared to place at your disposal, or that of

any competent body which you may be in a position to constitute, with the object of encouraging such training, the sum of $10,000 per annum. I would suggest that the fund which this sum would form might be designated as for 'The encouragement of Physical and Military Training in Public Schools,' and that it should be administered by a body of trustees appointed for the purpose. I should be glad to know what your own proposals as to the constitution of this body would be, but I think that the central committee might perhaps be composed somewhat as follows: Yourself or the Minister of Militia for the time being, as president; the ministers who deal with education in the various provinces of the Dominion as vice- presidents, but subject to the conditions that the province which each one represents has declared its adhesion to the principles agreed upon between the Department of Militia and the province of Nova Scotia, which were sanctioned and made applicable to the other provinces of the Dominion by the orders in council of 13th August, 1908; the executive council to be composed of (a) the members of the Militia Council; (b) representatives to be named by the ministers controlling education in the various provinces —two each for the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and one each for the remaining provinces of the Dominion; (c) the military officers commanding the commands and independent districts of the Dominion. Should His Excellency the Governor General be disposed to become patron of the trust, I should feel especially honoured by such action on his part, which would conduce very greatly to the success of the object which we have in view.

I should also deem it an especial honour if the Prime Minister, as evincing his approval, would consent to be vice-patron of the trust.

While the fund as a whole should be administered and money grants allotted by the executive committee—in general, proportionately to the school population of the various provinces of the Dominion—it would, I think, be desirable that the administration of the grant within the several provinces should be made by local committees, appointed under the authority of the central committee. These local committees might be composed, for example, of the military officer commanding the district, as chairman; three civil members, nominated by the Minister of Education for the province, and three military members, nominated by the Minister of Militia.

While I attach the highest importance to the advantages of physical training and elementary drill for all children of both sexes, I am particularly anxious that the especial value of military drill, including rifle shooting for boys capable of using rifles, should be constantly borne in mind. My object is not only to help to improve the physical and intellectual capabilities of the children by inculcating habits of alertness, orderliness and prompt obedience, but also to bring up the boys to patriotism and to a realization that the first duty of a free citizen is to be prepared to defend his country. The Dominion at the present time, and for many years to come, can hardly hope to be able to give so long a period of training to her military forces as by itself would suffice to make them efficient soldiers, but, if all boys had acquired a fair acquaintance while at school with simple military drill and rifle shooting, the degree of efficiency which could be reached in the otherwise short period which can be devoted to the military training of the Dominion forces would, in my opinion, be enormously enhanced.

I will only add that I should prefer that, for the present at least, the whole of the money grant should be devoted to those educational establishments which are maintained entirely out of public funds. I think, further, that the administration of the fund should be such as to enable both sexes, whether teachers or pupils, to share in the rewards, and that the allotments of money should be so made as to afford an inducement both to the teachers to instruct and to the pupils to perfect themselves in the training desired.

Believe me to be,
My dear Sir Frederick,
Very truly yours,
STRATHCONA.

In reply to this letter, I at once caused the following telegram to be sent:

Ottawa, 23rd March, 1909.

Strathcona, London.

Your letter 13th received. Gratefully accept your most generous offer to create fund for the encouragement of physical and military training in public schools of Canada. Organization outlined in your letter appears admirably adapted to attain end in view. Am forwarding by mail detailed proposals based thereon for carrying out the scheme. Hope you will consent to fund being called the Strathcona Trust for the encouragement of physical and military training in public schools. His Excellency the Governor General accepts position of patron and the Premier consents to become vice-patron.

BORDEN.

I may say, in addition that I received from His Excellency his consent to notify Lord Strathcona that he would accept the position of patron. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is here to speak for himself. He has already informed me that he will gladly accept the position of vice-patron.

In a private letter, Lord Strathcona informs me that, on hearing from me a cheque for $250,000 will be forwarded as the basis of the fund to provide the annual income of $10,000. I thought this matter to be of sufficient importance to justify me in bringing it up in this way.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I believe I shall voice the sentiments of this House, if, without losing a moment, I move that we offer our thanks to Lord Strathcona for the letter which has just been communicated to the House by the Minister of Militia. Lord Strathcona has rendered many services to Canada, but, I believe, none of greater importance than the present one. Physical education is of the greatest possible importance, and its value has never, in the history of the world, been understood as it

is now. I hope and firmly believe, that the system now initiated by Lord Strathcona, the organization which he sets on foot, will provide that, in all parts of Canada, physical training will become part of the education of the boys and girls of this country. I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. R. L. Borden:

That the thanks of the House of Commons and the people of Canada are hereby tendered to Lord Strathcona for his letter to the Minister of Militia just communicated to the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I have the very greatest pleasure in seconding the motion which the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has just proposed to the House. Lord Strathcona's offer will be received with feelings of the deepest appreciation, not only by members of this House regardless of party, but by all patriotic citizens regardless of party. This act of Lord Strathcona's is entirely in harmony with the many patriotic actions which have distinguished his wonderful career. His encouragement of physical training and of elementary drill amongst the children of the country is a most worthy object. I have no doubt whatever that this most worthy object will be stimulated to a very great degree by the foundation of this fund. I am sure that all of us earnestly hope and sincerely believe that it will be productive of all the great benefits and advantages to the people of this country which are so eloquently set forth in this letter with which Lord Strathcona has accompanied his gift.

Motion agreed to.

PORT OF OSHAWA.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), the other day, put a question, which, in part, concerned my department. I do not see the question on the paper to-day, probably because it was answered, so far as their departments were concerned, by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). I am prepared to give the answers from my department. The questions were as follows:—

1. Since taking over Oshawa harbour what officers have been appointed and what are their salaries, for duty at that harbour or in connection therewith?
2. What products have been landed at the said harbour by water route since the date referred to?
3. What duties, fees or receipts of cash have been collected by each department of the government since that date?
4. What expenditure upon the harbour or any part of it have been made by each department of the government since the date of taking over?

The answers to these questions are as follows:—

1. Wharfinger, W. T. Henry, salary $400 per annum, paid from collections; harbour master, W. T. Henry, remunerated from fees collected, remuneration not to exceed $300 per annum.
2. Coal and general merchandise.
3. The Marine and Fisheries Department has received, through the wharfinger, the following net revenue:—

1904-5	$ 804 69
1905-6	2 00
1906-7	813 94
1907-8	16 99
	$1,637 62

4. The Marine and Fisheries Department has expended the following:—

1904-5, $6.34, for inspection of scales.

1906-7, $82.88, repairs to coal cars, tramway, use of telephone, &c.

No expenditure has been made by the Department of Marine and Fisheries on the harbour or wharf.

CANADA'S SELF-DEFENCE.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called, I beg to give notice that on Monday next I will move the resolution which stands in my name, No. 2, under the heading of 'Notices of Motion,' as follows:—

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

The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner), in whose name stands the first notice of motion, has kindly given my notice precedence. I shall be very glad if the government do not interpose any unnecessary business in its way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I shall be glad to have it taken up as the first order.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk). I desire again to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that the return of correspondence between the department and Mr. F. W. Colcleugh, has not yet been brought down.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I understand that this return is almost ready. Yesterday, or the day before, I laid on the table a couple of returns in which the hon. member (Mr. Bradbury) was interested. I do not know whether they have reached him.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). Mr. Speaker, before you go into Committee of Supply, Sir, I wish to ask the government a question with reference to Bill (No. 108) respecting the saving of daylight. I am aware it is out of order to discuss the Bill at this time, but in view of the feeling which has been aroused from Vancouver to Halifax, the resolutions of boards of trade, and letters I have in my pocket, and telegrams, I desire to ask that the government place this Bill on the government orders, or else appoint a small committee to investigate the matter.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). We never have too much daylight in this country, but we have not yet daylight enough to see whether we can comply with the hon. gentleman's request.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In one sense perhaps it might be regarded as somewhat inappropriate for a parliament which does three-quarters of its work after dark, to undertake to impose legislation of this kind upon the people of the country. I remember reading a good many years ago a very interesting article by Benjamin Franklin, in which he humorously pretended to describe his astonishment at waking up at 7 o'clock in the morning, opening his windows, and discovering that there was plenty of light out of doors, and that his own room became filled with light at once. He said he had mentioned the subject to some scientific friends of his, who thought that he must be mistaken, and that the darkness had gone out of his room instead of the light having come in. It is an important matter to the people of this country to utilize daylight as much as possible, and undoubtedly there is a great deal of interest aroused in the subject which has been brought before the House by my hon. friend. A similar Bill has passed the British House of Commons, I do not know what will happen to it in the House of Peers. I do not know what would happen to this Bill if we should pass it and let it reach our own House of Peers. But it would seem to me that the request which the hon. gentleman has made of the government is worthy of consideration, and I trust the Prime Minister will endeavour to secure daylight enough before the end of the present week to make some announcement to the House with regard to it.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. Before you go on, is it intended to take up the supplementaries?

Mr. FIELDING. We will take up the supplementaries, giving precedence to the Minister of Public Works, who happens to have the largest block.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. FOSTER. Speaking generally, if it were not for some other considerations, I should object to the Minister of Public Works going on with any further estimates until he has filled the orders of the House. But I will not object to the supplementaries because of the understanding we have had with the Finance Minister. But I give the minister warning that when we come to the others, he will have difficulty in getting through any Public Works estimates until he fills the orders of the House. I have an idea that he is simply jollying the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very much surprised that my hon. friend should imagine that for a moment. I am much obliged to my hon. friend for not raising an objection now.

Public buildings—Ottawa parliament buildings—additions and alterations—further amount required, $40,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is required to make provision for carrying on works under contract in connection with the parliament buildings, up to the 31st of the present month. These works are in connection with the additions and alterations which the committee are familiar with. It includes also the construction of a new upper story and a roof on the tower which forms a portion of the residence of the Speaker. The total amount paid is $244,366.66 upon the new addition, and the amount due is $126,-321.01. Then in connection with the old building there is still due $4,867.32; that makes a total of $131,188.33. This amount we are now asking for will be required to complete payments up to the 31st of March.

Mr. FOSTER. This is all for changes and additions to this building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, including quite an amount in connection with the old building.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the total expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total amount is $447,732.94.

Mr. FOSTER. Of that, what is the amount for furnishings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been paid for renewal of windows, lumber, hardware, painting, carpets and mattings, $40,555. For furniture, mantels, furnishings, painting, papering, dishes, silverware, &c., there has been paid $313.88 and there is due $9,-282.85.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole will amount to a little less than $10,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is above, below, around and about; that is all?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That includes everything.

Ottawa—Royal Mint—refinery, guardhouse gates, &c., $6,300.

Mr. MACDONELL. I think the committee is entitled to a little more information regarding the operation of this costly undertaking known as the Mint. The Mint has not been a success in the matter of paying its way or making any revenue to the government. It seems to me that the Mint should at least pay its way and do something better. It should actually earn money as it does in other countries. There are some curious facts in connection with the operation of this department of the government. I think the minister should explain just how it is that during the calendar year 1907, the year before the Mint commenced to operate, the government imported from the Royal Mint over $1,000,000 in silver.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have sent for my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) because my hon. friend's questions appertain to his department and he will be here in a few minutes. In the meantime I will explain the items of this vote of $6,300. It is to cover the balance due for materials provided for the Royal Mint, the guard-house gates, &c. This is for hardware, electrical supplies, weighing machinery and machinery for the Mint generally. The total amount required to complete the payment of the accounts rendered is $6,190.71. We are asking for $6,300. I have here a detailed statement of the accounts which I will read to the committee if desired.

Mr. FOSTER. For this amount?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. There is due for hardware to Workman & Co., the McDougall Hardware Company, Charleson & Butterworth, $350.26; for electrical supplies there is due $1,392.80. There are quite a number of other accounts due for articles such as weighing machinery, amounting to $1,908.70, and then there are some ten or twelve small accounts altogether making $6,190.71.

Mr. MACDONELL. I understand that there is a return to be brought down in connection with this matter and that a motion will probably be made. Therefore, the matter may stand for further consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All right.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total cost of the Mint to date?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to the 31st December last the cost has been $530,233.88. That includes the site.

Mr. FOSTER. And the payments still to be made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $6,190.71.

Public buildings, N.B., St. John quarantine station, Partridge island, water service, &c.—additional amount, $6,200.

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to pay for work in connection with the water service. The work has been done under the direction of the resident engineer at St. John. Since the pipe was originally laid there have been several breaks in it and considerable work has been done. As my hon. friend is aware, Partridge island is some little distance from the mainland and this pipe is laid on the ground under the bay.

Mr. FOSTER. And connects with the water system in St. John?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been the whole cost of the service?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The following amounts have been paid:

Prior to—		
1904	excavating..	$ 4,067 74
1904-5	"	8,299 73
1905-6	"	20,920 15
1906-7	"	13,000 29
1907-8	"	8,796 89
1908-9	to Jan. 31, excavating.	7,652 72

Then there was a payment to Harvey Ring for loss sustained by reason of his weir being interfered with by the laying of the pipe of $2,400. There was a reference and upon the finding and the evidence given it was decided to pay him that amount. That makes a total of $65,138.72.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister just briefly say what he has to show for that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have a fresh water supply.

Mr. FOSTER. Never mind the supply, but tell us what you have.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a trench excavated from the mainland to Partridge island and the pipe was laid in the trench. Then, upon the mainland, there would be a pipe laid to connect with the city service.

Mr. FOSTER. Where?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From St. John street in the parish of Lancaster adjoining the city.

Mr. CROCKET. Was this work done under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it was done by day's labour. The water is carried to the island by a cast-iron main pipe from the main pipe of the city service at St. John street, Lancaster, down to Fort Dufferin, and from there across to Partridge island.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, on Partridge island what have you?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The water is distributed to the different buildings throughout the island.

Mr. FOSTER. In surface pipes?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course the main pipe would be laid underground to the different buildings. There are quite a number of buildings upon Partridge island and then there would be the ordinary services to the different houses.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this the end of the appropriations for this service?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is unless some accident should happen, for instance by the bursting of pipes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister the length and dimensions of the pipe?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I have not that information with me.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there a departmental estimate of the cost of this service before the work was undertaken?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect has no estimate; it was done under the direction of the engineer at St. John. He has no memorandum here of any estimate.

Mr. CROCKET. Was a work of that magnitude done by day's labour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have had a great deal of trouble with the pipe by reason of its bursting and leaks occurring from time to time and the work has been carried on from year to year by day's labour.

Mr. CROCKET. Who was in charge as foreman?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the name of the foreman here. This was some years ago. I will get him the names of the different foremen during construction and repairs.

Mr. CROCKET. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. When was this work commenced?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1903 or 1904.

Mr. BLAIN. I cannot see any justification for the minister proceeding with a work costing $65,000 without asking for tenders and without even an estimate to the department of the cost. Does not my hon. friend see that this afforded an opportunity for a good deal of political support to his party in a city like St. John?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend misunderstood me. I said the chief engineer could not give any estimate and had no memorandum because it was engineering work done under direction of Mr. Shewan, the resident engineer at St. John; but I presume there was an estimate which would be in my department. As that estimate was made three or perhaps five years ago I would not have it with me, but I will have it looked up if my hon. friend desires.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. How did the payment for a work costing $65,000 performed by day's labour in direct contravention of the statutes pass the Auditor General's Department? The statute says that work over a certain amount shall be let by contract and there has been great neglect by the Auditor General's Department if it has allowed a payment of this kind in direct violation of the statute.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think my hon. friend is right in saying that this was a violation of the statute. I am free to say that if I had to do that work to-day and anticipated it would cost anything like what it has cost, I would feel that, if it were possible to anticipate the conditions, tenders should be called for and the work let by contract, but it was begun some five years ago and it was never anticipated that it would cost nearly as much as it has. It has been carried on from year to year and there have been breaks in the pipe.

Mr. J. HAGGART. If it was commenced five or six years ago the minister's responsibility is hereditary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and of course the statute is not so imperative as my hon. friend intimates. There are cases in which the statute says work may be done by day's labour. I presume that at that time it was thought better to do it in that way.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Then we have a new interpretation of the Act by the minister that he is to decide whether work is to be done by tender or by day's labour. I never heard any doubt about the interpretation of the statute, unless the work is of such a character that it cannot be done by day's labour and then you get an order in council and state the emergency upon which the order was founded. There is no order in council in this case and no reason has been assigned here for doing it by day's labour.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a most suggestive item. This was simply a question of the laying of sufficient pipe from the water supply in the City of Carleton across to Partridge Island at no great distance. A certain quality and length of pipe was necessary and sufficient excavation was required to put it beneath the frost line so far as the mainland is concerned and a trench in which to lay it on the bottom of the harbour between the mainland and Partridge island. Once on Partridge is-

land and you have simply to distribute the water in small pipes to a number of buildings there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All through rock of course.

Mr. FOSTER. For that service up to date $65,000 has been expended. There has been no tender, contract or estimate so far as this House has been made aware, there is no order in council authorizing the minister to pay out his money for construction by day's labour rather than by tender and contract, and yet very much more than $5,000 has been expended each year. The expenditures for the different years run $8,000, $21,000, $13,000, $8,000, $7,000 and now we have this vote of $6,200. Whether this is comprised in the $7,000 I do not know but it seems plain and clear that the minister has violated the law absolutely, that he and his predecessors have taken the matter absolutely into their own hands and have done just as they pleased directly in the face of a statute passed to regulate these matters. In each of these years they paid out more than $5,000 without order in council, the only way in which it could be legally done, even supposing the ground is sufficient to warrant that method. I think we must look further into this than we have. The minister incidentally remarked that they had a great deal of trouble with pipes bursting. Why, if reasonable care was taken, was it not possible to buy the proper kind of pipe and to lay it so that it would not burst the year it was laid down or the year after, or the first year it is put in operation? Ordinary care in the selection and laying of the pipe would surely prevent this kind of breakage. The work has been performed without tender or contract, absolutely in the teeth of the law.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will agree that the repairs would have to be done without tender as it was not possible to ascertain what the cost of the repairs would be.

Mr. FOSTER. No one would object to that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no objection to any inquiry and I presume the Public Accounts Committee have had the past expenditures before them in different years.

Mr. CROCKET. From whom was the pipe purchased, and how much of this money was expended for labour and how much for material, and were tenders asked for the pipe and other materials?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have the information the next time we are in committee.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it a common practice for the departments to obtain orders in council from the government to construct public works, or is it rather a rare practice?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know how it was under my predecessors. The present practice is as far as possible to call for tenders, but if there are cases in which, though the amount is over $5,000, it is considered by the engineer or the architect to be better in the public interest that the work should be done by day labour, a recommendation is made to council setting forth the peculiar circumstances, and if council approves, authority is obtained to proceed with the work. Those occasions are rare, because most of the work is tendered for.

Mr. BLAIN. Since the hon. gentleman has been in charge of the department, have any orders in council of that kind been obtained?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there have been some.

Mr. CROCKET. Does not the statute provide that in all cases, when the amount exceeds $5,000, tenders must be called for, except in cases of urgency?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. It is not limited to cases of urgency. I think there are three provisions in the statute. If, in the opinion of the minister, and council concurs in that opinion, the work can be better done in the public interest by day labour than by contract, it may be so done.

St. John immigrant building—fitting up and furnishing Martello building for use as additional combined hospital and home, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is chiefly for hospital beds and other fittings adapted to hospitals.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this the first appropriation for that purpose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the first special vote for it, but I am under the impression that there was something expended last year.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this pay the whole cost of furnishing, with what has been voted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the cost of the building itself?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not purchased the building. We rent it for $1,673.50 a year.

Mr. CROCKET. From whom was it rented?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Messrs. Brannen. It used to be a large hotel, called the Martello hotel.

Grosse Isle quarantine station—disinfecting apparatus, including building, $1,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the expenditure.

Mr. AMES. What system of disinfecting apparatus did you put in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The French system called Dehâitre Laveuse Desinfecteuse.

Mr. AMES. Is it portable or stationary?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is permanently installed. Then, we have a formaldehyde machine.

Mr. AMES. Is this imported?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a French machine, which we imported direct.

Mr. AMES. Were any commissions paid to any Canadian?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We imported it direct, without any payment to any intermediary.

Montreal—examining warehouse (old)—new roof, alterations to freight elevators, repairs, &c.—to provide for interest accrued at 5 per cent per annum on delayed payments of accounts rendered by Jos. Thibault for material supplied and work performed, $500.

Mr. AMES. Why was the account delayed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A fire took place, and we had to make the repairs immediately, and we had not sufficient money available to pay the contractors.

Mr. AMES. Was not the government able to raise the necessary money to pay Jos. Thibault as he did the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend understand that I might have $10,000,000 available for different buildings, and if I owed $10 in respect to a particular building for which there was no appropriation, I could not pay it.

Mr. AMES. Then I understand that the minister ordered this work to be done when there was no money available?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building was burned, and this work had to be done. We had some money available, but not enough.

Quebec citadel—Governer General's quarters — repairs, furniture, &c. — additional amount, $11,600.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the balance due for the alterations and additions which were made in view of the reception of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, during the Tercentenary celebration.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How much did it cost altogether?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $36,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the hon. minister give the items? I am not objecting to proper expenditure being made, but I do not see how $36,000 could have been expended. It looks as if this public function was taken advantage of, as such functions generally are, by a number of hangers-on for the purpose of spoils.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not in this case. I can give the items. Carpentering and plumbing, new extension next to the river for bath room and servant's quarters, $6,000; closing up opening between the governor's quarters and the officer's quarters, $75; repairing roof of His Excellency's bedroom, $50; new porch at front door, $300; new deck on the terrace, $850; changing location of wine cellar, $25; repairing windows and drawers, $100; bath room next to officers' quarters, $25; fitting room adjoining His Excellency's old room with bath, $275; drainage, $500. The question of drainage gave us a good deal of concern. We had to make it perfectly satisfactory in order to suit those who were looking after the arrangements for the reception of His Royal Highness. Painting windows and doors, $250; papering bedrooms, $100. I am reading the estimates of the chief architect, who went over every thing very carefully.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Has the work not been done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Why not give the actual accounts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will see that where there was a contract let for a lot of different things, the contract will be for a lump sum, and I am giving the details so that the House may judge whether the amount was more than reasonable. Six bedrooms carpeted with 40 yards of carpet each, $660; carpeting front hall, $100; carpeting office, $100; carpeting drawing room, $300; curtaining six bedrooms, $300, and another six, $150; covering with chintz five sofas, one couch and six easy chairs, $225.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. What has become of all these couches and chairs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are all there. Furnishing four bedrooms with brass beds, new furniture, &c., at $500 each; writing table in His Excellency's study, $100; two writing tables in front office, $150; range and gas stove in still room, $120; chairs for dining room, $680; fitting up bathroom for His Royal Highness, and tiling it, $1,400; repairs to old furniture, $150; new windows, $150. Then we had to alter the stairs and the basement. Furnishing plate glass mirror, also some other plate glass, $1,275; graded plumbing, &c., $500; flooring under and over the latrines over the supper room, built in concrete, $350; hot

water heater, connections, &c., $200; cleaning stables, $100; fixing up the garage for automobiles, $500.

I explained that I was giving the estimates made by the chief architect, who went to Quebec and went over the ground as carefully as he could. The committee will bear in mind that the work had to be done somewhat hurriedly. We made contracts as far as we could, but some of the work could not be done by contract. The cost ran about $7,000 over what the chief architect had estimated—his estimate was $25,000 and it actually cost $32,000. There are other accounts in addition coming to $4,000, making the total expenditure about $36,000. I have not the data before me to show how much each of these items exceeded the estimate.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I don't want any more.

Mr. FOSTER. Who had charge of the work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Hutchison, the clerk of works at Rideau Hall. He went down and devoted his personal attention to this work at Quebec.

Mr. EDWARDS. Did I understand that of this total $6,000 was for the extension of closets?

Mr. PUGSLEY. One of the items I gave was a new extension for bathrooms and servants quarters, $6,000. We called for tenders and the lowest tender received was $6,800 and the contract was let to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. BLAIN. How much of this $36,000 was spent under contract after public call for tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will see that a large part of the expenditure was for furniture, and for that we did not publicly call for tenders. Mr. Hutchison was instructed to get prices from the different merchants and suppliers and to deal with those who gave the lowest prices.

Mr. J. D. REID. How is it that in all these cases of public works the cost exceeds the architect's estimates ? I have hardly ever heard of a public building, since I came into this House, but the cost exceeded by from 25 to 100 per cent the estimate of the architect. The effect of this kind of thing is to deceive the committee in the passing of these estimates. We are now voting money for buildings in different parts of the Dominion, and next year we shall find that the cost is greater than the architect's estimate. It seems to me that the architect of the department is liable to censure in having the minister state to us that a certain work can be done for a certain amount, and we find out, when it is too late, that the architect is wrong. I see it stated that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) himself is going to build an apartment building here. I am glad of it, for it is a necessary thing in Ottawa. But when the hon. gentleman gets an estimate from the architect, I think he will see to it that the work does not exceed that estimate, or somebody will be held responsible. There is something wrong in the department when an architect will thus underestimate expenditures. He should not be allowed to retain his position if he is going to make estimates which mislead the committee on every public work that is undertaken.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) does not desire to do injustice to the chief architect, but certainly he has done him a grave injustice by the statement he has made. Does the hon. gentleman realize the force of what he has said? He says that in not a single instance has it been shown that the cost has not exceeded the estimate of the chief architect. He is entirely in error as to that.

Mr. J. D. REID. Name one case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman states that in this case the contract entered into exceeded the estimate by 25 per cent. The hon. gentleman is mistaken only to the extent of about 100 per cent. The estimate was $6,000; and had this been exceeded by 25 per cent, the cost would have been $7,500. As a matter of fact, it was $6,809.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did not I understand the minister to say that the total amount estimated for the work to be done was $25,000, and that the actual cost was $32,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is taking everything.

Mr. J. D. REID. I take the whole contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me give another instance in which the hon. gentleman is astray. The chief architect's estimate of the cost of the Museum was $1,250,000. Tenders were publicly called for, and the lowest tender was $950,000, which was $300,000 less than the chief architect's estimate.

Mr. OSLER. That was as bad the other way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. REID) says that the estimate is always lower than the cost; in this case it was $300,000 higher.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the Museum completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not completed, but the contractor is completing his contract under his tender of $950,000, and completing it, I may say, in a most satisfactory and creditable manner. Now during the past year I have had the curiosity to compare

the estimates of the chief architect with the lowest tenders which have been received from time to time, and I have been struck with the fact that in the majority of cases the estimate of the chief architect has been very close to the amount of the lowest tender, or it has been a little above the lowest tender. If my hon. friend is a member of the Public Accounts Committee, and if he will look at the contracts entered into during the past year, he will be surprised, and I think he will feel like withdrawing the imputation he has made upon the competency of the chief architect.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not withdraw one word I have said. I have been here for a number of years, and I have never yet known an instance where the minister came down with an estimate of a certain amount for a public building, that it has not been exceeded. Take this museum. Will the minister state how much has been paid out on that contract? He states now that the contract was given for less than the amount estimated by the architect.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amount paid out upon the contract has been on progress estimates, retaining 10 per cent, and when the work is finished it will be done for the $950,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. No extras?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No extras that I am aware of. Taking the work for which the chief architect made his estimate, and on which he called for tenders, the contract is being completed by Mr. Goodwin for $950,000. I do not say, mind you, that $950,000 is not very much less than the work is likely to cost, because the next tenderer was some $300,000 or $350,000 above Mr. Goodwin's, which was very close to the chief architect's estimate. But Mr. Goodwin is finishing his work under his contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. When a government building like this museum is to be erected, the architect should be able to give an estimate including everything that is to be done in connection with the building, so that when the contractor hands it over, it will be completed without any extras whatever. But in every single case, in order to let the contractor out, in order that there may be unfair profits, there are extras added, and although the estimate made by the architect is said to include every thing, in every single case the work costs more than the original estimate. This museum that the minister says will not cost more than $950,000——

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the building?

Mr. J. D. REID. Whatever was to be done to that museum. As I understand it, when the plans were made out the estimate thereon meant that it should complete the building, everything that would be required. Yet we will see when the whole work is completed whether the words of the minister will turn out to be correct. I venture to say that when the whole work is completed, and the final statement is in the Auditor General's Report, we will find it will cost very much more. It is stated there will be extras, and so on. Surely, when a man is making out an estimate for a public building it should include everything. Why should there be extras to the amount of 25 per cent or 50 per cent more on every building that is being erected for the government? Will the minister mention one single building erected for the government where there were not extras, and where the people had not to pay more than they should for the building? No private individual would think of giving a contract for any building, with the expectation of extras coming in such as come in here in every single instance I do not take back one word of what I said before. Not only in the Public Works Department, but in every other department, these enormous extras are added to the original estimate. I say it is deceiving the committee, it is deceiving the members of this House, for any minister to come here and state that a certain work is going to cost a certain amount, and then afterwards tell us that there are some unforeseen expenses, or some extras have to be added, by which the estimated cost has been exceeded 25, 50 or 100 per cent. I claim that a minister should compel his architect to state what that building is going to cost, and if he does not know his business well enough to make plans and specifications for everything that will be required in that building so that there will be no extras, he is not fit to occupy his position.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is now shifting his ground. The hon. gentleman was finding fault before with the chief architect because he was astray in his estimates, evidently implying that he was not capable of estimating what would be the cost of the building. Now what the hon. gentleman says is that all these things in addition to the building, such as heating, plumbing, electrical wiring and lighting, should be included in the chief architect's estimate.

Mr. J. D. REID. I never said that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, what the hon. gentleman now says is that we often find that when these things come in afterwards they add to the cost of the building as originally given. That would not reflect at all on the chief architect, that is a matter

that must depend on the judgment of the minister and the policy of the department. If the minister tells the chief architect to prepare his plans and specifications in the first instance in such a way that the tenders should include everything, should include the heating, should include the electrical wiring, should include the lighting, and all the fixtures of every kind and description, then the chief architect would follow out those directions and he would ask for tenders accordingly. I may say to my hon. friend that in my opinion, so far as possible, it is desirable that that should be done, and since I have been minister, after consulting with my deputy, I have decided that in future, as I have done already in a number of cases, everything shall be included, so far as possible ; the contract shall include all these various things in connection with the building, in order that when it is taken off the hands of the contractor, the heating, plumbing, wiring, fittings and so forth shall be completed as well. In the case of the museum, my hon. friend is entirely wrong in saying that the cost will be different from what was estimated by the chief architect. His estimate was that the building just as it is now being constructed by the contractor under his contract, would cost $1,250,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are there any extras?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does my hon. friend mean? Does he mean heating, electrical wiring, fixtures?

Mr. J. D. REID. No, I mean the original contract for the building. Have there been any extras added to that?

Mr. PUGSLEY No, there have been no alterations in the original contract, no extras in that sense. There may be other work to be done, there will be other work to be done, there will be electrical wiring, perhaps some drains to be dug, plumbing work which must be included. But there will be no extras in the sense in which they are ordinarily understood as between the contractor and the owner, where the contract has been altered, or things have been forgotten and extra work has to be done. If the contract does not call for heating, electric wiring, electric fixtures or gas fixtures and they are to be provided afterwards I would not call those things extras. I would call an extra something that we are supposed to include and provide for in the contract but which has not been provided for in the contract and which it is afterwards found necessary to provided for. You should no more call electric wiring, heating and plumbing extras than to call furniture that you afterwards put into your house an extra. If you have not provided for it in the contract it is not an extra at all in the sense that my hon. friend has spoken of it.

Mr. J. D. REID. When we have had different estimates going through this House in the past we have been told that the amount that was estimated for included wiring, heating and so on, and in the end it turned out that it would not include these things.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is wrong in that.

Mr. J. D. REID. There are instances that I can turn up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think my hon. friend can.

Mr. J. D. REID. We will take this case of the museum. If it was not intended that wiring and heating should be included I would not consider them to be extras, but even with respect to an original contract we have had extras added and the cost has turned out to be twenty-five to fifty per cent more than the original estimate. Of course, we do not know anything about the museum just now, but next year we will have it up because then the building will be completed. I am glad to have had this discussion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad my hon. friend is not always unreasonable.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not want to be unreasonable. My hon. friend states that this building will only cost the amount of the contract $900,000 odd.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is what is contracted for.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister states that there will be no extras beyond the contract. Next year we will see whether there have been any extras. There are usually some changes made, but in this case the minister states that there have been no changes whatever and that there will be no extras whatever on that building; in fact that there will be nothing to pay over and above the amount of the original contract, $900,000, except for the wiring and heating ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that. I said there would be nothing extra to pay for the work that is provided for in the contract. There has been a change made in the tower but that had the effect of reducing the cost instead of increasing it. Do not let my hon. friend misunderstand me. In so far as the plan and specifications call for the work to be done I am not aware that there will be any addition to the cost.

Mr. J. D. REID. Have there been any changes in the original plans for the museum which will entail any extras when the work is finally completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. None.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, that bears out what I have stated. When the final statements are submitted and paid by the Auditor General there will not be anything more paid than what the contract calls for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is on the contract, but do not let my hon. friend say that the making of drains and the putting in of electric lighting are included in the contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. Drains and so on are outside of the contract, but what the minister states now is that there have been no changes made in the original plan or in the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will add to the cost.

Mr. J. D. REID. There have been no changes in the plan and no extras added to the museum; so that we will understand that when the final accounts are paid there will be no extras whatever charged against that building unless it be for wiring, heating, drains or something out of the building altogether.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Outside of the contract?

Mr. J. D. REID. No, outside of the building; never mind the contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the hon. gentleman making the statement or am I?

Mr. J. D. REID. You are.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The information I have from the chief architect is that there have been no changes made in the contract which will in any way add to the cost, but I do not consider that the work which has been done outside of the contract comes within the category of my hon. friend.

Mr. BARR. Is the original contractor doing the wiring and plumbing or is that work let to another?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plumbing is in the contract.

Mr. BARR. But the electrical wiring is not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BARR. Would not that have to be done before the plastering is done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes it will be.

Mr. BARR. Then the contract is not let yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. As far as I understand it, the contract included the plastering, plumbing, and everything complete except the electrical wiring and heating. Am I right in that, or does it include the electrical wiring?

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid I must interrupt the hon. member (Mr. J. D. Reid). The item before the committee is the item of the Quebec citadel The museum may be referred to as a matter of illustration but a long or detailed discussion about it would not be in order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would be glad to answer my hon. friend if you will allow me, Mr. Chairman. The contract includes the erection of the building, painting, plastering, plumbing and everything except electric wiring, heating, fitting and furniture. There may be decorations which would be in addition. Carving, if there is to be any, would be an addition.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think the chairman is right in his ruling as far as the discussing of this item is concerned, but when these estimates are going through at different times there is always an understanding that some item shall be left on which we can discuss other items. If we are to be held down to the rule so that we cannot discuss anything but the item that is submitted at the time I think we had better have an understanding and then the items can be allowed to stand. The minister was kind enough, when these items were going through the other night to state that we could discuss any item on another item that was reserved. I submit now that if you hold us down to this rule it will make it rather awkward if we allow the item to go through upon such an understanding.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think perhaps that what took place was that my hon. friend wished to discuss the rents of the buildings in Ottawa and also the accounts for telephones. It was understood that he might discuss those. But my hon. friend will see that it would be somewhat inconvenient if, on a discussion of items in the supplementary estimates, my hon. friend should enter upon a general discussion of some other building in regard to which there is nothing in these estimates, and in respect to which I would not, of course, have any information to render to the committee. But, I will be very glad indeed to give any information on any building that my hon. friend wants if he will give me notice. I am prepared to give any information in regard to telephones and rents.

Mr. J. D. REID. I admit that the minister is right, but in this particular case I think the minister will admit that it was he who introduced this museum, that it was not I and that therefore I am not responsible for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I introduced it as an illustration.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Chairman was calling me to order because I was discussing the museum. The minister should

be called to order for introducing it and not me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is all right now.

Quebec immigration detention hospital in Savard Park, for patients suffering from trachoma and kindred diseases—to provide for balance due on contract for building sewers, fencing, sidewalks, &c., $2,400.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is to pay the balance due on the work specified in the item. The work is being done by Jinchereau & Lamonde, the lowest tenderers.

Mr. AMES. What is the amount of the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $55,850.

Mr. J. D. REID. How many tenders were received?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not a memorandum of the number of tenders.

Mr. AMES. What was to be done for the $55,850?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building is two storeys high, of brick, with a stone basement, 147 feet long by 57 feet broad, exclusive of the verandahs, which are 10 feet in width, one extending the full length of the building in front, and the full length of one end. The verandahs are two storeys in height. There is a projection from the main verandah 19 feet by 10 feet. The basement extends under the verandah which is supported on stone foundations. The basement floor contains dining room, kitchen, laundry, fuel and furnace room and store room. The ground floor contains wards, living rooms, bathroom, &c., and on the first floor there are wards, living apartments, laboratories, operating room, &c. The materials throughout the building are mostly fireproof.

Mr. PERLEY. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. PERLEY. What will that make the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including the site it would be about $87,000.

Mr. PERLEY. The minister said the contract was $55,850. What is the balance made up of?

Mr. PERLEY. The Savard property was bought for $14,000 and some additional land for $5,000. If you add the heating, &c., and some additional work in connection with operating room, &c., and some sewer pipes, costing $3,718, I think it will run up pretty well to the amount named.

Mr. AMES. Were there any extras in the contract for the $55,850.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect says not so far as he remembers.

Mr. AMES. What was the original estimate for this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would naturally not have that information with me to-day as the building is completed, and this is to pay the balance. The estimate would appear in the memorandum of two or three years ago but I shall get the information.

Mr. J. D. REID. The item might stand until we learn what the original estimate of the architect was. This is a good illustration of the point I brought up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a good illustration of my contention. The contract was for $55,850. That did not include the heating apparatus, hospital beds, certain sewer pipes that had to be provided, and certain work in connection with the fitting up of the operating room.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister has not stated the original estimate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, because I have not that here. That, of course, would be presented on the first vote for an appropriation for the building.

Sherbrooke drill hall—amount due for contract and additional works, $42,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We did not anticipate last year that the contractors would proceed so rapidly with their work. They have got along much more rapidly than we anticipated and this amount is necessary if we are to pay them before the close of the present fiscal year. I anticipated last year, from the best information I could get from the chief architect, that we would not require this money until next year but they have gone on much more rapidly than we expected.

Mr. AMES. How much of this is due for the contract and how much for additional work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is all due the contractor. The reason it says in the item 'for additional works' is that the vote is taken in that way until the building is completed.

Mr. AMES. What additional work do you expect to have outside the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There will be heating and boilers, electrical wiring and fittings, furniture, sidewalks and fencing.

Mr. AMES. How much of the $42,000 is required for the contract and how much for additional work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The whole amount for the contract.

Mr. AMES. The contractor may do additional work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He may, of course.

Mr. AMES. How much of this is required on the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is on the main contract, the $42,000.

Mr. AMES. The minister said it was due for the contract and additional works. How much is for the contract and how much for additional work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said this is the way we are taking the vote so the vote will appear that way until the building is finally completed, and out of that we could take an amount for heating but I do not intend to do that out of this vote; we intend to pay this entirely to the contractor on account of his contract for the building.

Mr. AMES. What is the amount of his contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $82,500.

Mr. AMES. How much has already been paid on it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $18,960.

Mr. AMES. Then this $42,000 will not complete the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. AMES. The minister expects that all this $42,000 will go to the contractor for the work he has already under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. The contract calls for $82,000 and the minister is asking for $87,000 this year, besides which he got $20,000 last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total probable cost is $112,658.17.

Mr. FOSTER. That leaves about $30,000 to make up. What is that for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The difference is for heating and boilers, electric wiring, fittings and furnishings, sidewalks and fences, contingencies and superintendence, the site, legal expenses, printing, advertising, &c.

Kingston artillery park — new gun-shed, $1,200.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the work.

Mr. EDWARDS. What is the character of that building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a one-story wooden building, 111 feet long by 32 feet wide, covered by galvanized iron shingles, and the front and end walls covered with galvanized iron clap-boards underlaid with resinous paper. The lowest tender was $3,475 and the contingencies were $225, making the total probable cost $3,700. We had an appropriation for the current year of $2,500, leaving a balance of $1,300.

Strathcona public building — additional amount, $5,600.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the payment for the site.

Mr. AMES. What was the total cost of the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $10,500.

Mr. AMES. From whom was it purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Dr. S. Archibald.

Mr. AMES. Was he the agent or the owner?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The owner.

Nanaimo public building—fittings, &c., $500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for fittings, post office boxes and grills.

Mr. AMES. Are the fittings for these buildings in the west all bought from the Office Specialty Company in Ottawa? I notice that nearly all the post offices in the west are fitted up by this company. Has the government not a general contract with that company under which fittings are provided?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are two concerns in the business in Canada and we ask for prices from both of them, and let the contract to the lowest tenderer.

Dawson—Yukon commissioner's residence, $4,200.

This is to complete the payments.

Mr. FOSTER. What is being done there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will perhaps remember that the governor's residence was practically destroyed by fire and we have rebuilt it. The estimated cost of taking down the damaged portion of the building and rebuilding the same was $21,929; furnishings, $10,000; heating, plumbing and electric wiring, $8,000; contingencies $3,271; making a total of $43,200. We have had appropriations of $38,999.21, and require $4,200.79 to pay the balance.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the size of the house?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was erected eight years ago. It is a two story building, 55 x 50, with an L to it. It is finished in British Columbia fir, heated with hot air and lighted with electricity.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the hon. minister manage to bestow $11,000 worth of furniture?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It may be cut down somewhat. It is bought in Victoria and

Vancouver, and the freight charges are very heavy. That is the estimate of Mr. Bertrand, who is our agent at Dawson.

Mr. FOSTER. $10,000 on furniture is a pretty big item for a moderate residence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the official residence of the governor, and I am inclined to think that if my hon. friend were in Dawson, and began to get in furniture for a good sized dwelling, suitable for Government House, it would take him the greater part of $10,000.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. What is the population of the Yukon, including the Indians —about 3,500 is it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Ottawa public buildings—repairs, including ventilation and lighting, furniture, &c.—additional amount, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make additional provision for the wages of the clerk of works, mechanical engineers' staff engaged in remodelling the plumbing, improvement of ventilation, also for repairs and other supplies.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total appropriation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $175,000. The total expenditure up to the 24th March, was $163,412.18. Then there is additional expenditure for the balance of the month, clerk of works staff, $4,000; mechanical engineers, $2,000; outstanding accounts, $19,700; purchase of materials, lumber, paints, oil, glass, &c., and such ready-made furniture as cannot be constructed in government work shops, $5,879.36; probable requirements to end the fiscal year, $195,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of staff has the hon. gentleman?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that we could not get along very well with less. The chief architect is the head in charge of the work, but we have a superintendent of buildings, Mr. Shearer, who is a very competent and careful man. He is very careful with regard to applications for increases of salaries, and with regard to taking on additional men. I really think his staff is not larger than necessary, and the salaries are very moderate.

Mr. FOSTER. How many men?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 230. This takes in not only these buildings but all the departments.

Ottawa public buildings, grounds—additional amount, $4,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What does this make for grounds altogether?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am afraid I cannot give the details as fully as I would like because I got rather short notice to get ready the information as to these supplementaries. So far as the $4,000 is concerned, there are unpaid accounts, $1,086, of which I have the details, running from $1.45 up to $678. Wages for February and March, $450; tools, repairs, &c., $215.40 ; pay-lists which the accountant has already paid, $2,048.

Mr. FOSTER. How are the grounds taken care of—by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By day's work under a foreman.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has the supervision of the men?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Shearer is in charge and there is a foreman under him.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it part of Mr. Shearer's work to go around occasionally and see that the men are doing their work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, he has the superintendence of all the men.

Mr. FOSTER. Has his attention been called to the artistic work being done in the vicinity of the front entrance to the pathway up to the buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend mean opening the ditches?

Ottawa public buildings—heating, including salaries of engineers, firemen and watchmen—additional amount, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The vote required was $10,000. Probable estimated expenditure: wages, $5,100 per month, for two months, $10,200; gas for heating, &c., at $400 per month, for two months, $800; paid Heney & Co. for fuel, February and March, $17,-500.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, after public tender. Making a total of $28,500, less the balance of February 10, of $18,400, leaving $10,-000 to be provided.

Ottawa public buildings—gas and electric light, including roads and bridges—additional amount, $17,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total amount required is $53,000 to the end of the month. The vote was $36,000. The accounts of the Ottawa Electric Company on hand, $7,314. Then for the quarter ending March 31, $7,300; lighting the Imperial Realty Company building to 31st March, $2,500; lighting roads and bridges, balance of six months, $910. Total, $18,024.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that include rent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the arrangements for lighting?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We pay a flat rate of $2.25 per lamp up to three thousand lamps, and $2 over that.

Mr. FOSTER. What is a lamp?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sixteen candle power.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you get at that basis?

Mr. PUGSLEY. After investigation of the charges ordinarily made by electric companies. I think the rate is a reasonable one. We have about 16,000 lights altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister paid any personal attention to the distribution of lights? Is it possible we are uneconomical in the number used?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I had occasion to inquire into the considerations which led us to make the present arrangement, and satisfy myself that the arrangement was a reasonable one. The details, of course, we must leave to our electricians, who are faithful and responsible men.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the head of the service?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Johnston is the chief electrician.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he see to it that useless lights are not used?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, he reports on every application for lights.

Mr. FOSTER. How many lights are kept burning on the average?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be difficult to tell that; lights burned in an office to-day would not be burned to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. When the winter is over, I suppose that many lamps are not used all summer long. Is $2.25 paid for every lamp that swings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Of course, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will understand that if a lamp were kept burning winter and summer on a meter rate, it would cost much more than $2 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be interesting to know how many lamps are burned eight hours a day, how many six hours a day and so on. It must be that many of them do not cost much to the contractor. Possibly you may be paying a very high rate for the light you are consuming.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a matter for careful calculation by the electrician. I have no doubt that the matter was very carefully gone into when the arrangement was made.

Mr. FOSTER. It is possible that, having made your contract, the thing is considered done—you are going it blind, as it were. But it seems to me that a man, if this were his own business, would have somebody keep pretty sharp tab on it all to find out, as nearly as he could, the power he was using, and he would revise his contract if he thought he was paying too much. Of course, he might find that he was not paying too much, and so let it run. Is the minister taking any means of checking this business, so as to have information for his own guidance and for the use of this committee? If not, I would advise him to ask his officers—he has plenty of them; some are overworked, but some are not, and he could easily choose those who would not be overburdened with the duty— to make adequate investigation of this business and furnish him with information, which, I am sure, he would like to have and which, possibly, the House may ask for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told that there is a report. There is no doubt that it would be an advantage to have the electrician go into the matter carefully from time to time and see how we are faring. I will have the report brought down and laid on the table at a convenient time.

Ottawa public buildings—elevators, attendants, additional amount, $3,800.

Mr. FOSTER. How many elevator attendants have we?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Thirty.

Mr. FOSTER. That is in all the buildings? And how many elevators?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Twenty.

Mr. FOSTER. What length of service do these attendants give each day?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the departmental buildings, ordinarily, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. In the House of Commons, from 7.30 a.m. to all hours of the night.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they paid by the year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are paid a monthly wage.

Mr. FOSTER. What pay is given them during the recess when the elevators are not being used ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We only keep one during the recess.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you pay them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. One is paid $65, one $60, and 27 of them $55 each per month.

Mr. FOSTER. Thirty days a month?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is by the month.

Mr. FOSTER. It is prety monotonous work, pretty hard work. These elevator attendants ought to have a fair renumeration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does my hon. friend think would be about the rate?

Mr. FOSTER. I would not like to do it for any rate. There is nothing very interesting about it, going up and down a shaft.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that in some cases the elevators work later than 5 o'clock. In the Privy Council building, when Council is meeting, the elevator man has to remain until 6 o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the government would not err if they paid their elevator men a fair wage.

Ottawa public buildings—telephone service —additional amount, $2,850.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like some information about the system on which telephones are furnished.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had this subject under discusion when an item was up in the main estimates, and the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) thought that the charge for residences, $35, was too much. In consequence of that remark I have made inquiry, and I find that in Ottawa the charge for private residences is $25 and for business houses and offices, $45 per year. Some years ago an arrangement was made between the government and the telephone company under which there would be one rate of $35 for residences and offices both. Of course, in the case of residences as well as offices, if there is an extra telephone such as a desk telephone, or a wall extension, there is an extra charge. I took pains to make a calculation in respect to all the office and residence telephones, and to compare the total charge at $25 and $45 with what we are paying under a flat rate of $35 all round, and I find we are effecting a saving by the present arrangement of a litle over $1,600 a year. On the 13th February we had 282 office telephones and 120 residence telephones, or a total of 402. There were some extra phones in the House of Commons, costing $235. But the total cost at a flat rate of $35 for office and residence telephones, is $16,564.25. On the subject of telephones, I have a letter from the manager of the telephone company which I think it is only right to read to the committee, and which is written in consequence of the remarks made by the hon. member for Grenville when the item of telephone service was last before the committee:

Ottawa, Feb. 26, 1909.

D. H. Keeley, Esq.,
Gen. Supt. Govt. Telegraphs,
Dept. of Public Works, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I learned this morning that the question of the rates charged for government telephone service at Ottawa has been questioned in the House of Commons. While you, of course, have all the particulars, it may be that an explanation from the company would be convenient for the department.

The regular rates charged at Ottawa for ordinary telephones and service is $45 for business and $25 for residence inside the city limits, on one year contracts. By an arrangement dating from the time of the late Mr. Gisborne the government pays on the basis of $35 a year for all telephones whether business or residence, and reserves the right to cancel any individual telephone at any time, even within a few days of the date of installation. You will see that this rate is $10 lower on business telephones and $10 higher on residence telephones than the ordinary charge, and as the government has in use more office than residence telephones, the average charge is lower than would be the case if the regular city rates were paid. Any variation from this $35 rate is because of additional or desk equipment, or on account of extra mileage outside the city limits, which is charged for at the usual extra mileage rates.

I think this explanation should correct any misapprehension existing in the minds of hon. members of the House of Commons.

Yours truly,
J. MACPHERSON,
Local Manager.

Mr. FOSTER. When was the $35 arrangement entered into?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 15 or 20 years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. What diminution in the price of the house and office phones has taken place in the city within that time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think there has been any diminution.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the minister know what the rate is with reference to a longer contract than one year? That letter mentions a yearly contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think there is no difference in the rate.

Mr. LENNOX. He specifically mentions a contract for a year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He says the government can terminate at any time, while an ordinary customer must pay by the year.

Mr. FOSTER. I have an impression that the rates for the city in the last 15 years have diminished—the minister can easily get the information. But if that be true, there ought to be an equitable and proportional diminution in the $35 rate. The company was doing business with an excellent customer, to whom they now furnish over 300 phones. If, 15 years ago, they gave that as a fair rate, and if at that time business and residence phones were higher in the city, it is only fair that they should make a proportional reduction in the present rate. The minister might look into that and see. Any way, the government is an excellent and very large cus-

tomer, there is no competition in the business, and I think the company should take the general rule of business into account that the larger the customer the greater the consideration they show in the wares they have to sell. On the other hand, what is the rule upon which these phones are distributed? There are a great many of them, and I have information which leads me to think that there are a good many which can hardly be justified. What class of officials get phones?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Answering my hon. friend's first remark, I will make inquiry as to whether there has been any change in the rates. But to-day, taking business phones at $45 and residence phones at $25, if we paid that rate, we would be paying $1,600 per year more than we do at present on the $35 rate all round.

Mr. FOSTER. My point was in regard to the proportional diminution if there has been any.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In regard to our getting a reduced rate because we are having a good many telephones, I doubt very much if we could get the telephone company to do that, because private individuals would at once complain. They would say: You are only charging the government a certain rate per year and you are charging us $5 or $10 per year more as the case might be.

Mr. FOSTER. They might say that now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they cannot say that now because it is a flat rate that we pay for offices and residences.

Mr. FOSTER. You said that you got them for $1,600 less?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that may be.

Mr. BOYCE. You are getting a compromise rate between the residence and office rate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I might say something as to the reasons for installing these telephones. It goes without saying that telephones will be put into the offices of the ministers, the deputy ministers and the various officials who would be required to be communicated with by telephone. I suppose that the hon. gentleman would rather have me say a word as to residence telephones?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, as to whether the number is required.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not install a telephone in any office unless there is a requisition endorsed by the minister of the department. I am asking in all cases that a requisition from any department shall be in the form of a request from the minister for a telephone. I think that is only right. The minister would know whether it is reasonable that there should be a telephone placed in such and such an office, and he endorses his approval on the requisition. With regard to residences, it is the same way. We have telephones in the residences of the ministers, of the deputy ministers, of the chief officials of the departments, of the secretaries of the departments, and in some cases of one of the messengers of a department. We have thought it was not unreasonable to put a telephone in the residene of the chief messenger who might be called up from time to time by his minister or some one connected with the department. I think, in a general way, that is the principle upon which we have gone.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there only one messenger's telephone?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know whether there is more than one messenger in the department who has a telephone in his residence.

Mr. FOSTER. You mean the chief messenger in each department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not the chief messenger, but the messenger who might be chosen by the minister.

Mr. FOSTER. One from each department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They do not all have them. It is only in very rare cases that there are telephones in the messenger's residence. I have a list which I will send over to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. It was claimed that the government pay as high as $50 for some telephones.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A desk extension is $15 additional.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister sure that in some of the rooms they do not have three telephones where one may do?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot think that is the case. I have had no such case brought to my notice, and in looking over the list it would not appear that such is the case. I may say that I have had requests for telephones which I have refused.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. BLAIN. I see a good many telephones in the Public Works Department down at $55 apiece.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There might be two extensions. There is a desk telephone in my own office and a desk telephone and an extension would make $55.

Rideau Hall, including grounds—improvements, furniture and maintenance—additional amount, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the estimates of last year there was $35,000. There are unpaid accounts, as per the list which I have here, running from $9 up to $469, amounting altogether to $1,397.60. Then there are for linen, $666.24, wages for February and March, $2,500, and contingencies $439.35. We have a balance on hand of $1,199. This leaves a balance of $3,801 which we require to close up the accounts to March 31.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the total expenditure on Rideau Hall to March 31?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will make the total nearly $39,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Any extraordinary improvements included in that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Any addition or improvements to Government house itself?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, just the grounds.

Mr. FOSTER. No new furniture?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there would be some dry goods, linen, curtains and glassware, but the main part of it was for improvements and maintenance. The principal part of it is for salaries, $17,000; that would be for general work about the grounds. Then we paid a little over $7,500 for dry goods, linen, curtains, glassware, crockery and kitchen ware, $1,396 for lumber, $842 for furniture, flags, and cleaning carpets and $1,698 for plants, bulbs, trees, &c.

Mr. FOSTER. $17,000 for labour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. For taking care of the grounds?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For taking care of the grounds, including the salary of clerk of works, the conservatories, &c.

Dominion public buildings—heating—additional amount, $23,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The expenditure from April 1 to December 15, 1908, was $79,500. There are contracts for coal not paid, amounting to $33,500, making a total of $113,000. There was a vote in the estimates last year of $90,000, leaving a balance of $23,000 which we are now asking for?

Arisaig harbour—repairs to wharf and breakwater, $500.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the nature of that item?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the payments according to the pay-lists and accounts not covered in the vote of $1,500 in the main estimates. I had that reduced to $1,100, stating that we would make a payment out of supplementaries for the current year.

Bailey's Brook—harbour improvements, $700.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a balance. It is for reconstructing and extending the brushwork on the east side of the harbour.

Mr. JAMESON. Does that complete the contemplated improvements?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it will complete the present extension.

Glace Bay harbour—assistance towards harbour improvements, $900.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to pay the balance.

Grand Etang—partial reconstruction of channel protection works, $3,300.

Mr. PUGSLEY I gave the particulars of this the other night to the hon. member for St. Antoine Division.

Little River harbour wharf—additional amount, $200.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to close up the year.

Mr. JAMESON. Is this in Digby?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is in Yarmouth.

Mr. JAMESON. There is a Little River in Digby for which $2,500 was in the estimate last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not here.

Mr. JAMESON. Was that omitted from the estimates because Digby returned a Conservative instead of a Liberal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does the hon. gentleman himself think?

Mr. JAMESON. I am not replying to but asking questions.

Mr. FOSTER. It is your thinker he wants to work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not thought of that at all.

Mr. BOYCE. It is a question of extreme delicacy.

Portuguese Cove breakwater—strengthening structure, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to cover overexpenditure, to finish up the payments.

Scotch Cove (White Point)—breakwater—to complete payments, $9,350.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total expenditure on that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure up to the first of January was $20,274. This amount is due the contractor. The contract is for $28,935.

South Lake, Lakevale—opening channel from lake to St. George's bay—inclusive of protection work—additional amount, $4,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I gave the full particulars of that to Mr. Ames the other night.

Mr. JAMESON. This work was undertaken before the money was provided?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a case in which, owing to an error, the amount was reduced, but it was found to be absolutely necessary work in order to protect what had already been done. The engineer went on and finished it and this is the balance.

Upper Prospect—breakwater, $250.

Mr. JAMESON. Where is this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in Halifax county.

Mr. JAMESON. Is this to complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the payments, yes.

Sandy Cove breakwater—to provide for full and final settlement of outstanding accounts for labour and materials supplied in connection with construction of breakwater in 1903-4 by contractors Hayden & Oliver, $3,945.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a case which I think I should explain to the committee. The contractors took the contract to build this breakwater. The report of the engineer is that after they had proceeded a certain distance with the work it was discovered that the soil was entirely different from what the engineer and contractors had expected it would be. The result of placing the foundation of the breakwater there was to give a certain direction to the current which began to undermine the foundation. When this was discovered, the contractors saw that to go on with the work meant inevitable loss to them and they were of the opinion that they had better forfeit their deposit and abandon their contract. The engineer encouraged them to go ahead with the work and finish it up and stated to them that he would so report to the department and ask favourable consideration. The contractors say that they understood from the engineer that he would recommend that they should be paid the actual cost of the work. He does not recollect that that took place, but he does recollect that he encouraged them to proceed with the work and does not deny that he led them to expect that the department would be likely to take an equitable view of the case. They went on and built the breakwater, doing a thoroughly good job, which is very satisfactory to the department. The result of doing the work was to bankrupt the contractors. Then the men who had done work upon the breakwater and people who had supplied materials made a claim upon the department urging that as the government had got full value for what was represented by the actual labour and materials, the government ought not to allow these men to lose their wages or the value of the material supplied.

Mr. FOSTER. When did they make their claim?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At least two years ago. The department sent an accountant in November, 1906, down to the place where the work had been done to look into these bills for wages and materials, and the accountant certified that this amount was justly due. The engineer certified that there is no question whatever but that the actual cost of the work would be represented by this balance of $3,945.08, and we have the claims actually filed with us to that amount.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the total amount of the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $12,900, but the actual cost of the work was that amount plus this $3,945. The matter came before me at the last session and I declined to recommend this claim because I felt it was establishing a precedent which might lead us into difficulties in the future, that the contractors had taken the work as being the lowest tenderers at the contract price of $12,900, that the men who did the work and supplied the materials trusted to the contractors, and that therefore, if the contractors were unable to pay, they would have to lose what they had put into the work. I declined to bring it before the House at the last session of parliament. Since that time the matter has been still further urged upon my attention, and I looked again into the report of the engineer, and I concluded that, in view of the fact that the work was honestly done and thoroughly done, if we do not pay, it means that these poor men who have worked on this public work will lose the fruit of their labour, and the men who supplied the materials will lose the price of them; and also, in view of the fact that the contractor was going to throw up his job when he encountered this unexpected condition of affairs, and was pursuaded by the engineer to go on and complete the contract with the expectation—not a very strong one, I admit—that the department would look on the matter equitably, I concluded that it was not unreasonable to ask parliament to vote this money, and I hope the committee will concur in that view.

Mr. JAMESON. To whom will the money be paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be paid to the men according to the claims filed in the department.

Dorchester wharf—addition, $5,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to build a very important extension of the wharf, some 200 feet long, 9½ feet high on the average, and 52 feet wide on the top. It is a very important work; it is under contract, and this is to complete the payments.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $17,724.83. There is a great deal of business being done there, and it is increasing. This work was necessitated by reason of the business being largely done by steamers instead of by sailing vessels.

Mr. CROCKET. Who was the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Downey & Downey, of Curryville, New Brunswick.

Richibucto harbour—to pay John Jardine, contractor, in full and final settlement of all claims in connection with his contract of November 16, 1905, for extension of breakwater-pier on the north side of harbour, $5,395.34.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is an amount which, according to the report of the resident engineer, Mr. Stead, is due to the contractor. The amount of the contract was $17,000. In October, 1908, Mr. Jardine applied for a further sum of $6,333 on the ground that he had built the extension 8 feet deeper than was shown on the contract plan. In support of his application he stated that the depth of water where the extension was built was increased by at least eight feet from the time the survey was made by the government engineer, that consequently he was obliged to supply material for the construction and extension for the entire length of the extension eight feet deeper than the plan called for. He estimated the quantity of material thus used in excess of the survey as 300 feet long by 66 feet wide by 8 feet deep, making a total of 5,866⅔ cubic yards, at $1.25 per cubic yard, making $6,333. The matter was referred to the resident engineer, who reported that the contractor was entitled to $4,583.34, and on account of the extension being larger than was required at first, to a further sum of $812, making a total of $5,395.34. The resident engineer stated that he had taken soundings outside at the end of the breakwater, that the bottom on which it rested was sand, that as the work proceeded the scour of the current around the end deepened the site of the breakwater considerably, that at the end the depth had increased five feet along the range of the outside of the work 3 to 4 feet, and along the inside from 4 to 5 feet. He therefore recommended five feet as a fair average increase in depth, so that the total increase would be 3,666⅔ cubic yards, at $1.25, making $4,583.34. He further found that the extension had been built 326 feet on the top instead of 300 feet. The contractor, expecting that the work would be continued by an extension of his contract instead of by day labour, was not particular to end the work where the plan called for it. This extension increased the cubic contents by 464 cubic yards, which, at $1.75, the contract rate, amounted to $812. That makes the total amount of this vote.

Mr. CROCKET. Are these extra amounts based on the schedule prices?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but the larger portion is at $1.25 per cubic yard, all the resident engineer would allow.

Mr. CROCKET. Was Mr. Jardine authorized or directed by any officer of the department to build this addition or extension after the letting of the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, he was not authorized to build the extension, and that is the reason the department could not pay for it, and that is why we come to parliament. It is a useful public work, and it is only right that the contractor should be paid for it.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the minister state that Mr. Jardine did this additional work without communicating with the department and getting the authority of the department to do it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is correct.

Mr. CROCKET. And then he presents a claim to the minister and asks for this extra payment?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, if parliament approves.

Mr. FOSTER. That is pretty dangerous work.

St. John river and tributaries—construction of wharfs in tidal waters—additional amount, $4,650.

Mr. CROCKET. I understand that this amount, added to the amount already voted in the main estimates, makes $19,650 for the construction of wharfs in the St. John river for the year ending the 31st March, 1909.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. I understand there were four or five wharfs ordered to be built by the department last summer in the counties of Queens and Sunbury, and that without tender or contract. Can the minister tell us what is the position with regard to these wharfs? I would like to know what the total cost of each of these is to be.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At Chase's Point, $4,110; Oromocto, $4,379; Majorville high water wharf, $4,996; Gowan's, $2,750; Rothesay, $1,964; Long Island, $869; Meaford, $543.

Total, $19,611, and the appropriation was $15,000, leaving a balance of $4,011, and we are asking for $4,075.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this appropriation complete all these wharfs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. These amounts are required to make the payments up to March 31, and I hope they will complete these works, but am not sure.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like additional information with regard to a number of wharfs for which tenders were called during October last. The minister gave a list some days ago of nine wharfs for which tenders were called on October 9. In the call for tenders, November 12 was fixed as the last day when tenders would be received. I put a question on the Order Paper the other day, and was rather surprised, in view of what had transpired in Committee of Supply when the item of $20,000 was going through, at the amount of the estimated cost of these wharfs, as reported by the minister in reply to that question. I find that the estimated cost of the nine wharfs ran all the way from $4,861 to $19,561, and that the total estimated cost of the nine wharfs was $97,587. Those tenders were called, as the minister has informed us, upon plans and specifications prepared by the department on October 9, and the tenders were to be received up to November 12. Tenders were received for several of these wharfs, and notwithstanding the fact that in all cases they were considerably below the estimated cost, none of them were accepted. I would like the minister to explain why it was that his department, on October 9, just in the middle of an election campaign, called for tenders for the construction of so many wharfs in that constituency, and as soon as the election was over decided not to go on with the work. I would like to know also if it is the intention of the department during this year to call for new tenders for any of these wharfs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The reason why tenders were called for before the election was because there was not time to call for them earlier. They were called for last fall and there was no particular reason why we should wait till after the elections.

Mr. CROCKET. The necessity arose very suddenly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, my hon. friend must be aware that while the estimates were submitted early last year, for reasons which, I suppose, our hon. friends opposite thought good and sufficient, they did not seem quite willing, for some time at all events, that the estimates should go through without considerable discussion, and, may I say it without offence, some little opposition. The result was we did not get Supply until very shortly before prorogation. Parliament rose on July 20. I gave instructions immediately to have the plans and specifications prepared so that tenders could be invited. I did so because the information I had was that these wharfs were necessary in the public interest, and it would be desirable to have them put under way during the past winter. As soon as the plans were prepared by our engineer in St. John, Mr. Scammel, tenders were called for and in most cases they were somewhat below the estimates, but not very much below except in two instances. I had not myself gone carefully into the specifications, nor would I be supposed to do that, not being an engineer; but I did not anticipate that the plans would be very different from those which, when I was a member of the provincial government, we had prepared for wharfs constructed on the St. John river. When the tenders came in they struck me as very excessive. I could not conceive it possible that tenders would be called for wharfs that would cost so much beyond what the provincial government had succeeded in getting wharfs built for on the St. John river and its tributary lakes.

Mr. FOSTER. It arose from the condition of the political atmosphere at that particular time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it arose by reason of the very different kind of plans which the engineer in my department at St. John had prepared, plans for a more substantial wharf—really a coast wharf instead of a river wharf.

Mr. FOSTER. Which showed good judgment on the part of the engineer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know. Some engineers are in favour of very substantial wharfs, and it may be good economy in the long run; but at all events, I assumed that we would get a class of wharf similar to what the provincial government had been in the habit of building. There were two cases in which the tenders were very much less than the engineer's estimate, and I had these parties seen by one in whom I had confidence to ascertain if they really understood the plans and were prepared to to enter on the work. They said they had misunderstood the plans and could not possibly do the work at the price they tendered, and I did not call on them to enter into contracts which would have ruined them. They were farmers from Queens and Sunbury. I decided to call for new tenders and ordered new plans to be prepared. I have communicated with the Chief Commissioner of Public Works in the New Brunswick government and have asked if he would allow me to have the benefit of the experience of his provincial engin-

eer who has had a great deal to do with the building of these wharfs, so that we might have plans prepared for wharfs of the same class as the provincial government is in the habit of building, and which run in cost from $1,000 to $2,000. He has consented, very kindly, to allow me to have the benefit of the experience and services of the engineer. I am going to have the engineer of my department in St. John, Mr. Cawmill, confer with him, and we expect to get up a series of plans for the wharfs which will enable us to build a large number of these wharfs at a cost not to exceed the appropriation asked for in the main estimates. With regard to the different wharfs to which the hon. member has referred, it is my intention to call for tenders for these, unless it is pointed out to me that some of them are not necessary in the public interest. It may be that some information will come to me that will lead me to alter my opinion, but, as at present advised, I think they are all necessary in the public interest; and it is my hope—and my expectation also—that, during the coming season, the plans will be completed and tenders will be called for, I have the hope and expectation that the cost will not exceed from $1,000 to $2,000 for each wharf. I think we can get wharfs suitable for the St. John river and tributary lakes which will answer every purpose at a cost not to exceed on the average $2,000.

Mr. CROCKET. And the $20,000 voted will completely cover the cost of these nine wharfs ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should hope to get plans which will enable us to give contracts for not exceeding $2,000 on the average for each wharf.

Mr. CROCKET. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has given what, no doubt, may be considered a very plausible explanation of the department's refusal to accept the tenders for these wharfs. But I do not think he has very satisfactorily explained why it was that the department called for tenders for the construction of these wharfs upon such plans and specifications as were prepared. He, surely, must have authorized that call for tenders, and, before authorizing it, he must have been aware of the plans and specifications which had been prepared and of the estimated cost of each of these nine wharfs. I do not think the minister will deny that he was aware of these estimates, they having been made by the engineers of the department, no doubt at his direction. Those estimates for the several wharfs were as follows:— $19,561, $10,954, $18,733, $11,381, $8,067, $6,701, $9,072, $4,861. And now, the minister who authorized the calling for these tenders, and, no doubt, personally directed that this call should be issued at that par ticular time and with a full knowledge of these estimates of cost, comes before the House and states that the department was not warranted in contemplating the construction of wharfs of that character. This seems a most extraordinary proceeding on the part of the minister. The minister authorized that call for tenders for no other reason, I have no hesitation in saying, than that of influencing the electors of these constituencies as an election bluff. It seems to me that the minister now occupies rather an unenviable position before the public of the constituency affected, in view of the statement he has made that the department should not have thought of constructing wharfs in these waters which would exceed in cost $1,000 or $2,000 each. I am content to let the statement of the minister, as made, go before the electors of Queens and Sunbury; and I have no doubt that they will bear in mind in that connection the promises which were made by the minister and his candidate in that constituency with reference to these works. I only hope that the minister will do as he has stated—call for tenders for these wharfs during the present season, and I can say to him that the electors of that constituency——

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) thinks they are all necessary public works?

Mr. CROCKET. I have no hesitation in saying that some of them are.

Mr. PUGSLEY. 'Some of them.' Then, why does the hon. gentleman wish me to call for tenders for them all?

Mr. CROCKET. I am not in a position to state whether they are all necessary or not. But I do trust that, in view of the fact that they were promised in that way to the electors of that county, the minister will deem it his duty to do at least something towards implementing the promise which he has given to the electors of the constituency, even though it be to give a $1,000 or $2,000 wharf where an $18,000 or $19,000 wharf was promised.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At present we are considering the question whether these works are reasonably necessary and whether it is proper to vote this money for the purpose of completing them. So far as the opinion of the people of New Brunswick is concerned, I think they have not hesitated to express their opinion of my conduct, nor have they hesitated to express their opinion of the criticisms of my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) and his associates. My hon. friend is not unaware of the fact that, during the election, his friends went up and down the counties of Queens and

Sunbury declaring that this was only an election dodge and that there was no intention of the building the wharfs. And they went further and declared that the provincial government would build these wharfs, that it was unnecessary to look to the Dominion government, and that the proper thing to do was to support Mr. Wilmot and strengthen Mr. Hazen's hands in Queens and Sunbury, because he would be the next representative from New Brunswick in the Dominion government, he would be Minister of Public Works, and between the two governments it would not be necessary to go to Mr. Pugsley for these wharfs. The hon. gentleman says that these tenders were called for by me with the knowledge that the prices would be excessive, because the estimates called for wharfs more expensive than it would be necessary to build. My directions, after this vote passed parliament were that proper plans and specifications should be prepared and tenders called for for the work. I did not see the estimates when prepared by the engineer in St. John. I do not think he sent them to Ottawa. He followed my directions to make plans and specifications and call for tenders. I supposed that the tenders would be at reasonable figures. When I found that they were much larger than I thought they ought to be, I gave direction that the cheques should be returned, new plans and specifications made and new tenders called for.

Mr. CROCKET. Then, the minister called for tenders without regard to the estimated cost of the works if I understand his statement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my statement was clear.

Public works—chargeable to income—Quebec—harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a general vote. The additional amount is required.

Mr. GERVAIS. For the last two or three years, the city of Montreal has been requesting this government to build a wharf at St. Helen's island, opposite the city. Honourable members are aware that very large numbers of people visit St. Helen's island every summer. I understand that Mr. Michaud, the local engineer in charge of the Montreal works, has been making a report to the Department of Public Works about the necessity and the cost of building a wharf and a shelter on St. Helen's island, opposite the city of Montreal. I think that should be done this year. Over half a million of people visit the island yearly, most of them working people belonging to the poorer classes, and something should be done to make proper landing facilities on the island. I think that about $2,000 should be given for this purpose, out of the large aggregate sum now being asked for to improve the harbours and rivers generally. For instance, I notice that we are asked to vote $4,000 to repair a jetty at Nicolet. Then, I think we might take a portion of the money that we are asked to vote to build ice piers at Rivière St. Jacques in the county of Laprairie. The Minister of Public Works should give us some explanation why he has not proceeded before now with the work of building a wharf and shelter at St. Helen's island for the benefit of over half a million people.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the question is deserving of an answer from me, and I will endeavour to explain why I have not been able to accede to my hon. friend's request. He has pressed the consideration of the matter upon my department. What my hon. friend desires is that the government should build a wharf at St. Helen's island. Now I have not felt that I could justify this expenditure, particularly when there are so many pressing needs for public works in other directions. This wharf at St. Helen's island would be for the accommodation of the people of Montreal who wish to visit the island as a summer resort; it would be rather for the accommodation of the ferry between the city and the island. I have not felt that I could regard this wharf as a work so much in the general interest of navigation as to justify me in asking parliament to make an appropriation for it. However, I have not closed my mind entirely against it; I can say to my hon. friend that I will give the matter careful consideration.

Mr. GERVAIS. As a matter of fact, the corporation of the city of Montreal has been asking for that improvement for a number of years, I know that they have been sending report after report to the government asking a sum of money sufficient to do some work blasting and build such a wharf and shelter. It seems to me that this work on St. Helen's island is just as much needed as are a great many of the improvements along the river St. Lawrence which the government has decided to make, for instance, the improvements at the Rivière St. Jacques, at St. Louis, at Ste. Anne des Monts and so on. The people of Montreal are contributing a large portion of the revenue of this country, and some consideration should be given to the request of the city council of Montreal. I do not know why the request, the demands, the requirements, of the city of Montreal should be ignored for the benefit of all these little villages along the St. Lawrence river. The city of Montreal is contributing, not only largely to the national exchequer, but in every department of industry it is con-

tributing to the prosperity of this country, and deserves far more consideration than it has received. We are asking this wharf for the benefit of the workingmen of the great commercial metropolis of Canada, and the Minister of Public Works is not doing justice to them in ignoring their request made through the city council. I would like to know why the representations of the city council of Montreal should be disregarded to the advantage of the farmers of Laprairie, to the advantage of the farmers and traders of the Rivière St. François, for example. I call upon the hon. members here representing the other divisions of Montreal to support my request. In Montreal we have built up for the benefit of the whole of Canada a port and a channel which are worth to-day $50,000,000, to which the general government has not contributed one farthing. We have been deprived of this asset of the city, which has now been taken over by the general government, and when we are asking for the expenditure of a small sum of $15,000 or $20,000 for the benefit of the workingmen of Montreal, we are told that we cannot get it. For the last three years the representations of the corporation of Montreal have been disregarded, have been unheeded, I do not know why, and I would like to know why. I think that some better explanation should be given to the House, and one more satisfactory to the people of Montreal than the one we have heard.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to hear from the Postmaster General on that.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an easy reason why my hon. friend from St. James division, Montreal (Mr. Gervais) has not had his request granted. He looks so good natured and he smiles so pleasantly when he is making his demands, that the minister thinks he is not in earnest.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would ask the Postmaster General if he is in favour of this request of the hon. member for St. James division, Montreal (Mr. Gervais).

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has no right to demand that a member speak.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think he should express an opinion upon that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let us get through with the Quebec items.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Postmaster General knows about Montreal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He does not feel like making a speech just now.

Mr. J. D. REID. He is trying to avoid this question.

Mr. GERVAIS. I would like an explanation from the Minister of Public Works why this work has been delayed for the last three years. We are surely entitled to some consideration. There are some other members from the island of Montreal present and I will allow them to express their own opinion about the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I told my hon. friend that I would consider his request still further. The reason the appropriation has not been made is that this being a ferry wharf to accommodate the tourist travel or the people who go in the summer season from the city of Montreal to St. Helen's island, I had not felt that it had the same merits or the same claims upon the federal treasury as a wharf which might be more in the interest of general navigation. However I will give very careful consideration to the strong representations that my hon. friend has made.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think the Postmaster General should express an opinion upon this question himself. I really feel that the Postmaster General should tell us his idea so that we would be able to judge as to whether the request made by the hon. member for Montreal, St. James (Mr. Gervais) is justified or not. Otherwise, we would take it for granted that what the hon. member for St. James is asking is not a fair request.

Nicolet harbour—repairs to jetty at mouth of river, shelter, shed and dredging, $4,600.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us see what that is about.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is chiefly for dredging at Nicolet.

Mr. AMES. Who has the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract for dredging has been awarded to the Canada Improvement Company, the price being, for rock, $4, and for other materials 22 cents per cubic yard and $3 for rock and 20 cents for other materials when cast over.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is at the head of the Canada Improvement Company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know, but I think it is Mr. Moore of Montreal.

Mr. AMES. Is that the same as T. F. Moore & Company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know whether it is Mr. Moore or Mr. Cohen; I think it is one or the other.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are they in the dredging business?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, they are dredging contractors.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do they own dredges?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, they have a large fleet of dredges.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have heard of Mr. Cohen, but I have never heard of the Canada Improvement Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They have been in existence for three or four years.

Mr. J. D. REID. Had they been doing work for the Public Works Department before?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. Under the name of the Canada Improvement Company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

River Yamaska—landing pier at St. Michel d'Yamaska, $4,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. We want some explanaion of that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost of the work is $10,500, there was an appropriation last year of $2,000, there was voted in the main estimates for the coming year $4,500, and we require a supplementary vote, to pay for the work to be done up to the close of this year, of $4,000.

Mr. AMES. Is that work being done by day's labour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. The cost of the site was $500.

Mr. AMES. I understand the minister to say that $2,000 was voted for this work at the last session of parliament?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. AMES. You have spent $6,000 when you had $2,000 voted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. The estimate of the probable expenditure is $7,200.

Mr. AMES. Is the $4,000 you are asking for to pay accounts already incurred?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Does it not seem strange to the minister that he should ask for $2,000 to build a wharf and that he should deliberately spend $6,000, not by contract but by day's work? Is it not a rule of the department to stop the day's work when the appropriation is exhausted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. AMES. And has the government spent $6,000 with an appropriation of $2,000? Have the men been paid out of this $4,000 that we have now before us?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, this is for the purpose of paying them.

Mr. AMES. When was the work done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are still working at it.

Mr. AMES. But was not the bulk of the work done before the frost came last fall?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A good deal of it is done.

Mr. AMES. Then this money was spent in September, October and November during the election time after the appropriation had been entirely exhausted. The men were kept at work in the expectation that parliament would ratify it six months later. Is it not the rule of the department that work being done by day's labour stops when the appropriation is exhausted? Surely that is what is stated in the instructions which the chief engineer sends to the assistant engineers throughout the country. They are distinctly cautioned to on no account exceed the estimate. If it were a contract I could understand it, but when it is done by day's work why did the minister keep the men at work until an expenditure three times the amount of the original vote of this parliament was incurred? Why did the work not cease when the vote was exhausted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that he is quite right in his statement that the instructions of the chief engineer to the resident engineers are to stop the work when the appropriations are exhausted, but in this particular case the opinion of the resident engineer, and it was so reported, was that it was necessary to continue the work in order to save that which had already been done. I was surprised and somewhat annoyed when it came to my notice that the work had been continued, but it was the opinion of the resident engineer that it was necessary in order to save from waste and destruction the work which had already been done. I am asking for this appropriation to pay for the labour which has been done under the direction of the resident engineer, and with the approval, of course, of the chief engineer.

Mr. AMES. Will the minister give the items making up the $4,500. How much represents overdue wages and since how long these wages have been overdue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not believe I could give that just now, I have not the details of it.

Mr. AMES. Then I think the item should stand in the meantime because that is a case where, although the amount is small, the principle involved is serious. Parliament votes a certain sum and when it is an election year workmen are kept on long after the money voted has been expended.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am willing to allow it to stand.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister came before the House last year and said that $2,000 was required to complete this wharf. Now he says that they spent not only the $2,000 but $4,500 more last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does he say that I came down and asked $2,000 to complete it? The hon. gentleman should not make these statements unless he is sure. If my hon. friend looks up 'Hansard,' he will not find that I made any such statement to the committee. What does my hon. friend say about that?

Mr. J. D. REID. Did he not say that $2,000 was all that would be required during last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member said that last year I stated I wanted $2,000 to complete this work. I venture to say he will find no such statement in 'Hansard.'

Mr. J. D. REID. Perhaps I was wrong in that. I want to state that the minister came down and stated that $2,000 was all that would be required to be spent last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister made no statement about it. As a matter of fact, if I remember rightly, all these items went through in about five minutes without comment or question.

Item allowed to stand.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the House adjourns, I would like to inform the Prime Minister that if the House is to be moved into Committee of Supply to-morrow, we propose to discuss the report of Mr. Justice Cassels and the investigation before him, if that would meet the convenience of the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I had expected that my hon. friends would wait until we brought down our policy upon that report. I had hoped to be able to give the information to my hon. friend before this, but owing to my illness I have not been able to do so. I undertake that we will have it early next week.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman would prefer that we should postpone the discussion?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, until we have announced our policy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The only thing is, of course, that we are going to have a good deal of work crowded into the latter part of the session, and I would like to have as early a date fixed as would be convenient. Next week we are to take up the Grand Trunk Pacific loan, I think on Tuesday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will undertake to lay our policy on the table not later than Tuesday.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it be possible to arrange for a week from to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We will take up Supply to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What department?

Mr. FIELDING. We will continue with the estimates of the Minister of Public Works.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 25, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

FRUIT IMPORTS TO BRITISH COLUMBIA FROM UNITED STATES.

Mr. BURRELL asked:

1. What quantities, with values, and amount of duty collected, of apples, pears, plums, prunes, peaches and berries, respectively, were imported into British Columbia during 1908, from the United States points?

2. Similarly, what into Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and the rest of Canada?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1 and 2. The imports for consumption during the fiscal year 1908, were as follows:

	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.
	Lbs.	$	$ cts.
Prunes and plums unpitted—			
Manitoba	1,743,980	72,855	17,439 80
B. Columbia	789,522	35,610	7,895 22
Alberta	387,567	16,355	3,875 67
Saskatchewan	95,545	4,959	955 45
Rest of Canada	3,796,766	172,492	37,967 66
Green apples—	Brls.		
Manitoba	8,626	44,574	3,450 40
B. Columbia	13,862	63,777	5,544 80
Alberta	9,386	46,815	3,754 40
Saskatchewan	1,118	4,647	447 20
Rest of Canada	4,107	22,335	1,642 80
Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries and strawberries—	Lbs.		
Manitoba	357,077	48,380	7,141 54
B. Columbia	81,792	9,957	1,635 84
Alberta	8,516	1,224	170 32
Saskatchewan	1,055	234	21 10
Rest of Canada	1,247,675	121,723	24,953 50
Peaches—			
Manitoba	885,690	39,890	8,856 90
B. Columbia	571,503	24,860	5,715 03
Alberta	307,835	13,638	3,078 35
Saskatchewan	74,406	3,245	744 06
Rest of Canada	1,894,155	97,185	18,941 55

Plums—	Bush.	$	$ cts.
Manitoba..	15,761	40,633	4,728 30
B. Columbia.. ..	4,145	10,314	1,243 50
Alberta..	5,241	12,233	1,572 30
Saskatchewan . ..	1,233	3,001	369 90
Rest of Canada..	20,834	57,718	6,250 20
Quinces, apricots, pears and nectarines, n.o.p.—	Lbs.		
Manitoba...	594,873	25,643	2,974 37
B. Columbia.. ..	423,606	17,276	2,118 04
Alberta..	221,370	9,134	1,106 86
Saskatchewan. ..	42,785	1,507	213 93
Rest of Canada..	2,461,981	96,766	12,309 94

ONTARIO POLLING BOOTHS.

Mr. ELSON asked:

Have all the persons in the province of Ontario from whom polling booths were rented for the purposes of the last federal election been paid their dues? If not, why not?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). There are several polling booths in Ontario for the rental of which funds have not yet been sent to the returning officers; in some cases because the accounts of the owners have not yet been supplied and in others because accounts in hand have not yet been finally disposed of.

MAIL CARRIAGE IN MIDDLESEX COUNTY.

Mr. ELSON asked:

1. Does the present contract for carrying the mails between Hyde Park post office, Ferguson, Lobo, Ivan, Coldstream, Poplar Hill and Komoka, in the county of Middlesex, expire on or before April 1, 1909?
2. If so, has the contract been relet, commencing from April 1, and who is the contractor?
3. How long does the contract run, and what is the price per year?
4. Was it let to the lowest tenderer?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Expires 31st March, 1909.
2. Yes. Robert E. Morris.
3. Four years from 1st April, 1909 at $745 per annum.
4. Yes.

HOMESTEADS WEST OF LAKE WINNIPEG.

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

1. Is the government aware that a large percentage of the land homesteaded by Ruthenians, Polanders and Germans, west of Lake Winnipeg, is said to be poor land and not suitable for farming?
2. Has the government inspectors or others reported these lands unfit for settlement? If so, when?
3. Is it the intention of the government to allow these people who are located on reported bad lands to change for good lands in some other district? If so, when?

Mr. PATERSON

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. No.
2. No.
3. See answers to numbers 1 and 2. Without further information it is not possible for the government to arrive at a conclusion as to action to be taken.

MR. M. W. PLANK.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE asked:

1. Was M. W. Plank, V.S., of Uxbridge, in the employ of the government as special officer detailed to prevent the spread of the foot and mouth disease?
2. If so, when did his engagement commence and when did it end?
3. What salary did he receive, and what allowance for expenses?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. Yes.
2. Engagement commenced November 26, 1908. Engagement ended January 8, 1909—33 days.
3. Salary, $5 per day—$165.00; expenses, $202.70.

MR. BUELL.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE asked:

1. Is Mr. Buell, of Brockville, barrister, in the employ of the government?
2. If so, how long has he been employed, what are the terms of his engagement, and what is his salary?
3. Is part of his duties to present the claims of those having grievances to prefer before the Railway Commission?
4. On whose suggestion or recommendation was he employed?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. Mr. Shepley, K.C., and Mr. Buell have been instructed by the Minister of Justice to appear in the public interest before the Board of Railway Commissioners upon the applications of telephone companies and express companies for approval by the board of the companies' schedules of tolls and rates.
2. Upon different occasions during the last two years. Mr. Buell is not paid a salary, but receives a fee of $30 per day for such work as he may do, and in addition his expenses out of pocket.
3. His instructions from the Minister of Justice did not contemplate such duties, but under direction of the chairman of the board, the presentation of some of such complaints in connection with business of telephone or express companies has been undertaken by Mr. Buell.
4. By the Minister of Justice, of his own motion, after a recommendation from the late chairman of the board that some counsel should be instructed in the matter.

MR. ACHILE LEBEL, CLAIM VS. INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked:

1. Has the Department of Justice received a request for a petition of right from Mr. Achile LeBel, of Fraserville, or from his solicitor, for damage done to a valuable horse, then being carried in one of the cars of the Intercolonial Railway, at the Rivière du Loup station?
2. If so, is it the intention of the department to grant it, and when? If not, on what grounds does the department refuse it?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. Yes.
2. The matter is under consideration.

RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked:

On what date did Messrs. Furois and Dorais, railway mail clerks on the Quebec postal division, and Mr. Henry Wathen, mail clerk, on the postal division of St. John, New Brunswick, pass their promotive examinations, respectively?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (for Postmaster General). In 1897 the Civil Service promotion examinations for railway mail clerks were abolished, and a Case examination substituted therefor, which Case examination Railway Mail Clerk Furois passed on March 23, 1898, and Railway Mail Clerk Dorais on December 22, 1899. Railway Mail Clerk Wathen passed the Civil Service promotion examination in 1889.

HOLLAND RIVER AND NEWMARKET CANAL.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. When were tenders first called for the construction of section 1 of the canal from Holland river and Newmarket?
2. From whom were tenders received, what were the schedule rates in each and what was the amount in each case as moneyed out?
3. To whom was the contract awarded, and when?
4. Has the work been regularly proceeded with by these contractors during the working seasons since the contract was awarded?
5. What amount has been paid these contractors under these contracts, and when was the last payment made?
6. Is this contract still a subsisting contract, have the contractors thrown up the work or refused to complete their contract, and has the government agreed to rescind this contract?
7. Did the government call for tenders for this section a second time? If so, when?
8. What tenders were received upon this occasion, what were the schedule rates in each case, and what was the amount in each case moneyed out?
9. To whom was the contract awarded in this case?
10. If not awarded, what is the cause of delay?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The information to answer this question will be found in a return moved for on January 26, 1909, and laid on the table of the House on 4th March, instant.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the fact that the return called for by me on the 25th of January last in conection with the dogfish reduction plant, has not yet been brought down.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I have just brought it down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On the same day I moved for a return setting forth the rules in connection with the reclassification of the Civil Service. I do not know whether that information has been brought down. I asked also for a return of certain documents in connection with the French Treaty.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I think the correspondence was laid on the table, all there is in relation to that matter. If there be anything further, and the hon. gentleman will call my attention to it, I will supplement it.

Mr. STAPLES. On the 17th of February I asked for certain information in reference to work done on the Assiniboine river. The government undertook to do a certain piece of work, and left it in such a condition that unless it is completed it is going to flood a great portion of country. I would like to have that order brought down as quickly as possible in order that we may see what is taking place.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I will have enquiries made at once.

Mr. STANFIELD. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when we may expect Prof. Prince's report on the shad fisheries in Nova Scotia?

Mr. BRODEUR. The report was received a few days ago. I will lay it on the table as soon as it is printed.

Mr. CROCKET. I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to an order of the House which was passed on the 12th day of February for a return of all the papers, vouchers, &c., with reference to the survey of the St. John river between

Fredericton and Woodstock, and ask when we may expect the return.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will make enquiry. I am informed by my deputy that in the course of a few days a large number of returns which have been moved for will be brought down.

Mr. BRADBURY I desire to call the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that a return ordered by this House in the early part of the session, regarding the amount of money paid to the Logberg Printing Company of Winnipeg, has not been brought down.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). I will have enquiry made about that this afternoon.

Mr. BARNARD. On the 17th of February an order of the House was made for a return of certain revenues received, and particulars of those receipts, from the Kingston penitentiary. The matter was under discussion when the Solicitor General was passing the estimates of that department, and he stated that if a return was moved for it would be brought down at once. The return was moved, and it has not been received.

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Solicitor General). I find on referring to the Votes and Proceedings that the return alluded to by my hon. friend was brought down the day before yesterday.

MANITOBA FISHERIES.

Mr. BRADBURY. I wish to call the attention of the minister to a matter of importance. This House created a select committee to investigate the fisheries of Canada. I expected to have had the matter of our Manitoba fisheries referred to this committee, but the minister informed me as a commission had been appointed this could not be done . I wrote the hon. minister on the 19th urging him to add to his commission an Icelander, one of the settlers who had suffered most by the depletion of Lake Winnipeg, as anything short of this would not be satisfactory.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not seen the letter myself. I suppose it has been handed over to the department.

Mr. BRADBURY. The letter was addressed to the hon. gentleman himself.

POST OFFICE ACCOMMODATION AT DARTMOUTH.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to bring to the attention of the Postmaster General, or of the Minister of Public Works, the fact that the accommodation in the post office in the town of Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, is very insufficient. The postmaster and his assistants are said to be unable properly to perform their duties owing to lack of accommodation. I think the matter has been brought already to the attention of the Postmaster General. I have been asked to urge and I now urge upon him the necesity of immediate action.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I will refer the matter immediately to the superintendent and see what can be done.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—COST OF PRAIRIE AND MOUNTAIN SECTIONS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to ask the attention of the Minister of Finance to the information which has been brought down in response to my request on Wednesday of last week. I observe that the amounts actually expended on the prairie section and the mountain section are given in the answer A-1 as follows: Prairie section, $27,314,053.51; mountain section, $3,015,623.74. I would be glad if the Minister of Finance would furnish the committee, when we come to consider the resolution, with detailed statements of these expenditures. I ask that because I consider it is only reasonable, having regard to the very excessive amount of the total expenditures upon the prairie and mountain sections as compared with all the estimates that were presented to the House three or four years ago. The principal part of that information I think would be in possession of the government. I am informed it has been before the Committee on Public Accounts, but there is some distinction made which I confess I do not clearly understand, as to the expenditure which is made out of the proceeds of bonds guaranteed by the government, and the expenditure which is made out of the proceeds of bonds guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I do not understand how that distinction can be made; apparently it has been raised in some way. But if it were a perfectly valid distinction before the Committee of Public Acounts, it does not seem to me to be a valid distinction so far as the particular proposal now submitted to the House is concerned, inasmuch as the question of expenditure is a very important one for the purpose of considering the proposed assistance.

I may say I am not criticising these answers as not being in accordance with what was requested, but I desire to point out that, perhaps, they do not exactly fulfil what was in my mind when I asked some of these questions nor furnish just the information I would like to have.

Question 15, page 3. That question related to the total fixed charges. If it be possible to get an estimate of the actual

amount of the fixed charges upon the road, I shall be glad to have it. There may be some difficulty in making an estimate that would be of value, but it will be desirable from our standpoint to have it, if the government can conveniently give it.

Question 16. Actual amount invested by the promoters of the undertaking. The amount stated, as to December 31, 1908, is $9,597,149.19. I do not know whether or not that includes the sum of $7,094,-044.30 stated in answer to question 2 on page 1 to be an advance of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I would like to know exactly what this is and who has advanced it, and in what way it appears in the expenditure set forth in answer to question 2.

Question 20, page 5. That relates to the matter I have already mentioned—the total amounts of the expenditure by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I should like to know whether or not the books and vouchers of the company have been examined by Mr. Bell in respect of the expenditure of moneys derived from the bonds guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, as well as the expenditure of moneys derived from bonds guaranteed by the government. And I would like to have the result of his examinations which, according to this answer, have been transmitted by the Department of Railways and Canals to Collingwood Schreiber, C.M.G., government chief engineer of the western division of the Transcontinental Railway. I do not observe any other note, but later on I may mention one or two other matters to the Minister of Finance.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I do not happen to have a copy of the paper before me, and so I have not been able to follow very closely the points that the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) has raised. When his request was made some days ago I gave direction that the officials should at once go into the matter and make every effort to cover every inquiry on his memo. I think we have been fairly successful. I will see that 'Hansard' with the report of his remarks is taken up by the officials, so that any information in our possession in answer to his inquires may be produced.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. One matter I forgot to mention: It appears from the agreement, a copy of which is to be found at pages 12 to 15 of the printed information, that a certain sum of money, $793,600, has been credited to a certain stock issue amounting to 9,920 shares, and that the balance, between $793,600 and the par value of the shares mentioned, has been paid in in cash. I do not know that the disposal of that sum of money appears anywhere in the information brought down. I should be glad if the Minister of Finance would ask that this information also should be provided. I do not know that I make myself clear.

Mr. FIELDING. I will place the 'Hansard' report of the hon. gentleman's remarks in the hands of the officials, with instructions to get everything that he refers to that is in our possession or under our control.

Mr. H. B. AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine). I desire to ask for information to be supplied in connection with this debate. I would like to know where the guarantee of the Grand Trunk which is to be given in respect of this $10,000,000 loan ranks in relation to the other obligations which the Grand Trunk Railway has undertaken? Does it come after their loan capital and after other guarantees they have given? Will the minister please ascertain the facts as to this point?

Mr. FIELDING. I will have a precise statement prepared. It becomes an inferior security; the other guarantees to which the hon. member (Mr. Ames) has referred have priority.

Mr. AMES. Will the hon. minister make a list so that we may know exactly where it ranks——

Mr. FIELDING. Surely.

Mr. AMES. —showing what other obligations would have to be satisfied before this will have any value?

Mr. FIELDING. I will see that the information is furnished.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. A. N. WORTHINGTON (Sherbrooke). I desire to remind the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) that several returns that have been asked for from his department have not yet been laid on the table. When may we expect this information?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). I think at once.

SUPPLY—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY FREIGHT CLERKS, HALIFAX AND ST. JOHN.

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

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals whether or not he has taken into consideration the report of the committee which investigated some matters in dispute between the management of the Intercolonial Railway and the freight clerks at Halifax and St. John. I observe some rather important statements in the report of the

committee which have, no doubt, been drawn to the minister's attention and which perhaps he has considered. I quote from the report as brought down in a return to this House, page 4:—

Accordingly, and after full discussion, the following matters were agreed upon by all parties in the form as under:

Your committee are of opinion that it would make for greater harmony and better efficiency if a system of classification of clerks were introduced. Not only would the above results accrue, but there would then be an available scheme for promotion, which at the present time seems to be lacking, and which omission breeds discontent owing to the uncertainty of upward progress for efficient clerks who have by length of service and attention to the duties of their office earned the right to consideration in this regard. Just what system of classification should be introduced must neessarily be evolved by the offiials of the railway who are more intimately familiar with the details of the business of the Intercolonial than your committee can possibly be. The men involved must necessarily accept the classification determined upon, subject, of course, to the right which they possess of bringing to the attention of their superiors in office any improvement in such classification which to them may seem desirable in the best interests of the service.

Further on, at page 5, dealing with promotion, the report says:

Your committee are further strongly of the opinion that, outside of the rare cases that arise where an exceptionally able outsider is brought into the service to fill some particular position requiring special knowledge and training, the principle of promotion of those already in the service should obtain, having due regard, of course, to efficiency and the requirements of the service.

And further on, at page 7:

The committee further considered the question involved and now submit the following additional recommendations: The committee after its investigation, is of opinion that, in the matter of wages, the system that obtains of appointing from time to time, new men at higher pay over the heads of men long in the service and probably more capable of doing the work, is injurious to the service and unjust to the men. The remedy for this lies in reorganization, and the abolition of the existing system of appointment influenced by political patronage, which from the point of efficient working we find ample evidence to condemn as applied to the Intercolonial Railway.

I do not bring this up to-day for the purpose of making any animadversions upon or indulging in any criticism of the department, but merely for the purpose of inquiring whether the attention of the minister has been fully directed to this report, whether he has the recommendations under consideration, as I have no doubt he has, whether he has arrived at any conclusion as to what can be done and, if he is not able to give us his conclusions to-day, whether or not we may expect to hear them at a reasonably early date.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I may not be orthodox, but I cannot agree with any suggestion that makes length of service an absolute qualification for promotion.

Mr. FOSTER. Not the only one.

Mr. GRAHAM. To my mind ability to perform the duties is the supreme test. That, coupled with length of service ought to bring about the promotion of the individual. This report of the board was brought to my attention the other day by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) on going into Committee of Supply, I think, and if I remember correctly my reply was that action had not been taken as yet, one of the reasons being that the report implies the dismissal of several employees. In order to ascertain just how that report should be carried out, without doing injustice to an employee, I am having an investigation made into the whole situation as to length of service, ability and all that kind of necessary information with regard to each clerk in so far as I can get it. When that is done I intend to proceed along the lines of the report.

Mr. DANIEL. With regard to the report just referred to, I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) to the fact, that the other day, in speaking about the Intercolonial Railway, he stated that so far from the Intercolonial being overmanned it was not manned to the same extent as some other railways in Canada. If that is the case it would appear that the clerks in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway at Halifax and St. John are not too numerous and consequently this report can hardly be correct in that respect. Either the minister is wrong or the report is wrong, so that it would appear to me that the course of the minister is absolutely clear; that is he has to put those men in these two cities, working for the Intercolonial Railway, on a proper basis as regards pay, and I think, judging from the report that has been read, it was quite allowed by the reporters that the men there are not paid sufficiently. The statement was also made that the road was overmanned, that there were more than sufficient to do the work and that the salaries paid in excess of the requirements should be divided amongst those who are retained. But, taking into consideration the statement that the minister himself made the other day with regard to the manning of the Intercolonial Railway that it was not manned to

the same extent as some other railways were, I would think that the case was rather plain for the granting of an increase in pay to the clerks at the railway terminal at Halifax and St. John.

Mr. CROSBY. I would like to have had an opportunity of seeing this report but it has just come to my hand at this moment, I do not understand that this board of conciliation were appointed to deal with the question as to whether there were too many men on the Intercolonial Railway or whether there were not enough. I understand that this board were commissioned to ascertain whether the men on the Intercolonial Railway were properly paid or not. Therefore, I do not see what right they had to come and tell the Minister of Railways and Canals that his department was overmanned. I believe they overstepped the bounds in doing that, particularly as we had the Minister of Railways the other day stating distinctly that the Intercolonial was not manned to the extent of any other railway in the Dominion of Canada, a statement which was corroborated by statistics. Therefore, I think that settles the question and I do not think that this commision will be in a position to make a report that would be as definite as the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals himself. I think we can set aside altogether the question as to whether the Intercolonial Railway at St. John and Halifax is overmanned but, upon the question as to whether the men were in receipt of sufficient pay or not, the board reported distinctly that the men were not paid enough and recommended an increase to them. I am not going to deal with the matter of qualification and other questions touched upon in the report as I suppose we will have an opportunity of taking those questions up on some future occasion, but I really do think that whatever may be done in connection with this report the clerks who were willing to come under the conciliation clause of the Act known as the Lemieux Act and who have been willing to allow that board to be appointed, feeling that they would get fair play are entitled to be fairly dealt with in that respect. Whatever may be done with regard to the manning of the railway, if the minister should find upon investigation that such has occurred, I really think he should take this matter up himself because it is not a matter for the board to deal with. I am convinced from the statistics quoted here the other day, from the very exhaustive discussion that we had and from the elaborate references to the whole matter of railways in the Dominion of Canada that the Intercolonial is not overmanned as compared with other railways. The clerks have made an appeal, in fact, I think they went out on strike almost, or threatened to go out, they have accepted this board and they should have that which is due to them by the authority and report of the board.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply.

Landing pier—St. Michel, Yamaska, $4,000.

Mr. AMES. In this case the sum of $2,000 was voted and after the vote was exhausted the men were continued at work and further obligations incurred. What is the explanation of that?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The engineer carried on the work up to a recent date because his opinion was that to leave the work as it was would lead to the danger of it being destroyed.

Mr. AMES. After the $2,000 had been exhausted and expenditure to the extent of $4,000 more incurred before it was voted, were the men paid their wages?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they were not paid and this vote is to pay them.

Mr. AMES. Does the government owe $4,000 for wages and materials during September, October, November and December? Have the men been waiting all this time to get their pay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is quite correct but the men understood that if they continued work they would have to wait until parliament made an appropriation.

Mr. AMES. Does the minister commend such a practice as that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not and I would not justify it except in the most exceptional case. In this case the engineer in charge reported to the chief engineer on January 6, 1909.

The landing pier under construction at St. François du Lac in Yamaska is in danger of being damaged during winter or spring freshets unless the work is continued and completed this winter.

Mr. FOSTER. When was the appropriation exhausted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some time in the fall. He continues:

The urgent work yet to be done this winter is stone ballast, stringers, flooring, &c., requiring an additional use of $1,900, and for labour to complete the work, $2,300; total amount, $4,200. If work is continued persons working or supplying materials are willing to await payment until new appropriation is available.

The people understood that, but I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) that if possible this should never be done. In this case there were exceptional circumstances and the chief engineer allowed the resident engineer to proceed with the work.

Mr. AMES. In case of extreme urgency cannot the minister get an additional credit in a legal way?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In cases of unforseen emergencies a Governor General's warrant could be obtained and probably this might come within that.

Mr. AMES. Is it not a fact that the system of issuing Governor General's warrants is to meet cases of emergency and that the law contemplated, in sanctioning Governor General's warrants, that the system would remove all possible excuse for such an irregularity as this. If this were a case of real urgency why did not the minister ask for a Governor General's warrant? It is entirely infra dig, for Canada to ask people to work and wait for payment. We hear from all parts of the country that people have been asked to do work by the Dominion of Canada and its officials and then have not been paid. We had such a case in Lakevale, Nova Scotia, in which the workmen have not been paid and have been writing beseeching letters to the department and to their members for a considerable time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In this particular case the chief engineer, perhaps because he was not fully impressed with the importance of it, did not call my attention to the matter until some time in February; he took the responsibility upon himself by reason of the peculiar circumstances of this case. I find that on the 15th of December he wrote to the resident engineer as follows:

Sir,—With regard to your stoppage of work at St. François du Lac and St. Michel, Yamaska, the department is informed that unless these works are continued and completed during this winter they are in danger of being damaged or carried away in the spring.

The appropriations for these works are, of course, exhausted, in fact are over expended, but it is stated that labourers and parties supplying materials would be willing to await payment until the new appropriation required for completion is available.

Would you therefore give this matter your immediate attention and let me have a report stating whether it is urgent or not that these works should be continued until completed to prevent all chance of their being damaged, as above mentioned. You will also please let me know what amount is required to complete each of these works. As this is urgent, I would like to have a report without delay.

Mr. Belanger replied on the 6th of January by the letter I have quoted. In this particular case the explanation of the engineer is that the foreman allowed the work to go on for a short time after he had received notice not to exceed the appropriation, and then the chief engineer, having learned that it was necessary to proceed in order to prevent the works from being destroyed, wrote the resident engineer and received this reply.

Mr. AMES. When did he get the notice that the appropriation was exhausted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell exactly, but I presume some little time before December 15. My hon. friend speaks of this as if there were a number of cases. I venture to say my hon. friend has learned of every case there is. There have been only a very few cases, we do not allow this as a matter of practice.

Mr. FOSTER. How many?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some two or three cases have come to my notice where there are comparatively small amounts, and two of these were cases in which the engineer had acted upon the printed estimates which were sent out and apparently the chief engineer had overlooked the making of a correction after the amount was reduced here in committee upon my motion. Those are two of the cases and this is the third case. I do not know of any other case. We are very particular, I am particular in giving directions, and so is my chief engineer, that the resident engineers and the foremen all clearly understand what amount is available and that they must not exceed the appropriation. In this particular case there has been no hardship, because the men did this work which was apparently necessary in order to prevent the work that had been done from being destroyed, and it was clearly understood that they would have to wait for their pay until parliament made the appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the minister quite understands the gravity of the matter which has been disclosed in this one instance accidentally. The minister says that this sort of thing has not occurred more than three times, so far as he knows. We have to take the minister's word that so far as it has come to him there have not been more than three cases, but I invite the attention of the minister to what is involved in this. There is no other way under which appropriations of money belonging to the treasury of Canada can be expended except either by vote of this House or by the authority of a Governor General's warrant. The Governor General's warrant is an expedient which the ministers on urgent occasion may avail themselves of while the House is not in session and where there is no appropriation, in order to complete or do some work which is unexpected, unforeseen and absolutely urgent. When once parliament, by its legislation, makes no provision for the unexpected, the unforeseen and the urgent, that is the course that must be pursued by the minister; he is sworn to take that course. In this case what happened? Your vote was given, it was overexpended, your accommodating foreman did

not stop the men from working when he should have—and I would be glad if the minister would bring the exact date on which the foreman exceeded his instructions. The $2,000 was expended and a little more and then the minister, because he is responsible, drew a cheque on the treasury of the Dominion for $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, my hon. friend is entirely wrong; that is just what we didn't do These men are not paid yet, and will never be paid unless this appropriation passes.

Mr. FOSTER. I know exactly what I am saying, if the minister will allow me. I say the minister, having no vote, choosing not to go to council for a Governor General's warrant, drew a cheque on the treasury of the Dominion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is just what the minister did not do; no cheque was drawn for this sum.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister will allow me I will show him what he has done. There is no means of getting this clearly into the head of the ministry unless you use language which is strong.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But it is important it should be correct.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister drew a cheque on the treasury which he had no right to draw. He did not sign it on a piece of paper but he authorized his men to employ the workmen and promised them their pay. That is what I mean by saying that what he did was equivalent to drawing a cheque on the treasury of the Dominion, promising these men that at a certain date they would get their money. Had the minister any right to do that? He acknowledges himself that he had not. My language was figurative.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Extremely figurative.

Mr. FOSTER. I used it to make the minister understand the enormity of what he did. Would the minister, for instance, go into the bank and for a claim which was not due or for a work which was not authorized, authorize that bank to issue to him money payable on a certain date? Has he any right to do it? He knows he would not do it, he knows he could not rightfully do it and if he did attempt to do it, he would attempt to do what there was no law or reason for, and yet this is equivalent to that very same thing. My hon. friend behind me said that this was infra dig of the gov ernment. That is the smallest part of it, it is a system which is absolutely equivalent to drawing in advance from the treasury of the Dominion when you have no legal right or warrant. That is a very bad method of carrying on the business of the department. The minister gets out of these things easily. Yesterday we had a case in which the minister and his predecessor expended $65,000 without any authority and against the express provision of the law by day's labour doing a work from year to year and never availing himself of the simple formality of going to the Governor in Council and getting an order in council to make his action legal. There is a statute specifying the course to be pursued by a minister in such a case and implicitly forbidding any other course. The minister has violated that statute over and over again. The St. John pipe line was not the first case in which it occurred, we had other cases a few days ago. How far are we going. how far is this parliament going to allow the minister to go in this arbitrary, illegal and unauthorized fashion? We pass a law in which we lay down the principle that these expenditures shall be made by tender and contract, but as a too rigid adherence to that principle would sometimes lead to trouble, we make an exception and provide that if, in the case of an expenditure up to $5,000, the minister has reason to believe the work could be better or more quickly done by day labour, he makes his request and gives his reasons to council, and if the council consents, the work is done in that way. But my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works and his predecessor have spent $65,000 upon that Carleton and Partridge island work and had the work done by day labour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought we had passed that item.

Mr. FOSTER. I am using it as an illustration. I know that it bears heavily on the hon. minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. If he has a conscience which is not disturbed at all by such glaring violations of the law, and I take his word for it, I can understand how this does not affect him. But when there are violations after violations of the law, the question is whether parliament will give up its rights and leave such matters wholly to the discretion of an irresponsible minister. I do not think parliament wants to do that. It has few enough rights, and when it enacts a law, the minister should carry that law out; and a law regarding public expenditure is one of the most important we can pass. I place these matters before the minister as strongly as I can because they evidently do not disturb his conscience.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think my hon. friend took advantage of the right item on which to base his complaint. If he had condemned as forcibly yesterday the expenditure on the work at Partridge island as he has done to-day, his protest might have had some effect.

Mr. FOSTER. I did deal with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the item under consideration now is not such an item as affords my hon. friend reason to dwell upon it so forcibly, and for this reason. Parliament last session authorized this work to be proceeded with.

Mr. FOSTER. Authorized the minister to do the work for $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. After expending $2,000, it was found that unless the work was continued and this additional money expended, what had been done would be in danger of being washed away. That was brought to the attention of my chief engineer and he brought it to my notice, and the resident engineer was authorized to go on with the work so far as was necessary to prevent its being destroyed during the coming spring. All the chief engineer did was to tell the resident engineer that the men who did this work and supplied the material had to take their chances of the money being voted by parliament. Let me call attention to what took place over and over again when my hon. friend was Minister of Finance, just as it is taking place to-day and has taken place under all administrations. Suppose a public building has to be erected, and is estimated to cost $100,000. Parliament usually votes one-third of the amount as being the sum which is likely to be spent during the coming year, and the contractor goes ahead. It is provided in the contract that if he goes beyond the amount appropriated by parliament, he must do so at his own risk. He is supposed to stop when that appropriation is exhausted. By the 1st of October the contractor has done work on the building to the value of one-third its estimated cost and the parliamentary appropriation is exhausted. Does he stop? Did he stop when my hon. friend was minister? No, he goes on with the work. He may do work to the extent of $75,000. In such a case what did my hon. friend do? He put in the supplementaries an amount sufficient to pay the contractor for all the work done during the current year exceeding the appropriation. He did that over and over again. What is the difference between such a case and the present instance? My hon. friends say that in the present instance, the putting in of the supplementary vote is equivalent to drawing a cheque on the treasury for $4,000. But when my hon. friend gave his contractor to understand that an amount would be put in the supplementaries to cover what he did during the current year in excess of the parliamentary appropriation, was he drawing a cheque on the treasury to that amount? If his contention be right, then every time you put an item in the supplementaries, you are drawing a cheque on the treasury, and pledging the public credit, and all these votes in the supplementary estimates, amounting to $2,000,000 or $3,000,000, should not be there. Why are they there? They represent wages due, amounts due for rents and supplies, amounts due to contractors on public buildings and wharfs all over this country, and which were not wholly provided for in the main estimates of last year. That is why we ask to-day for these supplementary votes. My hon. friend may, with his keen intellect and his keen discernment of right and wrong, be able to see the distinction between the two cases, but I am not. No doubt it is the duty of the foreman to stop the work when he gets notice that the appropriation is exhausted, and his permitting it to go on can only be justified under very exceptional circumstances. In the opinion of the engineer, the case in question was one in which it was justifiable to go ahead and make the necessary expenditure to save the work from destruction.

Mr. GERMAN. The matter under discussion is one regarding which I have very particular knowledge. I know that all contractors are in the habit of doing work ahead of the appropriations. If the Department of Public Works or the Department of Railways and Canals, when they give out contracts, would notify the contractors that there was a certain amount to be appropriated and that after that appropriation was exhausted, the work for that year must stop, the contractors would tender on very different lines from those on which they do now. But under the late government, when my hon. friend from North Lanark was Minister of Railways, things were done in exactly the same way as at present. My hon. friend shakes his head, but I know they were. If the contractors were told that after the appropriation was spent, they must cease their work, they would put in their tenders accordingly but the difficulty is that they put in their tenders expecting to go on and complete their work, after the appropriation is exhausted. They spend their money and they find they cannot get paid, and that is what causes the whole difficulty. I have called the attention of the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) and the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) to this very matter. I believe the contractors who have spent their money under those conditions, should be paid interest, because they have to pay interest to the banks which are carrying them. I think it only fair that a contractor should be paid interest on the money due him from the date it is due until the date it is paid. If the department would notify them that they must work under certain conditions, then the contractors would put in higher prices, but they are not notified. I know sufficient about the whole situation to know that the proper thing to do is for the two

large spending departments of Public Works and Railways to inform the contractors that there's a certain amount to be expended, and when that is spent, they must stop the work. Or else tell them: Complete your work, and if we have not the money, we will pay interest on what you expend.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Let me show the distinction between the instance given by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) and the present instance. I will explain how we did it when we were running the government. Suppose we had a contract on the Canadian Pacific Railway the estimated expenditure on which was $5,000,000, but the amount to be expended during the year was $500,000, and that amount was asked for and voted. We entered into a contract for the $5,000,000, or for the $500,000, as the case might be. But the contractor knew, as every contractor for the government knows, that the only amount available during the year was the appropriation of parliament. He was notified when the appropriation ran out. But he relied upon the government to have a sum voted next year to carry on the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. J. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When he was in office did not he have supplementary estimates for the current year?

Mr. J. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For what purpose?

Mr. J. HAGGART. For the purpose of covering the work, just as the hon. gentle- (Mr. Pugsley) has done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just so,—where parliament had not already supplied it.

Mr. J. HAGGART. But, look at the difference between the two cases. Here is a vote for $2,000 to complete a work——

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the hon. member is entirely in error; it was towards the work, not to complete it.

Mr. LENNOX. Was there any intimation that more would be required?

Mr. J. HAGGART. It must have been the full amount.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, no.

Mr. J. HAGGART. If it was a work estimated to cost over $5,000, the minister had no right to do it by day's labour, but ought to have given it out by tender and contract. He did not do this. Why? For the simple reason that he thought $2,000 would complete the work. The House votes $2,000, and the minister goes on by day's work. After the appropriation runs out, the engineer, who is the judge of the emergency of this case, orders the work continued, and tells the men that they will be paid. So, the cases are entirely different. A contractor may have a contract for $5,000,000, the year's appropriation towards which may be only $150,000. If the contractor does $200,000 worth of work, it is quite legitimate to ask for $50,000 in the supplementary estimates to make up the difference.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. member allow me to ask him this question?: Does not that show that the minister approved of the contractor doing work to the extent of $50,000 beyond the amount voted?

Mr. J. HAGGART. I am sure the minister understands the distinction. This work was to be completed for $2,000——

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, no.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The fact that the minister violated the law in going on by day's labour, if the estimated cost was $6,000, shows that he did not expect to spend that amount. If it were a work of emergency, the minister's duty, when the $2,000 appropriation was expended, was to have an order in council passed in favour of going on with the work as an emergency work. But look at the position in which the great Dominion of Canada is placed—owing its men for days' wages for six or seven months, awaiting supplementary estimates in order to get the money to pay them. There is a silent contract between the minister and these men that they are simply to be allowed to go on with the work and will wait for their pay until the minister gets a supplementary estimate. That is not an enviable position in which to place the country, and, if I understand him aright, the minister knows it. He tries to excuse it all, but in a very lame fashion, —it is wrong to do it, and hopes that the same thing will not occur again.

Mr. FOSTER. As the minister does not seem to understand it yet, I would like to add a word. The minister takes as one example a large contract. Let us take a concrete case: We will say work going on for dredging in the city and harbour of St. John. The estimates are laid on the table and when they come up in committee the minister is asked how much it will take to complete the work, and he gives the estimate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Suppose that the minister is not asked, and makes no statement?

Mr. FOSTER. I can hardly conceive——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not the hon. member know that these Quebec items went

through and no one asked a single question?

Mr FOSTER. But it is not the duty of the minister to slip through votes, even in hurried moments, without giving to the House at least the elementary information with regard to them. And if the minister had a vote for $2,000 for work which he knew could not be completed for that amount, he was not treating the House fairly if he did not tell the House, in all frankness, that it would cost more to complete the work. The minister's duty is clear, and I am sure no one sees it more clearly than he does. Here is a public work, the quantities and estimated cost of which are known. An appropriation is made for it. The minister makes a contract for the construction, which contract binds him to pay for the work so much on progress estimates as the work is done. Nobody can tell just how much will be done in one year. It will depend very much upon the circumstances that meet the contractor as he proceeds. But the contract is plain, if the contractor finishes that work he is to receive so much money. The contract is plain, because parliament has agreed to the expenditure of that large amount of money for that work, and it proposes to pay for it, and authorizes its minister to enter into a contract to get the work done. This case is entirely different. Here is a piece of work which is done by day's labour. The minister does not tell the House when he brings down his estimates and gets his $2,000, that it is to cost more. If he had told the House that it was to cost $6,000, he would then have been obliged to let it by tender and contract, or to have got the authority of council in order to allow the work to be done by day's work. But he did not tell the House that, it is $2,000, and that is all the minister has, and it is all he has a right to pledge. The cases are as different as they can be, and the minister sees it as clearly as any man in this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish I had the ability of my hon. friend to make black appear white and white appear black, but I am not able to do that. If I understand my hon. friend, this would have been all right if, at the last session of parliament when I asked for the $2,000, I had stated that the work was likely to cost some $10,000; and then, if I had entered into a contract to have the work done, and the contractor had gone on and finished the work just as it is now being done, in that case I would have been quite right in coming to parliament and saying: Although I have only $2,000 of an appropriation, yet I have given the contract for $10,000, the contractor has gone on faster than we anticipated, he has finished up his work, and I must ask parliament for a vote of an additional $4,000, or all that is required, to pay him. That would have been all right, according to my hon. friend, would it not?

Mr. FOSTER. Go on and make your argument.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought my hon. friend would not agree to that. The only difference is that here the country has got good value. These poor labouring men have gone ahead and have done this work under the direction of the engineer, done work which was absolutely necessary in order to save from destruction what they had already done, and for which they were paid out of the $2,000, and now we are asking parliament to give us the money to pay these men for their labour, and pay for the materials which have been put into the work. I can see a technical difference between the two.

Mr. FOSTER. Can you not see a legal difference?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I am not able to see a legal difference, because in the case of a contractor he has to go on and take the risk of parliament voting his money. The contractor had no business legally to spend one dollar under his contract beyond the appropriation of parliament. What does the contractor do? The contract expressly provides that the minister is not bound to make a payment until and unless parliament makes a further appropriation. If parliament does not make the appropriation, the minister is under no obligation and the government is under no obligation. The contractor could not go into the Exchequer Court and recover a single dollar. It is entirely a voluntary matter on the part of parliament to vote in the supplementary estimates the requisite amount to cover the over-expenditure which the contractor has made during the current year. While I say this, I am also free to say that this is something which the engineer should not permit except under the most exceptional circumstances. I do not attempt to justify it as a practice which ought to be generally pursued. The engineer thought in this case that he was doing what was in the public interest, he thought the work he was doing was necessary to save from destruction that which had been already done. He fully explained to these men that they would have to wait, he explained that they could not expect the money until parliament voted it. As I understand it, the distinction is merely a technical one. In each case the work has been done; in the one case the contractor, and in the other case the men, simply look to parliament to do what it is not bound to do, and it is for this committee now to consider whether this work having been done, it being a useful public work, and having been done in the public interest, it should provide money for

the purpose of paying these men for their labour and to pay for the material.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is an eminent lawyer, stands high in his profession; I am not a lawyer, but I am willing to put my common sense against the minister's law, and submit it to this committee. The minister came down to parliament, he proposed this work, he told parliament it would cost $10,000. Parliament gave an appropriation of $2,000 towards the completion of that work. That authorized the minister to enter into a contract for the work, he called for tenders and let the contract. With that authorization he entered into a contract with a man to perform that work, and upon the work being properly performed and certified to, that man would have a claim for $10,000. That is the one case fair and square.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would he have a claim until parliament voted the money ?

Mr. FOSTER. It makes no difference. The very moment you make a contract with a man by which he is to carry out that work, he is to receive on the completion of that work, $10,000. That is a hard and fast contract. My hon. friend said that if he went on and built it, it was a mere matter of grace, or favour, or good will for parliament to make an appropriation to pay him. Now I will put my common sense against his law, and I will say this: If the minister entered in that way into a contract with a man to perform a work upon the completion of which he should be paid by this country $10,000, if the man went on and performed the work, advanced his own money when the appropriation was run out, paid his own men, bought his own material and performed the work himself, and said, there is your work, put on your inspector, and the inspector goes on and says it is all right, that man can collect from this country his $10,000, unless the country is mean enough not to give him the fiat to go to court.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend omitted to state that in all these contracts it is expressly provided that if the contractor goes beyond the appropriation he does it at his own risk.

Mr. FOSTER. Exactly, he does so at his own risk, and he pays his men, if he wanted to pay before the six months are over. You are not then in the deplorable condition of having John Smith, and Tom Brown, and a dozen others owed by the government six months for work, and the government not able to pay them, and this country held up in that sort of fashion. He can go on and say, 'I will complete this work, I have got the men and material here, I will provide my own money and complete it, and when it is completed I will get my money from the government.' There is no government in the world that could withhold that money from him. He takes his own risk, but the risk amounts to nothing. This is the difference. The minister in this case came for a $2,000 expenditure, if he had come for a $6,000 expenditure, he would have had to let it by tender and contract. He dit not do it, and he came for his $2,000 and got it, that is all he should have expended. His engineer did wrong, and he himself did wrong, in allowing his engineer to enter into any kind of an understanding with these men to go on and complete this work for $4,000 more, and promising that in four or five, or six months afterward this parliament would pay it. But there is no use in my hon. friend and myself showing our comparative excellence in law over these items, so I think we will stop.

Batiscan—dredging channel at mouth of river, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract to Randolph Macdonald, and is to finish up the payments to him.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has it cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has cost somewhere in the vicinity of $70,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is being done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for dredging at the mouth of the channel and improving the navigable river to a depth of six feet at low water, a distance of five miles up the river.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the business on the Batiscan river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is considerable local traffic. Market boats call there. The Richelieu & Ontario Navigation Company's boats call, and it is a great convenience to farmers to have steamers come in and give them a cheap means of getting their produce to market. The mail boats call there.

Mr. FOSTER. The Batiscan flows into what river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Into the St. Lawrence. It is 21 miles below Three Rivers.

Mr. FOSTER. What point are you dredging up to?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Ste. Geneviève, five miles from the mouth.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Ste. Geneviève?

Mr. LAVERGNE. 3,000, including the parish and town.

Mr. FOSTER. If you take in a whole county you can easily get 3,000 and more. You might go right up to the height of land.

Mr. LAVERGNE. The census will show you that my statement is correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work is being done at the very reasonable charge of 17 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. FOSTER. If, in our time, we had undertaken to spend $70,000 in every little village and in every little river I think there would have been ructions in this parliament and in the country as well. Seventy thousand dollars is a tremendous amount of money to spend. What is the commercial equivalent that is to come from the expenditure of $70,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. First of all I want to correct a statement I made as to the contractor. It is not Mr. Randolph Macdonald, but the contractors are Messrs. Dufresne, Turcotte & Marchildon. My hon. friend says there would have been ructions. When—years ago?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, at any time when we had good sentiment in the House and in the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was not as much revenue as we have now.

Mr. FOSTER. And there was not as much call for revenue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is probably because the country has about doubled in growth and importance and everything that contributes to the development of the nation.

Mr. FOSTER. There were not as many taxes then as now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And not as much ability to pay them as now.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know about that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we had better discuss the item.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, go on.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Besides the town of Ste. Geneviève there are on the river, Batiscan, St. Prospère, St. Stanislas and St. Narcisse.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these places below Ste. Geneviève?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are all accommodated by this steamship service.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that so? The minister says they will be; will they be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is my information. Apparently there was a petition presented in favour of this work. I have not the petition with me now because this was entered upon some few years ago, but the people of Batiscan, St. Prospere, St. Stanislas and St. Narcisse represented that it would be a great advantage to them to have steamers calling and to be thus enabled to send their products by water, it being much cheaper than by railway. I think we ought not to take too strong a stand against improving the waterways of the country. A reasonable expenditure in dredging out these rivers to enable the steamers to get to the various settlements of the country to enable the people to get their produce to market by water is a matter of a good deal of importance. Water transportation is very cheap as compared with railway transportation.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know about it being any cheaper when you have to do it at a cost of $70,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is cheaper for the people and while the initial cost may be larger when it is once done it is done for all time.

Mr. BLAIN. What amount was voted last year for this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was an appropriation of $15,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Was it all expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. And how much more?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It takes $4,000 to finish the expenditure of the current year.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. They spent everything last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This $66,000 has been running for a number of years. All we spent last year was $18,867 and we had $15,000 of an appropriation.

Mr. AMES. What will it cost to finish it up to the railway bridge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the memorandum.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What depth of water will it give?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Six feet at low tide.

Mr. FOSTER. Do the Richelieu steamers run up there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Flat bottom boats?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A number of boats of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company; I do not say their biggest boats.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister explain how the Richelieu steamers are going to get up with six feet of water?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Their big steamers do not go there, but they have a boat which makes close connection with the mail steamers on the river.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, I was buoying myself up with the idea that these magnificent steamers went up there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The mail steamers do not go up the different rivers, I think the mail steamers connect with the boat which runs up the river.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps it is a row boat.

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to know what it will cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It all depends on how much dredging we will do.

Mr. LAVERGNE. This is in the county of Champlain. I am sorry the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin) is not here because I know he would defend the work if he were present. There are large saw-mills located upon the river and boats go into the river to get lumber.

Mr. FOSTER. Saw-mills at Ste. Geneviève?

Mr. LAVERGNE. Yes there is one at Ste. Geneviève and one at the mouth of the river Batiscan.

Rivière Bonaventure—training pier, $4,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make payment on a contract for work done during the year.

Mr. AMES. We have already made our protest against that.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the meaning of a 'training' pier?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to train the current so that it scours out the channel and directs the flow of the silt.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it prove itself fairly amenable to training?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does as a rule.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought that a current was rather obstinate, uncertain and difficult to train?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is wonderful how you can direct it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much will it take to put this current into a good condition of training?

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been expended altogether?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be about $27,000.

Mr. FOSTER. When that amount is spent what will the minister have?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will have a training pier 1,200 feet long, 22 feet wide on top, 14 feet high at the outer end and 5 feet above high water spring tides.

Mr. FOSTER. The design is to keep the current out of the river.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is rather to concentrate the current into a narrower channel so that it will carry away the silt.

Mr. FOSTER. And allow of better navigation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the size of the city to which the navigation goes?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is one of the largest shipping points upon all that coast.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the lumber go out by water?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister sure of that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the lumber loaded on this pier?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know but I should think not.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. C. Marcil). May I be allowed to say that the Bonaventure river is the largest river in the county of Bonaventure and probably the largest in the Gaspesian peninsula.

Mr. FOSTER. What does that mean?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is the outlet for the famous Robitaille timber limits which are known as the best timber limits in the province of Quebec. They were held by the late Lieutenant-Governor Robitaille and his family for 25 years and three years ago they were purchased by a syndicate headed by Senator Edwards of Ottawa, called the Cascapedia Trading Lumber Company. It was said at the time that $400,000 was paid for the limits which are now worked by this Canadian Company which has an agency in Buffalo. There is a large mill situated at the mouth of the river which formerly belonged to Mr. LeBlanc and which was purchased by this company. There are men living in Bonaventure county to-day who remember that 40 years ago three masted schooners used to enter the Bonaventure river and proceed to the basin in rear of the barrachois where there is a depth of 25 feet of water. When these limits commenced to be worked logs and stumps floated down the river and becoming embedded in the sand they completely blocked up the channel. The parish of Bonaventure River, has a population of about 1,800 and is about the largest parish in the county. This lumber company has gone very extensively into the operation of these mills and means have to be found to enable them to carry on their business. I think there was a statement made to the department last year showing that from 60 to 75 steamers and sailing craft of all kinds had been loaded with lumber and railway ties at that point. Mr. Crocket, my former opponent, who is the largest dealer in railway ties in the province of

Quebec, sent several hundred thousand from that point. These ties came down the Bonaventure river and were shipped to different parts of the United States, and even to Mexico and South America. These steamers and sailing vessels which took this freight had to anchor a mile or a mile and a half out in the open without any shelter from storms. The lumber and the ties had to be conveyed in scows and some of these were lost last year with their cargoes, and the lives of the crews endangered. Mr. LeBlanc, who was a large lumber operator there, made several requests on the government for facilities to carry on his industry. Mr. Breen, who was engineer of the district for twenty-five years, and who is still the engineer in charge of the district of Quebec, sent in one or two interesting reports showing that it was out of the question to build a wharf at Bonaventure river because it is flat land extending out into the bay, and the only way in which assistance could be given was to build a training pier which would serve to scour the channel of the river. This pier has been built at a cost of $27,000, and the idea is to dredge out the channel, the training pier being intended to prevent the south and west winds from filling up the river with sand and other accumulations. When some dredging is done, the vessels which now have to lie out in the bay will be able to enter the basin and load there under all conditions of weather. Anyone who has visited the locality will admit that this is a very useful work. The village of Bonaventure River itself is growing very rapidly. The Cascapedia Lumber Company has erected a large departmental store which is a new feature in the Gaspé country, and I think they employ 400 men during this winter. More lumbering is done at that one point than probably at any other point on the Gaspé peninsula.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Are there mills there?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes. Mr. LeBlanc's mill was purchased by the Edwards syndicate and it employs 150 men. It is a sawmill with all modern appliances and has been working day and night. It is one of the attractions of the place to see it. The Bonaventure river has three mouths emptying into the Baie des Chaleurs, and it runs for 60 or 70 miles into the Gaspé peninsula. There is a peculiarity caused by the development of the lumber operations in that, while in all the rest of that country the settlements are on the front, there is on the Bonaventure river the parish of St. Alphonse de Caplan located some distance from the bay. I think there are settlements now up to the 12th range from the Baie des Chaleurs into the back country as a consequence of these lumbering operations.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. FOSTER. The river itself is not navigable, I suppose?

Mr. SPEAKER. Not navigable. The fishermen go there, the salmon fishermen; it is navigable for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. And do they still load outside?

Mr. SPEAKER. They have to load out in the open, perhaps a mile and a-half out. Mr. Leblanc, the manager of the firm, informed me last year that the vessels have to anchor a mile or a mile and a-half out and the lumber is taken out to them in scows. Sometimes a change in the wind over night will delay operations or toss a scow over. They have no protection from the south and west, although they have protection from the east.

Mr. FOSTER. The training pier, costing $27,000, has not benefited them so as to allow them to bring the vessels up and load inside.

Mr. SPEAKER. The last report of the resident engineer is that the pier does not go far enough, it will have to go 150 feet further to reach the low water mark.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it proposed to do that?

Mr. SPEAKER. An application has been made, but it has not been granted yet.

Mr. FOSTER. It is no good.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Please do not tell Mr. Speaker it is no good, he has been urging an extension of the pier, but it has not been agreed on.

Mr. SPEAKER. Dredging will have to be done to give a proper channel to the mouth of the river.

Mr. AMES. Is there not a wide mud flat for a mile or so out from the Bonaventure river?

Mr. SPEAKER. The bay all over is very shallow.

Mr. AMES. The vessel could not get within a mile or a mile and a-half of the river?

Mr. SPEAKER. I could not say that it is a mile; I am not a judge of distances on the water, but it is a long distance out.

Mr. AMES. The pier would not be of use until a mile of dredging is done.

Mr. SPEAKER. Dredging would have to be done.

Mr. AMES. I can see where several millions could be spent before you can get a three-masted schooner to the mouth of the Bonaventure river.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think so; my hon. friend frequently visits the Gaspé peninsula, he is a sportsman—

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose he goes fishing there when he is not photographing?

Mr. SPEAKER. We have the finest salmon fishing in the world there. A large amount of business is done at the Bonaventure river and it is only fair that some assistance should be given to it.

Mr. AMES. If there is a chance of making a protected harbour and getting the requisite depth with a reasonable expense, it might properly be made, but as I understand, this river, like the little Pasbebiac, spreads out as soon as it reaches tide water and makes a wide mud flat. If this training pier is only a preliminary which must be followed by dredging operations, to form a channel for three-quarters of a mile or a mile from the mouth of the river out to deep water, it would seem that we are making a useless expenditure now or else this expense can only be made useful by an additional expenditure of many hundreds of thousands.

Mr. FOSTER. We have secured some valuable information and it whets our appetite for more. We find, in the first place, that a training pier 1,200 feet in length, and costing $27,000, has already been built, and, in the second place, that the training pier has actually proved of no benefit at all to navigation, and the representative of the county says that the pier will never prove of any benefit to navigation unless it is made longer, at an added expense. How much longer must it be?

Mr. SPEAKER. 150 feet.

Mr. FOSTkER. 150 feet has to be added before it will have a chance to be of any service towards deepening the channel. Even then it will be of no advantage until you dredge out a mud flat for a mile or a mile and a-half.

Mr. SPEAKER. Sailing vessels always stay out a long distance in case of squalls.

Mr. FOSTER. So we will have to lengthen the pier and then dredge out this mud flat forming a channel which, in a river like that, with its silt is likely to fill up within a year. $70,000 has already been spent in getting a six-foot channel at Batiscan for less than three miles. For the ocean vessels that will come here you must have a depth of much more than six feet, I suppose from 20 to 30 feet, and I would like to know what the estimate of the amount of dredging required here is.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is greatly exaggerating and magnifying the probable cost even of doing the dredging.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not named a sum.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The report is that there will be 23,000 yards of dredging, mostly sand and mud. The Batiscan dredging cost 17 cents, and if you put this at 25 cents the cost would be only $5,000.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What depth will that give?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Eight feet at low tide. The tide rises 8 feet so that will be 16 feet but when you get into the inner harbour or basin there will be 20 feet.

Mr. FOSTER. But you have to get in there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You can get in at high tide. My hon. friend knows that in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick there are many places which are dry at low tide, where a large lumber shipping business has been carried on.

Mr. FOSTER. The channel is the vital thing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The vessels would go in and out at high tide. Many quite large vessels do not draw over 16 feet.

Mr. FOSTER. How much do the vessels draw that do load there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Those that lay out in the St. Lawrence would draw more, but those that go into the inner harbour would be adapted for that trade.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Tranship outside?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOSTER. This is to provide for transhipment. Consequently you must have ocean vessels coming up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Many do not draw over 16 feet, and the larger number of vessels carrying lumber do not draw over 14 feet. Sailing vessels only draw 14 feet and many only 12, which take away very large cargoes of lumber.

Mr. DANIEL. Are these steamers to which the minister refers?

Mr. SPEAKER. Some are steamers. Two years ago, Messrs. Thos Crocket & Co., a well known lumbering firm, loaded the largest steamer that ever left the province of Quebec with railway ties for Mexico. It was a record shipment.

Mr. FOSTER. How much would that vessel draw?

Mr. SPEAKER. From 16 to 18 feet. The town of Campbellton is at the head of the bay and the most prosperous town on the northern shore of New Brunswick, and the steamers which go there now cannot take on full cargoes. They take until they draw about 12 feet of water and then drop down the river and finish there. If steamers could go into the natural basin and take on one-half or three-quarters of their cargo, the remainder could be taken on further down.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to doing anything reasonable for the country-

side, because the country districts have claims as well as the cities, but when we boil this down, we find that the $27,000 which has been spent and the balance that will be spent is all absolutely for the advantage of a rich syndicate which has very valuable limits and which is working these limits for its own profit. It would have been a small thing for a rich syndicate, in which Senator Edwards is represented, to have done something themselves towards this expenditure instead of loading it on to the country. All the more so because the Dominion government gets no revenue at all from it. The work no doubt helps the parish and the parish above, but it is very doubtful whether we should unduly load the revenues of this country in our hurry to do a work which a large and rich lumber company should do for themselves.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I am very glad to learn that the lumber trade have enlisted the sympathies of the Minister of Public Works, and I presume this expenditure is intended to compensate that trade somewhat for the competition they have to meet through the free admission of American lumber. But I have been endeavouring, ever since I came here, to ascertain what is the policy of the government with regard to where they should place these wharfs and where they should not build them. I am led to believe from the discussion this afternoon that this $27,000 has been expended at this place because a lumber company, which bought the limits for about $400,000 and employs some 400 men, and a village of 1,800 population and a parish with a total population of some 3,000 are benefited by it. I would remind the Minister of Public Works that last year there was an appropriation of $2,000 for a wharf at a place somewhat similar but that wharf has never been gone on with. And at that particular point, limits were purchased by a company to the value of over a million dollars.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What place is that?

Mr. GEO. GORDON. It is a small place called Cache Bay on Lake Nipissing. This $2,000 was in the estimates last year but does not appear there this year. The limits purchased at that place are three or four times the value of those in connection with the particular item under discussion, and the men employed are three times more numerous than in this case.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. That was in Ontario.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. What I would like to find out is on what basis the government decides these things. In business the test would be what we were going to get back in dollars and cents and what business was going on in the locality. If the government had any such policy, I would like to know why that particular vote of $2,000 is not in the estimates this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work at Cache bay stands over, as do a great many others, in pursuance of the policy of retrenchment during the coming year.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. They voted wrong the last election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That cannot be the reason because I have kept in a large vote for a dam at Latchford which is in that constituency. But this particular work did not seem urgent, and we thought it might stand over.

Rivière du Loup (en haut)—dredging and other improvements at mouth, $6,100.

Mr. BLAIN. Who has the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. W. J. Poupore and Company. It was given after public advertisement and tender.

Mr. BLAIN. What amount will complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The expenditure was $31,219, and the appropriation $25,200. This is to pay the balance. This will not complete. It depends on how far along we may go. We have got to make a complete survey before we can tell the total cost of the work that may be required.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been spent so far altogether?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Since confederation $83,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How much by this government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the figures here.

Mr. FOSTER. How much more will be spent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not undertaken to let any new contracts next year.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there no plan made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is very necessary work. We could stop right now and have done good work in the way of improving the harbour, but there is other work to be done if we choose to do it. We have not decided yet to do any further work.

Rivière Saguenay—wharf on northeast side of Rivière aux Vases, $800.

Mr. AMES. Is the hon. minister sure this is not for a municipal bridge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no information that it is intended for a bridge. The proposed wharf will be 180 by 20, the outer block 30 by 30. Depth of water at low tide, seven feet. Total length, 210 feet. That does not sound much like a bridge, and I am sure my hon. friend need have no fears on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. What is there there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a small village, with two cheese factories and two stores. The only market is Chicoutimi, and the only communication is by water.

Mr. FOSTER. How much will the wharf cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $7,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a navigable stream?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Saguenay?

Mr. FOSTER. This is not on the Saguenay. This is on the Rivière aux Vases.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, this is on the Saguenay.

Mr. FOSTER. Is a depth of seven feet sufficient for the Saguenay boats?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is enough for the boats that ply on that part of the river, but not for the big boats.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it above or below Chicoutimi?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is six miles above Ste. Anne village, and above Chicoutimi.

Mr. DANIEL. Are these wharfs built on piles?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. DANIEL. What are they made of?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Cribwork.

Rivière St. François—landing pier at St. François du Lac, on the west side of river, $8,000.

Mr. AMES. How much was voted for this last parliament?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $3,000.

Mr. AMES. The work was done by day's labour, was it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. This, I think, is in almost exactly the same position as the other we were discussing.

Mr. AMES. Twice as bad, for it cost double the amount.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was in hopes it was not half as bad.

Mr. AMES. When did the appropriation run out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get that information and bring it down with the other.

Mr. AMES. Strange, is it not, that all these cases occur in the county of Yamaska? It is a very close constituency, and the majority to the credit of the Liberal candidate is small.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Still, it is enough.

Mr. AMES. These two wharfs may have had something to do with making it enough—just enough.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is another case of the minister spending $5,000 by day's work. Did he get an order in council to authorize it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. I did not think the expenditure would reach $5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. But he knows it now; does he propose to get an order in council for the prosecution of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work is about completed.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What made it so expensive? What was the estimate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It cost for wharf and right of way $10,000.

Mr. AMES. From whom was the right of way purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A gentleman by the name of Cocher.

Mr. AMES. When was it bought?

Mr. PUGSLEY. August 26, 1908.

Mr. AMES. When was Mr Cocher paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume, about that time. The order in council was passed on the date I have given. The payment would be made through the Justice Department, and I have no memorandum of it.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the law that guides the minister in this matter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will send for the statutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me put the question: When the expense is not over $5,000, the minister can have it done by day's labour, but, in order to do that, must have an order in council? And if it is over $5,000, does the law provide that he has no option but to do the work by tender and contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. member is in error.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister should have direct knowledge on that point to aid that conscience of his.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What is the penalty if the minister violates the law?

Mr. PUGSLEY. One penalty is to get raked over the coals by hon. gentlemen opposite. And there is nothing much worse than that; it hurts me so much.

Mr. AMES. This seems to be an aggravated case. The minister asks $2,000 for a public work, and spends the $2,000, and then spends $8,000 illegally after the other is exhausted. There seems to be something about public works in Yamaska which causes the minister to drop the usual precautions.

Mr. PUGSLEY. While I am waiting for the statutes to be brought, perhaps we could go on with other items.

Rivière St. Jacques (Laprairie)—ice piers near mouth on River St. Lawrence, $260.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the price of the pier?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a balance due. The contract was for $7,023.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this the same kind of ice pier as Annapolis is to have to chain its ice down?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not exactly the same.

Mr. BLAIN. No suggestion of a bridge in this item?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Ste. Anne des Monts—harbour improvements at mouth of Grand Rivière Ste. Anne, $1,100.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been done there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for a combined dam, training pier and brush and stonework protection extending from one side of the river to a small rocky islet. Then there will be some new dredging to keep the channel open to a depth of about five feet at low water.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that for the purpose of directing the movement of the ice ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, this is not an ice pier, this is to keep the channel open for the entrance and departure of small vessels. The total cost is $17,750.

Mr. BLAIN. Why was this done by day labour instead of by contract ?

Mr. FOSTER. Give us the law now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was a class of work that could be better done by day labour, in the opinion of the engineer. The law will be found in the first Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 39:

36. Whenever any works are to be executed under the direction of any department of the government, the minister having charge of such department should invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of such works, except in cases,—

(a) of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest; or,

(b) in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department; or,

(c) where the estimated cost of the work is less than five thousand dollars and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. I think there is a provision defining the emergency, is there not ?

Mr. AMES.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of anything else in the statute bearing on that question. I may say to my hon. friend that my view has been that in cases where the work is important and likely to involve an expenditure of over $5,000, I have felt it my duty to go to council. But except in cases where, in the opinion of the engineer, the work is not likely to cost a great deal of money, and it can be done more expeditiously and more economically by day's work, in some cases I have not gone to council. In some cases we are not bound to go to council, but I have usually done so.

Mr. AMES. How much of this $17,000 has gone into the construction of the approach to this wharf ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not got that separate from the rest.

Mr. AMES. I would like to know how much is being spent on land and building roads ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I trust my hon. friend does not understand that this total of $17,000 has been expended. That is the estimate of the total cost. I do not see any special expenditure for an approach, I do not think there will be any approach in this case.

Mr. AMES. Last year the minister told us that the total expenditure from the start, including the approach, would be $17,750. What we would like to know is how much of that is for the approach ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may have had in my memorandum last year a reference to the approach, I have none with me at present. I do not see why I would have used the expression including the approach, because I do not see what approach there would be.

Mr. AMES. Evidently the minister thought he had good reason for using that term last year. Would the minister make further inquiries ?—because I would like to know what proportion has been expended in the approach that will be required for this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I must have been misreported last year, or else I used the expression without warrant.

Mr. AMES (reading) :

Ste. Anne des Monts—harbour improvements at mouth of Grande Rivière St. Anne, $3,500.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the nature of the improvements?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is for the purpose of completing the improvements in course of construction. The works are a combined dam and training pier. Day labour. Total expenditure from the start, including the approach, $17,750.

This is from the 'Hansard' of July 4, 1908, page 12042.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That must have meant including protection work. There must have been some error on the part of the reporter, because I do not see why I should have mentioned an approach. I may have said protection work.

Sorel—deepwater wharf, $34,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the new work which I explained a short time ago. It is to replace the wharf that collapsed.

Mr. AMES. How much property has actually been lost through the collapse? I think there were two collapses.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know what the old wharf cost, but a considerable portion was destroyed some three years ago, and recently another part was destroyed.

Mr. AMES. What is the estimated cost of replacing the old portion destroyed three years ago and the portion destroyed last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This $125,000 is to replace what was destroyed three years ago and also what was destroyed last year. The engineer was anticipating that that would probably be destroyed also, and it is intended to replace it under the new contract.

Mr. AMES. I understand that the slipping away of the old wharf is equivalent to a loss of $125,000, inasmuch as it costs that amount to put it back in a good condition again. What did the minister discover to be the reason for the loss of the wharf at Sorel?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The reason was the peculiarity of the soil in the river bed. There is a good deal of quicksand, and the wharf as originally constructed was not designed apparently to withstand the shifting of the quicksand. I think the first wharf was built upon piles and evidently the soil slipped from the bank. There was a landslide and it carried the pile wharf into the river. We have changed the design. We have excavated a foundation for the wharf and put in a large quantity of stone as a lower foundation and upon that we are building crib work. The engineers believe that the present design, which has been studied very carefully, will do for a wharf which will be permanent in character.

Mr. AMES. How long had the wharf which slipped away been constructed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About two years before the first accident happened.

Mr. AMES. Who was the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was the McAuliffe Company, either McAuliffe, Poupore and Company or Poupore, McAuliffe and Company—I do not remember which.

Mr. AMES. Had the plans been approved by the departmental engineer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. AMES. How does the minister account for the total collapse of the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because of the nature of the soil which is down under the water, conditions which were not foreseen occurred.

Mr. AMES. Is it a fact that there was considerable dredging undertaken near the site of the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think that the dredging would account for that. It is just one of those extraordinary things that you find along the banks of these rivers, such as the landslide that occurred upon the Lievre.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I understand that the plans for this wharf were incubated in the office up here without any consideration——

Mr. PUGSLEY. What dreadful thing happened to the plans?

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The plans were incubated up here by men who had never seen that part of the country at all and did not know where the wharf was to be built. It is just the same as those cottages at Kingston; they were designed to have cellars because it was thought that it would only be necessary to excavate in soft soil and they did not know that it would be necessary to quarry out limestone. But, they had to dig out the limestone and that is what increased the cost so greatly. These wharfs were designed by engineers who had no knowledge of the situation. I understand that there is a great loss to the government every year by reason of these wharfs being swept away along the St. Lawrence. Has it occurred to the department that it would be better and cheaper to carve slips into the river bank than to extend the docks out where they will be caught and carried away by the ice? In other countries, I understand, they cut slips in the banks of the rivers instead of sticking wharfs out into the water where in the spring they are carried away by the ice. I may say that I have that statement from an engineer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman has been misinformed. The plans for the work were designed by the resident engineer.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Who was the resident engineer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not now recall to mind who was in charge. Mr. Michaud is now in charge.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Who is the resident engineer, because I understand from some

engineering authorities that it was bad engineering that cost this country $125,000. It would be well to put the blame where it belongs.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are always plenty of people to criticise engineers after an accident occurs. I remember that in St. John it was proposed to build a wharf on the western side of the harbour at the Sand Point slip; it was constructed after plans drawn by an engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the work was started by the city, and when it was pretty well along, all at once, there occurred a landslide and the whole of the piling slid into the Sand Point slip. They had to change the design entirely and build on crib work. I would assume, until I had some evidence to the contrary beyond mere hearsay, that the resident engineer who was responsible for the designing of the plan, was familiar with the local conditions, and that circumstances arose which were not anticipated.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. We would like to have the name of the engineer who drew the plan. It would not take the hon. gentleman more than two minutes to get it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not tell without going to the office. I will get the information.

Mr. CROSBY. The Minister of Public Works must know the name of the engineer who made the plan which brought about an expenditure of $127,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These plans were made and this work was done quite a number of years ago. Of course, I would hold the chief engineer responsible. I presume these plans were drawn six years ago. I cannot recall who the resident engineer was, but I would be glad to get the information.

Mr. CROSBY. Would not the deputy minister know?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROSBY. How long has he been in the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Several years. I can get the name of the engineer.

Mr. CROSBY. It seems very strange that you should not have the name.

Yamaska River—dredging, $8,100.

Mr. AMES. Here is another over-expenditure on the Yamaska river. Would the minister kindly give an explanation of this item?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been dredging done during the year as follows: From July 15 to the end of October, 147,118 cubic yards of clay and sand were dredged, the channel having been cleared 3,354 feet down stream. From the outlet of the Cheval D'Or the dredging amounted to 26,732·82 cubic yards. There was also the removal of 11,907 cubic yards by the department's dredge 'St. Louis.' The appropriation was $20,000, and it requires $8,878.81.

Mr. AMES. Was it let by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, so much per cubic yard.

Mr. AMES. When the appropriation was exhausted the dredge was kept right on?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For a short time.

Mr. AMES. Until it incurred an expenditure of $8,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. AMES. When was the expropriation exhausted in connection with that dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the exact date.

Mr. AMES. You told us a moment ago that it was about the end of October, some time after the 26th.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It must have been a slip if I said that.

Mr. AMES. There were a great many urgent and illegal expenditures in the county of Yamaska at that time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You know the weather gets bad early in November and the dredges stop work.

Blind River wharf dredging, $13,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract.

Mr. BLAIN. What good purpose does it serve?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a government wharf there.

Mr. BLAIN. Will this complete it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so; it is all we intend to do at present.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is the Minister of Public Works considering the question of dredging the mouth of the Au Sable river? Ten years ago the government expended about $17,000 in building a wharf at the mouth of that river and since then they have made an added expenditure to the extent of about $25,000. Vessels of a reasonable size are not able to approach the wharf and in summer time the mouth of the river is completely closed. The wharf is of very little use owing to the fact that the aproaches are not owned by the government and people going there are continually being warned off. I trust the minister will investigate and see if it is not possible to arrange that dredging be done there this summer and that the approaches be put in first-class order so that the wharf can be used. This is a thickly settled district;

there is no railway within 12 or 14 miles, and in the summer time there are 2,000 people in the town of Grand Bend.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I quite appreciate the importance of the town of Grand Bend, and it was with a view to accommodating the increasing business that the wharf was built. There was some trouble about the right of way to the approaches and we are taking steps to expropriate. I can tell my hon. friend that there will be as little delay as possible in completing the approaches. In view of the large reduction in the vote for dredging this year I cannot hold out any hope to my hon. friend that dredging will be done at present.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The wharf is of very little use unless the dredging is done and when the wharf was built it was promised it should be done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will keep the matter in mind.

Mr. SMYTH. I had the honour to present to the minister a short time ago a petition asking that certain repairs should be done on the wharf at Blind river. Is it the intention of the minister to have these repairs made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no appropriation for the purpose at present, but I have directed that a report be made as to the repairs, if they are needed. When I get the report I will decide whether they can be attended to during the present year. The wharf is quite new and can hardly need any extensive repairs.

Mr. SMYTH. The petition asks for the re-flooring of the wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have the matter looked into.

Mr. BLAIN. What qualification is required on the part of foremen who have charge of works of that kind?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The policy of the department is to employ only those who are thoroughly reliable and believed to be thoroughly honest and competent to perform their duties.

Mr. BLAIN. On whose recommendation are they appointed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The member for the county is asked to recommend a competent man whose name is then submitted to the resident engineer who is instructed not to employ the man unless he is thoroughly competent and experienced.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the member or the engineer who is the highest court of appeal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The engineer.

At six o'clock committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Collingwood harbour—to pay Contractor Joseph Battle interest accrued at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, on delayed payments for works performed by him in connection with his contract of August 25, 1905, for the construction of an addition to the town wharf, $474.02.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is interest on an amount due to Mr. Battle. The payment was delayed ever since the contract was made on August 25, 1905. A dispute arose as to a claim rendered for additional work which the contractor claimed was not included in the original contract. After investigation it was finally decided by the minister to allow interest from October 25, 1906, on the final estimate of $15,240 at 5 per cent for 192 days and on several smaller amounts for different periods.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this a final settlement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The minister knows the circumstances in connection with this wharf. Shortly after its construction the concrete split and the face of the wharf was ready to fall into the water. Have the department taken precautions to make the contractor responsible in case it should collapse?

Mr. PUGSLEY. After an investigation the engineering department concluded that the splitting was not the fault of the contractor. I think the diver found that a dredge had interfered with the under-pinning.

Collingwood harbour—improvements, $10,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the payments on the contract work done during the past year.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. An over-expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. He exceeded the appropriation a little.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The work there is hardly completed yet. There is supposed to be 20 feet of water coming into the harbour, yet last August a vessel drawing 17 feet stuck in the middle of the channel. That channel ought to be swept and there are several corners where the 500 foot vessels cannot manoeuvre into the wharf. In order to make the channel thoroughly satisfactory some work should be done. I know that this committee has not the power to increase an appropriation but I would suggest that the minister, in allotting his general vote for dredging, should consider the advisability of making these improvements in the Collingwood channel.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I recognize the importance of Collingwood harbour. The business there has increased rapidly and there is no doubt that further improvements are very much needed; but it must be borne in mind that we have already expended in a comparatively few years pretty close to $1,000,000 in Collingwood and we have made it a good harbour. But at the same time we must recognize that the business is congested and that there is necessity for further improvements. The channel needs straightening, there are some edges of rock to be taken off and some deepening to be done. The matter is engaging my careful attention. I do not know just what we can do this year, we have many demands from a great many sections of the country and my general dredging vote is very small, I am sorry to say.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. In this connection I would point out the importance of the question of lake transportation. I notice that in the estimates the knife has been put very deeply into the works appertaining to transportation, especially on the great lakes. I mentioned to the House once before this session that the works at Fort William and Port Arthur were being carried out in accordance with the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Transportation. There is one weak link in the chain, the points on the lower end of the lakes. I do not think the government recognize that the increase in the number of steamers and barges in our lake fleet will necessitate the construction of fully half a mile of new dock accommodation at the lower end of the lakes every year. Each of these ships is from 300 to 500 feet long, and they must have discharging accommodation. We should consider the advisability of making ample provision at the various ports on the lakes, for their accommodation. It will be only ten or fifteen years until we will not have enough harbours for that traffic. I find in the statistical report of lake commerce given by Col. Davis of the corps of engineers of the United States navy and also in the report by the American section of the International Waterways Commission, that the number of Canadian steel steamers in that trade in 1907 was 108. The number has now increased by about 8 or 10, making 115. The registered tonnage in 1907 was 92,224 tons and the value of this tonnage was $7,648,000. The average cost of carriage from the head of the lakes per ton mile to the lower end was ·08 cents. I am giving these figures with a view to showing just what advantage the public are deriving from the work carried on by this government and the necessity for these improvements. The total tonnage carried, according to the American statistics, was 2,747,750 tons. About an equal amount is carried from Port Arthur and Fort William in American bottoms, making a tonnage of nearly 5,000,000 tons a year from the head of the lakes to American and Canadian ports. The average trip to the American ports would be about 827 miles, but many of the Canadian ships go as far as Montreal, and the average trip will be about 1,000 miles, and at an average cost of transportation of ·06 cents per ton mile. The saving on the thousand mile trip over rail transportation will be 31½ cents per ton.

Take that saving on 5,000,000 tons a year, and you will find that the farmers of our Northwest actually save $1,775,000 per annum on the cost of transport of their products to Montreal by water, as compared with what they would have to pay for haulage by rail. Within the last two or three years Montreal has been getting the bulk of the grain traffic for Europe, which is due to our good harbours and deep waterways. Taking up to-day's newspaper I find that the Americans are endeavouring to take the grain trade away from Canada through American ports and are taking steps to cut the through rates on the American trunk lines. With this end in view they have cut about a cent a bushel on grain to the sea-board all around. It is up to us to see that we do not lose the advantage we have gained after many years of struggle and the expenditure of enormous amounts of public money. The fact that on the other side of the line they are endeavouring to take the trade away from us should make us all the more determined to keep it and if necessary spend a little more money for that purpose. Such money will be well spent because the expenditure will accrue to the benefit of the Northwest, not only as regards the people there now but the mililons who will be there ten or fifteen years hence. It is estimated that the canals at Sault Ste. Marie will not be able inside of ten years to accommodate the amount of traffic requiring to go through them. I know that many hon. members really cannot realize the enormous amount of traffic which comes down through that country, and by which the ports of Montreal, St. John and Halifax are benefited. But if that tonnage goes through Buffalo and Erie, the earnings on the lower end of the tonnage, which now benefits the people of eastern Canada, will be lost to Canada. What that means can be realized when the saving of 3½ cents a ton amounts to nearly $2,000,000. I feel satisfied that the minister recognizes the importance of this, but I wish to impress it upon the House, and more especially on his colleagues, who are not in touch with the transportation problems of this country. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals knows the tremendous growth of this trade. I can remember when you could count all the ships en-

gaged in it in Canada on the fingers of your hands, but to-day we have over 100 steel vessels carrying that traffic. I trust the government will see fit to increase the expenditure this year on those lower lake terminals. I know that the question of expenditure on the port of Montreal will come up, but as a Canadian, living far from Montreal, I would be satisfied to vote in favour of making Montreal and St. John free harbours. That is the only way in which we can keep our supremacy. This year the estimates for the province of Ontario on the upper lakes has been cut down over $1,000,000 in the case of harbours and other improvements to navigation. I know that the government left the door possibly a little too wide open in its policy last year on account of the elections, but after all the cut, I think, is a little too deep, especially in view of the fact that other departments of the government have not been quite so economical. We all recognize that the Minister of Public Works has great difficulties to meet, we all know that he has to try and disarm with his pleasant, sunny smile those who are urging expenditures on him, but I think he should rather exercise his diplomatic arts on his colleagues and make them give a little more money in order that these works may be carried out and that the spout be not too small at any particular end. The port of Montreal should be looked after, the whole chain of transportation should be looked after. It is that chain which has given us the supremacy. Instead of spending money on visionary projects for diverting the traffic from Montreal and these other ports to Hudson bay and elsewhere, we should rather spend our means on practical objects, and then, if we have anything more to spend, use it on these future possibilities.

Mr. D. A. GORDON (East Kent). The hon. gentleman apparently has fallen into the impression that our harbours in the Georgian Bay district are insufficient to take care of the traffic. I would remind him that one dock, 500 feet in length, capable of accommodating an ordinary steamer, can handle at least 10,000 tons a day. In fact boats carrying ten thousand tons are frequently unloaded in less than seven hours time.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What kind of freight?

Mr. D. A. GORDON. Ore.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. There is no ore coming from the west.

Mr. D. A. GORDON. It will unload ten thousand tons of grain in six or seven hours, and on that basis twenty docks would handle 50,000,000 tons during the eight months of navigation.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. My hon. friend should take a trip and find out whether he could handle 10,000 tons of package freight in seven hours at any of these ports. If he can do that, he ought to take out a patent, and he would make a fortune. That freight is all handled by hand, and to handle ten thousand tons by hand is slow work.

Mr. D. A. GORDON. I was not aware that package freight comes from the west. I was referring to the grain trade.

Mr. SPROULE. There happens to be an immense quantity of package freight for the west and from the west. I would endorse every word of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie). I have lived on the Georgian bay for some fifty years, and watching the development from year to year, I know the growing importance of these works and the urgent need for the expenditure of money. No doubt in the future all these ports will be overtaxed. Although the accommodation there is moderately fair to-day, in the future it will not be sufficient for the needs. With the increasing number of railways reaching the Georgian bay, it becomes absolutely necessary to have these harbours made suitable for handling freight. You may unload a boat very rapidly with grain, but there are times when it is a very slow process. At Owen Sound frequently you will see the place crowded, and I presume it is the same in Collingwood and Midland and in all these ports on the Georgian bay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not object to my hon. friends pointing out what they think ought to be done in the future, but it would be a graceful thing if they would recognize what we have done in the very recent past.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. We do.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very glad to hear it. I think that this government is entitled to the greatest possible credit for its recognition of the transportation needs of the country and more especially of the great opportunities which exist for the development of trade between the western shores of Lake Superior and the ports of eastern Canada by way of the great lakes. We have done a great deal in the past. We have done all that the government could be expected to do. Just consider what has been done at Port Arthur. We are engaged in deepening the harbour, we have already deepened it to 22 feet, and our plan provides for 25 feet so as to give accommodation to the largest lake steamers, which can go to any port on the western shores of Lake Superior, whether American or Canadian ports.

We are building a great breakwater, which, ultimately, will be made two or three miles in extent, so as to afford not only a

safe harbour but one in which the shipping will be moved with the greatest economy and convenience. At Fort William, in addition to the terminals of the Canadian Pacific, we are engaged in a large scheme of deepening and widening the Mission and Kaministiquia rivers. Here also we are providing a depth of twenty-five feet. We are making a turning basin with an area of thirty-two acres, with a view to giving every possible facility for the handling of vessels. We are also building a long revetment wall which will be of great benefit to the shipping in the harbour. Of course the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Canadian Northern are doing their part, but the government is co-operating with these railways to the utmost extent. I think my hon. friend (Mr. J. A. Currie) ought to realize that the government and the country is dealing in a broad spirit with these harbours when it is providing, notwithstanding the present conditon of the revenues, $600,000 for improvements at these ports on the western shore of Lake Superior during the coming season. That is a large sum to spend and it will be spent to the best advantage. The result will be that, before long, there will be terminal facilities at the western end of Lake Superior which will not be surpassed by any port in the world. I have seen the plans of these railway companies, and I know what our plans are. The terminals are being made on a broad and comprehensive scale. We are working to a definite plan and with the determination to make these ports all they ought to be. Our aim is to provide that any lake vessel which can enter the harbour of Duluth or Chicago shall be able to enters the harbours of Fort William and Port Arthur. What we want is that our harbours shall be equal if not superior to those on the United States side of the line. We realize that for many years, the grain traffic of the west has been going to the port of Buffalo and the Atlantic ports of the United States. It is much to be regretted that as much as 18,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain passed through the port of Buffalo last year and was lost to the eastern Canadian ports. We are seeking to remedy that. That is our aim, and we hope that, before long, the whole grain trade of the west, as well as the other trade of that country, will pass through Canadian channels and through Canadian seaports to the markets of the old country. I believe we shall succeed. Now come to the eastern shores of the Georgian bay. The hon. member says that we ought to pay more attention to the development there than we have done. We have spent money in the improvement of the harbours of Parry Sound, Collingwood—and I may say right here that, at Collingwood, we have spent about $1,000,000. The gentleman who represented that riding before my hon. friend (Mr. J. A. Currie) was persistent in putting forward the claims of Collingwood and he got great recognition of those claims.

Mr. HENDERSON. He made a lot of sacrifices to get it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not prepared to say that the country made any sacrifice. I am not prepared to say that the expenditure was not a wise one. It has greatly increased the facilities for carrying the trade on the great lakes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) is aware that the work was undertaken virtually in partnership with the town—the town paid its share ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is always well when the municipal authorities show their faith in the future sufficiently to put their money in it—it is good evidence that they have faith in the town. And, no doubt, it made it easier for the gentleman who represented the constituency to win the recognition he did of Collingwood's claims. We have improved the harbours of Owen Sound, Midland, Southampton, Goderich, Sarnia, Meaford, Penetanguishene and Depot Harbour —all ports on Georgian Bay and Lake Huron, and all giving signs of being capable of doing large business with our Canadian west. Take Goderich, for example: it is perfectly wonderful how the trade of that port has increased. From only two or three millions of bushels of grain which came there a few years ago, the trade increased so that, last season, 10,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain were brought into Goderich harbour. Goderich bids fair to become a great distributing point for the grain trade of the west. We have spent a good deal of money there and are asked to spend more. We hope we shall be able to spend more. Our attention was called to what seemed to open up a greater possibility than ever before of developing trade through Canadian ports by means of the railways, and these new harbours of Tiffin and Victoria. What will it mean when these railways are constructed? It will mean that one locomotive will haul forty cars of grain in a trainload, instead of fifteen or twenty cars as at present, thus reducing the cost of hauling grain by fifty per cent. I mention these things to show that we have not been dealing in a niggardly way in the expenditures we have made in the development of transportation between the east and west.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I know that a very strong effort is being made by the two transportation companies to have all the money spent at Tiffin and Victoria harbour. But I want to point out that fully forty per cent of the grain that comes from the northwest

is ground in mills in Ontario and through this adjacent country. I will warrant that fully fifty per cent of the grain that came through the elevator at Goderich was absorbed before it reached Montreal, or, at the very least, before it reached the maritime provinces. When we consider the enormous quantity of grain coming down from the west, it is evident that the portion that goes into local consumption will afford business for other harbours than Tiffin and Victoria. For that reason, I do not see why making terminals at these two points for the through traffic should prevent a little money being spent at other places that have given evidences of their good faith and their belief in themselves and in their public works. And, after all said and done, after the work at Tiffin and Victoria harbour is all finished, the same trouble will exist as before—there will not be sufficient dockage. The hon. gentleman who quoted figures about the vast quantity of tonnage that can be got from the hold of a vessel in a short time, had in mind the work at the docks of Cleveland and Lorraine, where they will run fourteen buckets holding ten tons each into the hold of a vessel to be loaded at once with iron ore. These vessels that traverse the lakes spend fully fifty per cent of their time loading and unloading. Sometimes they have to wait three days for their cargo at the head of the lakes, and sometimes four or five days at the south end of the lake to have their cargo discharged. The minister has told us how $600,000 is to be spent by the government in the development of Fort William and Port Arthur. But the railway companies and elevator companies, I understand, are spending $2,000,000 in improving their grain handling facilities there. The only reason why I dwell on the importance of Georgian bay ports in this: If you turn to the minister's own report you will find an extract from an American authority showing that the vessels the Americans are employing are vessels 500 and 600 feet long and carrying 10,000 to 12,000 tons at a load. It is important for us to keep our seaports going in the winter time, and for that reason we should have large storage elevators at this side of the lake as well as large terminals at the other, so that grain can be hurried down in the winter months through the natural channels, for instance, to St. John. A large quantity now goes to Portland that should go to St. John, or Halifax, or other ports on the eastern shores of Canada. There is no reason why one pound of this tonnage should go out of this country except through Canadian ports.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister thought he was doing a good deal at the head of Lake Superior in making these harbours suitable for ingress and egress of the largest boats from the east or from the west. But I want to draw his attention to the fact that the same boats go to the south shore of the Georgian bay. Boats carrying 250,000 bushels of grain, and that is about the ordinary cargoes, come down the Georgian bay, and the harbours must be equally as deep and as good on the Georgian bay as they are at Port Arthur and Fort William. though they may not require as much space. They want just as great a depth of water and equally good facilities for loading and unloading. The minister says he thinks they have done very well in providing and spending $600,000 on these harbours at Fort William, Port Arthur and other harbours. But does he think, when they are spending over a million dollars on that Newmarket ditch, what that sum of money would do for these very harbours we are speaking of, and that whereas, in the one instance, the money is absolutely thrown away, in the other instance it is very much needed. If there is a shrinkage in the revenue and it becomes necessary to curtail expenditure, we would expect a wise government to curtail expenditure on useless proposals, and use all the money available in places where it is very much needed, like these harbours on the Georgian bay. The money is very much needed at Port Arthur and Fort William. A large share of that grain, as my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. J. A. Currie) says, is hoisted into elevators on the south shore of the Georgian bay, and in the winter it is distributed to the mills that grind all the time. Consequently these improvements are required in these harbours. Meaford is a fairly good harbour, but it is not equal to the needs. There is only room for one boat to go in at a time. Owen Sound is a better harbour than Meaford, but in neither is there anything like the depth of water that is sometimes needed. Then Collingwood has a fairly good harbour compared with what it was years ago; but the grain growing trade of the country will outstrip its conveniences in the near future. So all these harbours call for constantly increasing expenditure to keep them up to the development of the trade that is going on from year to year.

Little Current—improvements of Northern channel in Georgian bay, $82,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is to pay the balance due on the contract for the current year. The work is being done on what is called the inside channel of Little Current, between Manitoulin island and the mainland. It is dredging and blasting rock.

Harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $5,500.

Mr. EDWARDS. I desire to call attention to a matter which I think I may properly mention under this item. Some days ago I put a question on the Order Paper in reference to the Wolfe Island canal, and I was informed that the Department of

Public Works could not get any information in reference to that matter. Now Mr. Chairman, this Wolfe Island canal was constructed over 50 years ago, and therefore there may be an excuse for the department not being able to find information in reference to it. It was in use up to about 20 years ago, since which time it has not been in use. I want to draw the minister's attention to the following circumstances. There is a bridge across that canal which is necessary to the people living on Wolfe island. That bridge has got to be reconstructed or repaired, I think a new bridge will have to be built, and naturally the people of Wolfe island would like to get assistance in rebuilding it. They have applied to the department for assistance, and have been refused. They have also asked to be allowed to shorten the spans of that bridge, and have been told that they must not fill in on either side of the canal. Now, it does seem to me, and I think it must seem to this committee, that it is a hardship that those people can neither shorten the span of the bridge, nor can they get any assistance to rebuild it, nor can they make any use whatever of the canal, which, as I said, has not been used for over 20 years. I want to ask the Minister of Public Works if he will either grant some assistance to the people of Wolfe island in rebuilding that bridge, if he desires that the span of the bridge shall not be shortened, or that he will leave it to the council of that municipality to exercise their own judgment in filling in and shortening the span as they think proper. I am only asking what is reasonable, namely, that he will either permit the council of Wolfe island to exercise their option in shortening up the span and construct a shorter bridge, or if he desires that the bridge be not shortened, that he will grant some assistance to the people of that municipality in building a bridge of the same length as the old one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who constructed the bridge in the first place ?

Mr. EDWARDS. That is a question I asked the Minister of Public Works some time ago, and he was unable to answer me. I am sure that the municipalities through which it runs contributed by way of bonus to the construction of that canal, but I cannot say how much. I am also under the impression that the Dominion government, or the provincial government, gave some assistance, although I am not sure as to that. I have been told by residents of the island that the Dominion government claims jurisdiction over the canal, claims authority to say that the islanders shall not shorten the span of the bridge. If they do claim that jurisdiction, it seems to me they ought to help in constructing a new bridge across the canal.

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure my hon. friend would not ask me to build a bridge at Wolfe island, which is wholly within the province of Ontario; I do not see upon what ground I could ask parliament for authority to do that. But, with regard to giving permission to the municipality to shorten the span, as at present advised, I do not see any objection to doing that. If the public have not been using it for the purpose of navigation for a number of years past I do not see any objection to making the span narrower. I think I am quite safe in saying that if the municipality will send the plans to my department, showing the span which they would like to have shortened, their request will receive favourable consideration. The matter has not come before me, but I shall certainly give to any such request my most favourable consideration because I recognize that anything that can be done, without interfering with navigation or interfering with the public interest, which would reduce to the municipality the cost of repairing the bridge, ought to be done.

Mr. EDWARDS. Of course, the hon. gentleman says that this canal is entirely within the province of Ontario. I do not know that it differs very materially in that respect from the Rideau canal or the Newmarket canal. If this canal was constructed by the government originally and if the government of to-day claim jurisdiction over it, I do not see any reason why the government should not construct the bridge across that canal as well as construct a bridge across the Rideau canal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government, as far as I am aware, does not claim any jurisdiction over the canal. If it were used for the purpose of navigation we would have the same control as we do over any navigable water. It would only be in that respect that we would have jurisdiction over it. But we have never claimed any jurisdiction or ownership over it. As far as I can learn the canal was built long before confederation, but concerning the question as to who built it there seems to be no definite information.

Mr. HARTY. It was built by private parties.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The Dominion government sent a dredge there to deepen it not many years ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps so.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. When we were discussing wharfs in Quebec last night or the night before, I referred to the fact that in the townships of Wolfe Island and Howe Island they have several wharfs there that have been built by private parties and that they have no other means of getting a market than by steamer. I know that the people of Wolfe island can only get to King-

ston or Gananoque by steamer and that the wharfs were constructed on Wolfe island and Howe island by private parties. I think that when the government is building wharfs all over the country the townships of Howe Island and Wolfe Island should also have some assistance from the government.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Public Works Department build wharfs on the property of private parties.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think I can give an instance to the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. On the St. Lawrence river below Cornwall.

Mr PUGSLEY. I know the island you mean.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is an island owned entirely by a private party.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman says that the government had built a wharf there on private property. It is not the case. Adjoining the government property there is private property, but the wharf is built on government property.

Mr. J. D. REID. The wharf is built on property there that belongs to a private individual.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The land adjoining the wharf belongs to a private individual.

Mr. J. D. REID. But the whole island belongs to a private party. I do not suppose that the government bought the land upon which the wharf is.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, they did. Would the hon. gentleman expect the government to buy the whole island?

Mr. J. D. REID. No, but I want to say to the minister that they simply built that wharf there for the convenience of a private individual. It was built entirely for his purposes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it was built as a harbour of refuge for the boats plying on the river.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is simply a pleasure resort owned by a private individual.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Another case of misinformation.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister knows well enough that that was an island owned by a private individual who had a wharf there before and the government rebuilt it for him. In this case that my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) is speaking about, I remember that last year or the year before a deputation came down and wanted assistance of the kind to which my hon. friend has referred. I know the place well. The government practically took possession of the canal, and the fact that they had been dredging and improving it made it necessary to provide a more expensive bridge. It also made it necessary to have a swing bridge that will cost much more than would be required if it were simply a stationary bridge. If the canal were dredged out there is no doubt that the route would be a great deal shorter between Kingston and Cape Vincent than going around by the upper part of the island as they have to do at present.

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty), if I understood him correctly a minute ago, interjected a remark that this canal was built entirely by private parties.

Mr. HARTY. I always understood so.

Mr. EDWARDS. My information is not the same as that of the hon. member for Kingston. He may be right but I do not think he is. While a company constructed the canal I think I am quite correct in saying that the municipality of Wolfe Island contributed by way of a bonus to the building of the canal.

Mr. HARTY. They may have.

Mr. EDWARDS. And I think the county of Frontenac also contributed something. Here was a canal which was constructed, we will say, by a private company which the municipality of Wolfe Island contributed to and which has been out of use for something like twenty years, a canal from which the municipality is getting no benefit whatever, has not for a great many years, and I think it is most unfair that this useless canal should be the means of imposing extra expense on that municipality. I think I am quite within my rights and that the people there are quite within their rights in asking a contribution from the government towards the construction of that bridge or that it may be left to them to shorten the span as they may see fit. I think the facts are that this company failed to carry on the canal and that the canal passed into the hands of the government. I am rather confirmed in that idea because of the fact that the government within the last twenty-five years, at all events, expended money in dredging that canal. I maintain that if the government claim ownership over this canal they should construct the bridge entirely.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My department does not claim any ownership over it.

Mr. EDWARDS. Whether you claim ownership or not I think the government is the owner of the canal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see how this government can be the owner of it.

Mr. EDWARDS. If you were not the owner why did you spend money on it? Why was dredging done upon it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We spend money on many rivers simply because we are requested by the people to do so to improve navigation. We do not own the bed of the river; we have no title and no jurisdiction over the foreshore so far as I know. If anything was done by the provincial government before confederation which gave us title to this canal, the bed of it and the soil of it would all be owned by the Ontario government because it would not pass at confederation to the control of the federal government All that the Federal government has is control of navigation on navigable waters.

Mr. EDWARDS. I presume that in exercising that right over navigable waters the federal government would not allow the municipalities of Wolfe Island to shorten the span of the bridge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be the reason; if it is not useful for navigation that reason would not exist.

Mr. EDWARDS. The claims of the municipalities there should receive the consideration of the government. There is a large amount of trade passing to and from these islands to Kingston and across the line, and as it seems to be the policy of the government to build wharfs and dredge harbours, the older settled parts of the country should receive consideration as well as the newly settled districts.

Mr. GERALD WHITE. Two sessions ago I brought to the notice of the government the urgent necessity for some improvements being made to the dock at Petewawa, and an item was put in last year's estimates to provide for that work. I regret to say that the appropriation has disappeared from the estimates this year, and I cannot too strongly urge on the Minister of Public Works the great necessity for these improvements. At a meeting of the Pembroke Navigation Company held recently, and at which I was present, the directors of that company asked me to bring to the attention of the government the present state of that dock. The minister knows that when that dock was constructed a few years ago, there was some defect in the plans and at low water it is almost impossible to get to the dock, there being a reef at one side which is very dangerous to navigation. Although there was an item in the estimates last year no work was done on the dock. We are not particular as to whether the government will improve the existing dock or build a new one in front of the military camp. Petewawa, since the establishment of the military camp there, has become a very important place, and it is absolutely necessary that some means should be provided to reach it by water. I would strongly impress on the minister the advisability of taking this matter into consideration and putting an item in the estimates for this work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will give it consideration.

Lake Nipissing—improvement of navigation through Narrows between upper and lower reaches of West bay and up to Monetteville, $2,000.

Mr. ARTHURS. What is this item for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The object of this is to give communication between the upper and lower reaches of West bay to Monetteville, which is quite a new settlement, but a very important one. There are a large number of farmers in there who produce a good deal of produce, chiefly hay. By doing this work, which will not cost more than $6,300, it will give them eighteen or twenty miles of navigation and enable them to get their produce to market at less expense than if they had to haul it by road. A delegation of farmers from that district waited on me some time ago and made out such an exceedingly strong case that I thought an appropriation should be provided.

Mr. ARTHURS. Is it not a fact that $5,000 has been already expended on this work and that its object simply is to provide a small canal to connect a small inland lake with Monetteville and Lake Nipissing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is nearly right; $4,800 has been expended and this is to pay for the work. The work had to be done this winter if it is to be of use next summer.

Mr. ARTHURS. I call the attention of the House to the fact that this is a small inland lake three miles in extent, and that it has no connection, or very little connection with Lake Nipissing except during high water. The fact is that a man friendly to the government erected a small sawmill with a capacity of 8,000 or 10,000 feet a day at the wrong end of the lake and unfortunately for him and he had to scow his lumber to the end of the lake so as to get it across to Lake Nipissing. In order to facilitate him in getting out his lumber the government undertook this work, which I am informed was commenced shortly before the election and carried on for a short time. It will be of no use to anybody except to the man who owns the sawmill. This is a long way from Monetteville and I hardly think there is any danger of it ever getting to that village.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend certainly is misinformed. My information is that there is a population of over 1,000 within the settlement that will be to a very considerable extent benefited by this improvement. It will give navigation for about 18 miles. The three gentlemen who waited on me did not come before the election. Mr. Monet was one of the gentlemen but I do not remember the others. So interested were they that they came all the way to Ottawa to urge this work. They made out a very strong case indeed. They showed there was a very large settlement in there, that vast quantities of hay were raised in that vicinity and that this would give navigation of about 15 miles. Mr. Corriveau the engineer of my department in charge of work in that locality confirmed their statement as to the necessity for this work.

Mr. ARTHURS. Is this work under contract or not, and was it commenced before the election ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Almost everything dates from the election. It is like the burning of Rome, the great fire in St. John and many other things that are important. My hon. friend has the date of the election as the one burning subject which he thinks of by day and dreams of by night. There was a report on October 8, 1908, from Mr. Corriveau making a recommendation as to opening this channel 275 feet long and 30 feet wide and also doing some rock cutting, and the work was authorized. There was an appropriation of $3,000 for it made at the last session of parliament and it was quite proper that the work should be gone on with.

Mr. S. SHARPE. When was the work started ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In October. Then the delegation I referred to came down after the election. The work had been gone on with as far as the appropriation allowed and the deputation said to me that it was very important to finish the work this winter. A gentleman named Levesque who is doing quite a large business up there said that if these men were permitted to finish the work under the direction of the engineer he would pay the men and if parliament made the appropriation well and good, he would take the risk of that. That shows how anxious they were to have the work done. I said: 'If you do so I shall bring the matter before my colleagues and if they agree I will put a sum in the estimates to complete the work.' That is why we are asking this additional amount.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I understand that this channel, in place of opening 15 miles of navigation, will open three miles; the lake is three or four miles long.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, about 15 miles long.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The lake is about three miles long and they would have to go around it three or four times to measure 15 miles.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no. There is a short distance that has to be dredged and it is 15 miles from there to the head of navigation.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. People acquainted with the country say not, and that there will be only two or three months in the year during which you will have water to get into the ditch.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I believe Mr. Monet is an intelligent man, a man of high reputation and he said it would be about 15 miles of navigation.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What is the length of the lake ?

Mr. ARTHURS. About three miles.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How far is it from the channel to the head of the lake?

Mr. ARTHURS. The channel is between Lake Nipissing and the small lake.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the distance between Lake Nipissing and Shanty lake?

Mr. ARTHURS. Some few hundred yards only.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. That happens to be in the district that I have the honour to represent and I think that perhaps I would not be doing my duty if I did not say that, although I have not actually been over the ground, if Mr. Monet and the other people from that locality gave that information to the minister they were abusing his confidence. I have been in past there and while I do not actually know whether the lake is three or four miles long, I think I am safe in saying it is not more than four, and I think this has been a case I am sorry to say, of misplaced confidence. I am sorry to have to say it, because I like to see improvements going on in my own district where they are needed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman disapprove of this expenditure?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Wait a moment and allow the hon. member to answer.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. You cannot undo it now because the money is spent.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I will tell you. A gentleman named McKee had a small mill at that lake as the hon. member (Mr. Arthurs) has said. He built the mill in the wrong place, at the head of this little lake

and he found he had to place his lumber upon scows, bring them down to the little portage, draw the lumber over the portage and then put it on boats again to bring it to Sturgeon Falls. Just when the election was approaching, men were set to work to do a little digging in anticipation, I suppose, of having to handle a good deal of lumber over there this year, but unfortunately the little mill has not been running this year, not a log has been taken out, so there will be no lumber to be transported there. There are a few farmers there but not a great many. They have misinformed the minister when they say there are 1,000 people, there is nothing like that at all. It will be a little benefit to these people because small craft can go in and out and it will help them to bring out a little hay, but at the same time there is a road parallel to this and for my part I would much prefer seeing that expenditure made in several other places I might point out where it is more required, as at Latchford or New Liskeard. If you investigate this I think you will find I have represented the case to you exactly as it is.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. Does it open up 15 miles of navigation?

Mr. GEO. GORDON. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would this be possible? I was told certainly it would save fifteen miles of haul over the road for the farmers' produce. What does the hon. gentleman say with regard to the distance saved as compared with the water route?

Mr. GEO. GORDON. About four miles.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Fifteen was stated to me and I will make inquiries.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that the minister told the deputation to go home and spend the money and he would see that it would be returned?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we will let this item stand.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the money been expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Under this assurance.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that the minister told the deputation to spend the money and he would recommend a repayment by the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What took place was this. They were very anxious that the matter should be proceeded with.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. That was during the election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it was after the election. There was a gentleman with the deputation, who was a man of considerable means, and he said the matter was so important he would advance the money to these people. I said that I did not know whether parliament would vote it or not.

Mr. BLAIN. How much?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are asking $2,000. I have put in the item upon the representation that the work would open up this extent of navigation which I stated. If I have been deceived, I would not ask the committee to pass the item.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The hon. minister should pay it out of his own pocket if he has put this in on false representations.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would sooner do that than ask parliament to vote it, after what the hon. member for Nipissing has said.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the hon. minister allow these gentlemen to go on and spend the money and then put an item in the estimates for parliament to vote, without sending an engineer there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was an engineer there.

Mr. BLAIN. Did he get a report from an engineer on which he based this estimate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. An engineer made a report, Mr. Corriveau. He is not here now. But upon the statement made by the hon. member from Nipissing (Mr. Gordon) I will allow the item to stand.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I understood the minister to say that the engineer stated it would give fifteen miles navigation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, these gentlemen said that.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What was the gentleman's name who offered to disburse this large amount himself?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Levesque.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. There has been some $2,300 spent on this, and I hope that the government will go on with the work and finish it as otherwise that money would be absolutely lost. I stated awhile ago that this would be of some little use to those few farmers, but the statement made by those men who came here that there would be a saving of fifteen miles was not correct. I do not think there would be that saving. It would be absolutely wrong to spend the money if the work had not been begun, but now that part of it is done we ought to complete it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Upon that admission, we had better carry the item.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am informed there is a bridge down near Cardinal for which the Minister of Railways has no particular

use. It has been lying there for four or five years. Would he take into his serious consideration the sending of that bridge down to Wolfe Island and putting it across the canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. The council of Edwardsburg want to buy it.

Mr. EDWARDS. Have you placed a price on it?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not sure.

Mr. EDWARDS. I suppose you will consider an offer from Wolfe Island?

Mr. GRAHAM. We will be glad to get the most we can for it.

Mr. J. D. REID. The township of Edwardsburg do not require the bridge, they have built another one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This discussion must be out of order when we are considering Public Works estimates.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I hope hon. gentlemen will not too long keep away from the item under consideration.

Meaford—harbour improvements, $400.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What is this item for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will complete. The contract was for $34,742.87. Then there was dredging in addition. The total expenditure to 15th February was $44,086.64, and the appropriation for the same year was $43,700, leaving $386.64 due.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has there been any plan adopted for the improvement of this harbour—any definite permanent plan?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but I do not know whether I can say that it is unalterable, like the laws of the Medes and Persians. There was a good deal of discussion as to the best plan, and we adopted one on which we are proceeding. I have here the particulars of the work done during the past year. The contract was, first for an extension 50 feet in an easterly direction at the inner end of the breakwater, which was then 430 feet long and 30 feet wide, with a view of affording additional protection from the northerly gales to vessels lying loading at the elevators in the harbour and those wintering there. Then to build a revetment wall of pile work and concrete, 300 feet in length. Also put down close sheet piling 135 feet in length and dredging to 30 feet below the low water level.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. We had a severe storm there last fall, and it was a great disappointment to the people to find that after spending all that money, the harbour was still in such a state that the boats were torn from their moorings and a number driven against the bridge and their upper works destroyed, and quite a number had to be brought to Owen Sound to make them reasonably safe for the winter. My object is not to criticise but to see if I cannot impress on the minister the advisability of changing the plan he has adopted. When, after spending $43,000, we find that the harbour does not afford sufficient protection to vessels, some change should be made. That is why the other day I impressed on the hon. minister the advisability of putting something in the supplementaries. Unless something be done now, there will be further injuries this year. This is a case which would justify the minister in placing in the estimates an amount for the purpose of remedying as far as possible the defects proven to exist in that harbour. Meaford is one of the harbours on the south shore of Georgian bay, which it is the policy of the hon. gentleman to deepen and improve, for the accommodation of large vessels unloading grain, and I would urge on him to do something this year to preserve the work already done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very glad to have the matter looked into in view of what my hon. friend has said. He speaks of putting an amount in the supplementaries, but I have not yet been advised by the Minister of Finance that we are going to have any, so that I am unable to say whether or not it will be possible to make any provision this year.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) got a memorial sent to him by the town of Meaford?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does he remember what it recited?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but it will be looked into very carefully.

Mr. OWEN. When does the minister expect to begin building the wharf at Brighton village? I hope that soon he will be asking for tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. OWEN. Did not the minister promise a wharf last election?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so.

Mr. OWEN. That was the understanding in the riding.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Owen) convey that message to the electors?

Mr. OWEN. No, not I. It came from Ottawa headquarters, and the minister did not send it through me. Somebody else delivered it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have to make inquiries.

Mr. OWEN. There was a post office promised for Campbellford, too. It was promised right from the platform on nomination day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad the hon. gentleman has mentioned Campbellford, for it gives me an opportunity to say that I have seen a letter from the gentleman to whom he refers, and that gentleman denies, in the most positive terms, that he made any promise of a public building for the town of Campbellford.

Mr. OWEN. When did he deny that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In a letter I have seen.

Mr. OWEN. I never said he made the promise.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The statement was made in this House.

Mr. OWEN. Not by me. What is the name of the gentleman charged with making that promise?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some hon. member of the House made the charge. I will look up the letter from the gentleman who was the candidate.

Mr. OWEN. I did not say that the candidate made the promise.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my memory serves me right, some hon. member of the House made that statement.

Mr. OWEN. I am more convinced than ever now that the promise was made from Ottawa.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Will the minister bring down the report of the engineer with reference to the item of $2,000 for Lake Nipissing before concurrence takes place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very glad to.

Owen Sound harbour—dredging and pile protection work, $15,700.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Who has the contract? Is this money to finish the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This money has been expended, or will be before the close of the fiscal year.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Who has the contract, and how is the work being done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A. F. Bowman, Southampton.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What was the total contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is dredge work, and is paid for by the yard, $2.75 for rock and 25 cents for other material.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How much rock has he excavated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No rock.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Was this let by tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, Mr. Bowman was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Who were the tenderers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not that information before me. I think it has all been submitted to the House and will be found in the returns or in 'Hansard' of last session.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I was not here and I would like to have that information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be glad to get it for my hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro).

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Were there disputes between the contractors and the department as to the work done in the harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was some slight dispute as to the work done in a dredging slip. The matter was not brought to my attention. There was some question as to whether the contractor was to be paid for certain work.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Can the minister give a statement as to the amount in dispute? Was there any dispute as to the work on the revetment?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will find out.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What amount has been expended on the harbour of Owen Sound to date?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think $453,000, since 1874.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Who is the inspector who certifies to the quantity of earth removed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not say, but I will get that information also.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I will postpone further discussion until we have the facts. I suppose the item stands ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Middlebro) will not ask to have the item stand. These are our supplementary estimates for the current year and these votes are to close up business. When we come for the full amount in the estimates of 1909-1910, the matter can be discussed. Will this be satisfactory?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Yes, especially as the money is expended.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would like the minister when he comes to the general vote for harbours to let me have the number of cubic yards of material excavated at Collingwood for each year for the last fifteen years, showing whether it is rock, hard pan or clay. I think the department has the facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we have the returns year by year.

Sault Ste. Marie wharf—dredging approaches, $57,700.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Is this by contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Is the work finished ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not quite.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Who has the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Great Lakes Dredging Company.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. What rates do they get ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For rock and boulders they get $2.45 a yard.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. What about clay ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is none; it is all rock and boulders.

Silver Centre—wharf on west side of Lake Temiskaming—further amount, $500.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. What is the original amount?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Last year, the House voted $4,000.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Does this complete it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will complete the block, but not a substantial approach to the land. Something further will have to be done later on.

Southampton—extension of and repairs to town dock, $16,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract, and the vote is to complete payments for the current year.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How about the town dock ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is called the town dock, but it is a public dock.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What was the revenue from it last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be in the Department of Marine, and I would not have that information.

Toronto harbour—improvements, $75,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete payments for the present year under contract.

Mr. MACDONELL. What work is this ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The western channel.

Mr. MACDONELL. What is the total amount of the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total amount of the contract is $495,000. Then there is other work going on at Toronto. There is a concrete superstructure on the northern part of the substructure of the western pier of the eastern entrance. That is costing something over $50,000.

Mr. MACDONELL. Who are the contractors for that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Miller & Cumming. Then there is other work being done for the protection of the island.

Mr. MACDONELL. I want to get the details of that contract, when it will be completed, and the amount appropriated for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What we want this vote for is shown by the following figures: There was an appropriation in 1908-9 of $120,000. To the 1st of January of the present year, we expended $126,969.49.

Mr. MACDONELL. Can you give us the details?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was paid to the contractors. Messrs. Weddell have one contract, and Miller & Cumming have the other, namely, for the island breakwater extension. That made an overdraft of $6,969.49. There is now due to the Messrs. Weddell on that contract for the new western entrance, to the 1st of March, $40,120.

Mr. MACDONELL. Would the minister kindly give us the particulars of these three contracts so far as he has them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could give some of them. The most important contract is the one for the western channel, that is the Weddell contract, and is $495,000. That is to be completed on the 15th of May, 1912.

Mr. MACDONELL. What work has been done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Somewhere in the vicinity of $100,000.

Mr. MACDONELL. Can the minister give information about the breakwater?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That contract was given to Miller & Cumming on the 8th of June, 1908, for $39,000, and is to be completed on the 8th of June, 1909. That is the construction of the extension of the Toronto island breakwater according to the amended design. There are to be six groins of crib work and concrete, 60 by 12 feet, and 163 feet of tongued and grooved 10-inch sheet piling with stone protection.

Mr. MACDONELL. I understand there are three separate contracts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are only two contracts, we are doing the other work ourselves. We are repairing the eastern breakwater by day's work, that is, putting in stone and protection work.

Mr. MACDONELL. What is being done by day's work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Repairing the breakwater at the eastern gap. That consists of the restoration of the stone talus, protection of the slope with large blocks of stone.

That is under the direction of Mr. Sing, the resident engineer of Toronto.

Mr. MACDONELL. Is there any work being done to deepen the eastern entrance?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was some dredging done last year. There is no contract for dredging work there.

Mr. MACDONELL. What is the intention of the government with regard to it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no present intention one way or the other. My information is that there is sufficient water now for the purpose of navigation, and it does not seem to be necessary to do any more dredging at the eastern entrance at present.

Mr. MACDONELL. Is there any appropriation for that? That entrance fills up every season, every season it becomes almost blocked, and requires dredging in order to make it navigable in the spring.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no special appropriation for that. We took one vote for it, improvements at Toronto harbour, quite a large vote. Of course we can do any work out of that which might be regarded as necessary for the improvement of the harbour. But with regard to the eastern entrance, I may say that until quite recently the dredging has never been properly done. We think we have now done it thoroughly, we have deepened it to give sufficient depth, and we do not expect it will fill in in the very near future.

Mr. MACDONELL. What appropriation has the minister made for the protection of the island breakwater?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have no separate appropriation for that, it is a general vote. The contract is for $39,000. Out of this general vote we pay on progress estimates, and also for the work which is being done by the day. That work is to be completed in June of this year.

Mr. MACDONELL. When is the work on the piers to the eastern entrance to be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is being done by day's work. There is no contract. I stated at least three times, but perhaps there is such a noise that my hon. friend could not hear me, there is no time fixed for the completion of it.

Mr. MACDONELL. What appropriation is there for the present year in addition to this $75,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $120,000.

Mr. MACDONELL. And this $75,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. This $75,000 is to close up the accounts of the current year.

Mr. MACDONELL. That has been spent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has not been spent, but the work has been done for which this is to pay.

Mr. MACDONELL. Then there is $120,000 for the approaching year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the $120,000 is for this year. Then, we have a vote in the main estimates for the next year to continue the work.

Mr. MACDONELL. What is that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not remember at this moment. My hon. friend will see it in his copy of the estimates if he will look it up.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the policy of the minister for the coming year as to these estimates which are now being voted for dredging in different places in Ontario and Quebec? Is it the intention to advertise for tenders for the contracts or just to give the work out to those who had the contracts last year without calling for tenders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not quite decided yet. Last year I was over-persuaded to call for new tenders and it cost the country about $200,000. I do not want to repeat that. If my chief engineer reports that the work of last season has been satisfactorily performed and that the prices are fair and reasonable and I am satisfied of it I would be rather inclined to continue the contracts for the work which is necessary during the coming year.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. Referring to the matter of the Latchford dam and the correspondence which the minister has just handed to me, I would just like to say that in looking through this correspondence it appears to me that the gentleman who has been negotiating with the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission has not been treating the minister exactly fairly, nor has he been treating fairly the chairman of the commission. I find in the correspondence here from Mr. Davis to the minister the following :

> Mr. Davis endeavoured to ascertain what 'upset price' meant, but states in his report to the minister: 'The terms upon which these lots will be turned over to the government is not made clear.' Thus far my inquiry for further particulars has not been answered by the commission. I am to-day supplying information with the hope of getting further particulars in this respect.

I have here a letter written by the commission, dated Toronto, August 28, 1908.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Addressed to whom ?

Mr. GEO. GORDON. Addressed to Mr. Davis, and Mr. Davis has evidently not sent a copy to you. I am told by Mr.

Englehart that this is the last letter written by him to Mr. Davis.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman kindly state whether this forms part of the papers on file that we have ?

Mr. GEO. GORDON. No, Mr. Davis does not give you copies of any letters from the commission to himself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will be a copy that the hon. gentleman has received from the commissioners, I suppose ?

Mr. GEO. GORDON. Yes, I got a copy from Mr. Englehart. That is why I think that Mr. Davis was not treating you quite fairly. I will read this letter which Mr. Englehart states is his last letter and to which he has not received any reply from Mr. Davis:

Toronto, Aug. 28, 1908.

J. S. Davis, Esq.,
Barrister, &c.,
Latchford, Ont.

Dear Sir,—

Re Latchford Dam.

I am duly in receipt of yours of the 20th in reply to mine of the 19th with which you enclose copies of letters of the 30th July to the chairman. I assure you this is the first we have seen of these.

As you are aware, there were some thirty lots on which building requirements had not been made, but for which purchase money had been received. Under date June 1, I wrote to each of the owners as follows:—

I am instructed by the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Commission to notify you that on account of your failure to construct building, as required by your agreement of day of for purchase by you of lots in townsite of Latchford, said agreement is liable to cancellation, and unless you take steps forthwith to comply with the agreement we shall cancel same and refund to you the amount that has been paid for said lots. We register this letter and require your acknowledgement on or before the 10th day of June, 1908.

They have notified these people that unless they build forthwith their claims will be cancelled and they will refund them the money. That would place an exact price on the value of these lots.

We have refunded purchase price to——

Three different names are given here.

The following say they have given options to you.

That is to Mr. Davis.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There were more than three lots sold?

Mr. GEO. GORDON. Yes, several lots.

The following letters have been returned by the post office authorities—parties not having been located.

Five names and seven lots are included in the list.

Mr. W. J. Holmes, owner of lot 171 writes me that he sold the above lot to Mr. Wm. O'Brien, of Sault Ste. Marie. The above will leave eight lots about which we have not heard. The owners of the lots and the numbers are as follows:—

It gives the numbers and names, which I need not read.

With regard to the unsold Latchford lots, average price of which is $165 each; before these lots were put on the market the upset price was arranged on each lot.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The upset price on better situated lots was $70 and $80 and they wanted this government to pay $160.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I see that Mr. Davis states that here, but these prices were the prices put upon the lots before the sale was made.

So that if these lots had been sold, above prices would have been the least that would have been accepted, and I regret to say that we cannot accept the prices of $70 and $100, which were not the prices that you claim were set out in the first offer to the public.

The above is a complete resume of the matter, so far as we have it.

If there is any way in which we can be of assistance to you to expedite the matter, we shall be only too happy to do so.

Yours truly,

.....
Secretary-Treasurer.

That letter is dated on the 28th August and while Mr. Englehart informs me that it has not even been replied to by Mr. Davis, Mr. Davis writes here on February 27 and the hon. gentleman gives me quotations from his letters up to June.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think August 13 is Mr. Davis' last letter to the department. Is it not there?

Mr. GEO. GORDON. No, there is a letter addressed to Mr. Hunter and signed by M. Davis under date of February 14.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What year?

Mr. GEO. GORDON. 1908.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You will find a letter in August on the file, or rather an extract from a letter.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. No, it is not on the file.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. It would appear from looking over the file that you did not have any letter such as this before you.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to see it.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I hope the minister will pardon me for being so persistent, but I do not think he realizes that there are thousands of people at the head of the Montreal river who will be unable to get

in a sufficient quantity of supplies to carry them over the summer if this work is not done, and may therefore be exposed to great suffering. Mr. Englehart has assured me he will do everything in his power to have this trifling question about the land adjusted, and I hope the minister will go on with the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The commissioners own this land and if they choose to put an exorbitant price on the lots it is their own business.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. There are only ten lots owned by the Ontario government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They asked us to pay $160 each for lots which during the boom at Latchford they were unable to sell, while they sold lots far superior to these at an upset price of $70 or $80 each. It is not that the $1,600 is so very large but if we pay $160 each for the very worst lots on the town site it would mean that this government would be mulcted in very heavy damages if we had to pay a relatively high price to the private owners of better lots. What I complain of is, that when this government proposes to do a thing for the benefit of that section of the country, and for the benefit of the people there, and for developing property which is owned by the Ontario government, and out of which the Ontario government will get large sums for royalties, they should hold us up for the very last dollar and even double the value of these lots on us. I do not propose to engage upon the construction of this dam unless I can see where we stand with regard to the land damages. If we are going to me mulcted in thousands of dollars of damages for flooding lands I must stay my hand and not proceed with this work. Mr. Englehart in this letter says that if there is any way in which he can be of assistance to expedite the matter he would only be too happy, and I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Gordon) that if he wants to be of assistance he can get the Ontario government to give us a quit claim deed of the land. If that were done, I can assure my hon. friend that it would go a long way to help us forward towards the construction of this very necessary public work.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. At the time of the sale at Latchford there were no buildings erected, but now it is quite a little town and the lots are more valuable than they were then.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But they have not been able to sell them.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. They have been treating with the government here and they would not want to sell them to any one else in the meantime. I would ask the Minister of Public Works to consider that the Ontario government has built that railway without one cent of subsidy being received from the Dominion government, and I think it is the only railway in Canada which stands in that position.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And they say it is paying very handsome returns.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I think it is doing very well, but at the same time the majority of the people of Ontario hold that the Dominion government owes to the people of Ontario $6,400 per mile for every mile of that railroad. In view of that, and of the great urgency of this undertaking, I hope the Minister of Public Works will not let a few paltry dollars stand in the way, particularly when the money will go into the hands of people who will take good care of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not a question of the amount of money we might pay for these lots, but if we pay $160 for each of these worthless lots for which they have been unable to obtain purchasers it will become the basis for the claims of private owners who have much better lots. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Gordon) that if the Ontario government will cut the amount in two I will close with them to-morrow.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. On these ten lots ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and then they can give us a quit claim deed on the other lots and let us deal with the purchasers.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. That is, if they give you these ten lots for $80 each ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and then let them convey to us the other lots upon which other people have claims and upon which they apparently have no claim except the right to receive some purchase money.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. That is the other 30 lots ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, so that we will be able to deal with the purchasers and take up the whole thing and bring it to a head and get it settled and go on with the work at once.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I will see about that.

River Sydenham—clearing east branch of sunken logs, snags, &c., $300.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Is there any navigation here ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. D. A. GORDON. Just 36 feet of water to Wallaceburg.

Mr. S. SHARPE. What kind of craft ply on that river?

Mr. D. A. GORDON. Anything that floats.

Spanish River improvement, $12,700.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is dredging work?

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Why is there $12,700 in the supplementaries? The appropriation was $6,000. You have exceeded that by $12,700. When was the work commenced and was it done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was done by contract let on September 5, 1905. We were pressed very strongly to do this work at the mouth of the Spanish river, in fact we had been pressed for it for some time. The outlay during the year just closing was for the removal of 66,738 cubic yards of quicksand and clay sand by the dredge 'Meade' from September 21 to November 14, from two long sand bars, 6,000 yards up stream from the mouth of the Spanish river to secure a depth of 12 feet at low water. The expenditure for that was $16,708. In addition there was material and labour for the building of a pile and concrete pier at Massey 15 miles above the mouth of the river, which cost $1,861.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Who had the contract for the dredging and was it let by tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The C. S. Boone Dredging & Construction Company of Toronto. The contract was let on September 5, and the price was 25 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. What was the necessity for the work and why was it so urgent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a company there called, I think, the Spanish River Navigation Company. They are navigating the Spanish river and they urged this work very strongly. The hon. gentleman who formerly represented the constituency also urged it. We had very strong requests for this work.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. The minister perhaps is aware that an appropriation has been made for this work several times. As far back as 10 or 12 years ago there was an appropriation of $10,000 in the estimates for this particular work. That did beautifully during the election of that year. Then it was dropped out of sight. Four years afterwards, an item appears in large type in the local newspapers favourable to my late opponent stating that the government had revoted $10,000 for the Spanish river improvements. That was lost sight of immediately after the elections. This last time there was $6,000 of an appropriation for this work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman sees I did not lose sight of it.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. It became very urgent indeed last fall that this work should be done for reasons of which the hon. minister is no doubt aware. Why was $12,700 more than the appropriation for this work expended? Was it not as necessary ten, eight, six or four years ago as it was last fall? Why the urgency for doing the work at the particular period at which it was done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a very proper question.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. And a question I am afraid the minister would have a hard time answering to the satisfaction of the people of the district of Algoma.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You just try me now.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. I know he is an expert, but notwithstanding all that the people of the district of Algoma know full well why the work was done when it was done, and during a period of the year when dredges are usually being laid up in winter quarters.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend think the expenditure was absolutely necessary in the interests of navigation?

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. If it was really necessary, it was necessary 10 or 8 years ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is it necessary?

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. It is no more necessary now than it was then.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was it not necessary last fall?

Mr. W. R. SMITH. It was done purely and simply for political purposes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am interested to hear my hon. friend say that.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. I am never afraid to tell the truth.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure my hon. friend would not be, because I have great respect for him.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. And I have great respect for my word.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot see how, if the dredging was necessary and it has now been done and some 66,000 cubic yards removed from these two large sand bars, the expense has been wasted. This dredging is to give a depth of 12 feet.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Does it give it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. You have to dredge out from time to time to keep down to the 12 feet. We have now taken out 66,000 cubic yards, but if it is not deep enough we will have to dredge deeper.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Has the minister anything in the main estimates for the continuation of that work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. The work the minister has done is absolutely wasted unless he continues to dredge the river much further up than he has done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a different thing. What my hon. friend means now is that we must go further and spend more money.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. If it is necessary to do it at all it is necessary to do it right.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With regard to the work not being done some years ago my hon. friend is quite right in calling attention to it; the difficulty was to get a dredge. It happened that last fall it was possible to get a dredge. The dredge of the C. S. Boone Company had got through with its work on the Blind river, and we were able to have it moved down to do this work at the mouth of the Spanish river.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. That dredge almost got there by lightning.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course, because it got through with the other work and the sooner it would get to work on the Spanish river the sooner the owners would make some money, but in the busy spring or summer this year it might have been impossible to get a dredge there as has happened in other years. I may say frankly that Mr. Dyment found a great deal of fault with me and my department because we had not put the dredge to work before. I explained that there was no dredge available, but just as soon as this dredge was available she was put to work on the Spanish river. We have done the amount of dredging I have mentioned, and if it is necessary to go to a greater depth I would hope that before very long we would be able to continue the work so as to effect what I think my hon. friend would say is a very much needed public improvement.

Mr. SMYTH. It may be needed, but the money expended was simply thrown away, in the way the work was done and during the season in which it was done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot see that. It was done at so much a cubic yard.

Mr. SMYTH. Yes, but the same number of cubic yards is in that same channel today. You cannot take a boat through the channel you dredged last fall. I am doubtful if the money was spent which we are asked to vote. The dredge was there only a very short time. During the election campaign, my opponent made the boast on the public platform that he had ordered the department to send that dredge to the mouth of the Spanish river, and that it would be there in a few days and sure enough it was. But it took ten years to get that dredge there, according to the minister, because there was an appropriation made ten years ago for that purpose and also four years ago. Yet he now says that the work was so urgent last fall, the dredge had to be sent there during the election. But if the work was so urgent last fall, why is there not this year a sum in the estimates to complete it and make that channel navigable for the coming summer? If the work is to be of any benefit and if the boats are to be enabled to reach that dock which the government built up the Spanish river some twelve or fourteen miles, the minister will have to do a good deal more dredging. They built the dock before there was water enough for a boat to get there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is mistaken. The vessels of the Spanish River Navigation Company were running up to the place where this dock was built. I recognize that it may be desirable to do further dredging. My hon. friend has asked why there is not an amount in the main estimates for this purpose.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Because there is no election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but it is in accordance with the policy of economy which we have been obliged to adopt.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. There is no economy when you spent $12,700 more than was appropriated last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is done and my hon. friend is asking about next year. I cannot say whether we shall be able to do further dredging next year or not. I shall have to give the matter further consideration.

Mr. SMYTH. Is the hon. minister aware that the dredge in question employed 23 American citizens doing the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was not aware of that.

Mr. SMYTH. I am informed on reliable authority that there were 23 American citizens on the dredge at the mouth of the Spanish river doing that work.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was in the estimates last year for harbours and rivers in Ontario and how much this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not got the main estimates here. The hon. gentleman will find the amount in those estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to see how far the policy of economy is applied to Ontario in respect of these items.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is applied to Ontario to no greater extent than to any other province in Canada.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The estimates were $1,619,780 last year and $795,250 this year.

Mr. SMYTH. When did that dredge stop doing work on the Spanish river ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the 14th of November.

Mr. J. D. REID. When did it begin ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was let the 5th of September and it began the 21st.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was there anything in the estimates last year for that work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. What was the price paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Twenty-five cents per cubic yard, scow measurement.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he proposes to do any dredging at Port Credit this year. For several years his predecessors promised that a certain amount of dredging would be done there. The excuse always given for not doing it was that no dredge was available, but that excuse can hardly be advanced now since the appropriations are somewhat smaller for Ontario than in former years, and consequently the dredges will not be so busy. There is always some work going on at Hamilton and Toronto, and Port Credit harbour lies between the two and is very close to either of them. In the appropriation we have this year, may we expect the government to carry out the promise that some work would be done at this important point?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of any promise by my predecessors and none was certainly made by me. I am not in a position to say whether any dredging will be done there the coming season or not. We have no sum in the estimates for it, and I do not see how it is possible for me to do all the absolutely urgent work the coming year out of the general dredging vote. With regard to Port Credit, there is another difficulty, and that is that it is owned by a company. Many years ago, before confederation, the Ontario government was in the habit of handing over certain harbours to private corporations, and Port Credit unfortunately is in that position. I do not know if that would be an effectual bar to our dredging there, but the most I can say is that I will think the matter over, but I cannot hold out any strong hope.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has never expended any money at that point but there was some expended there some years ago. My hon. friend has not given any promise, but two of his predecessors gave promises on the floor of the House which I quoted in a discussion two years ago. If my hon. friend will look over the history of his department, he will find that two of his predecesors promised they would spend some money at that important point. I never could understand why they did not do it. My hon. friend is very careful of course in not promising, but I hope he will look into the matter and see that some money is expended there. It is a very important centre and should be kept open in the public interest. There is a good deal of traffic on Lake Ontario between Hamilton and Toronto. Indeed, it is a harbour of refuge in many times of storm. I think the minister should send his engineer to examine and should give this matter rather serious consideration. I may expect that from the minister, I suppose, this year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will make a note of it and think it over.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister can hardly give as a reason for not spending money on the Port Credit harbour the fact that it is owned by a private corporation, because the Dominion has expended money on harbours similarly owned.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where?

Mr. DANIEL. In Nova Scotia, Glace bay—I think that is the harbour—is owned by a coal company, and the Dominion has spent a great deal of money there; it practically made the harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. There is no parallel in Canada with this harbour of Port Credit. I am sure Glace bay is not a parallel. The foreshore may be owned, but not the harbour, not the water.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not insist on the name, but certainly one of these harbours is owned by the coal company.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister say that the government does not spend money on harbours owned by private parties in any part of Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not say that, because I think there has been some such expenditure, but I say it creates a difficulty, as, I am sure, the hon. gentleman will recognize.

Mr. SMYTH. As the minister has expended $18,000 on the Spanish river, I would urge upon him the necessity of continuing the work. For two reasons: the first is that the work has been done improperly, I say advisedly, but with all due respect to the engineers and those who did the work. There is a great deal of shifting sand, and I do not think it was dredged wide enough to prevent the sand going back into the same ground. That is one reason—the minister ought to try to save the work that has been done by doing more. Another is that, as he is dredging at one end of the river and has a dock at the other with no means of getting to his dock with any satisfaction with any steamboat of any size, he might better continue improving the river all the way between

the dock and where the improvements have been already made. No doubt, he is aware that there is a good deal of contention between the steamboat company and the lumbermen. Money could well be spent by assisting both the lumbermen and steamboat company in connection with the channel. But as the minister was so anxious to spend the money last fall, and spend it lavishly, I hope he will find reason to continue the work this year and save the work already done. We will see what can be done.

Mr. MARSHALL. Has the minister given Port Bruce any more thought?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have been thinking Port Bruce over.

Mr. MARSHALL. May I ask if the minister has been thinking favourably of it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, I hear very good reports of Port Bruce.

Mr. MARSHALL. The minister would not like to make me a promise to-night?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not to-night.

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not want very much.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is modest, I know; and I really will think it over. But I would sooner give the hon. gentleman the dredging than give him the promise.

Mr. WRIGHT. I desire to draw attention to the condition of affairs with regard to minor wharfs that are being built on inland waters. I find that an agent is being appointed by the government in some instances and in others not. In these latter cases, apparently nobody is in charge of the wharf after it is built. Instances come to my mind of wharfs being simply appropriated, sometimes to the detriment of the public. But, if an accident happens, a plank gets out of place, there is nobody to look after it. I made inquiry last year and was told that the wharfs where I live were under control of an engineer at Toronto, 145 miles away. How are these matters managed after the wharfs are built?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The proper, the regular course, would be to transfer the wharf to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries appoints a wharfinger and gives him a percentage of the wharfage tolls received. In that way, there is somebody to take care of the wharf and see to it that the necessary repairs are made. But sometimes, as the collection of tolls would be quite burdensome, especially to the farmers who are using the wharf in a small way, my department has been asked not to make the transfer to the Marine and Fisheries Department. In the majority of cases, I am sorry to say, both under the old government and under this government, that request has been acceded to, and the transfer has not been made, no wharfinger has been appointed and no tolls collected. An arrangement may be made with a steamship company so that they may use the wharf, but that is unsatisfactory. I recognize the importance of the question that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wright) raises. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been considering the question how to deal with these small wharfs, and he thought it might not be inadvisable to lease them to the steamboat companies, or charge them so much for the right to come to the wharf, or, perhaps, to lease the wharf to the municipal council and so do away with the necessity of charging a farmer a toll for getting a barrel of flour or ten pounds of sugar delivered on the wharf. That is a very obnoxious tax to impose upon the people, and we are endeavouring to do away with it.

Mr. McCALL. While the minister seems to be in a generous mood in granting wharfs and harbour improvements, I would like to ask if his attention has been called to the necessity of a landing pier at St. Williams, in the county of Norfolk, on the north shore of Lake Erie. Would he say whether he has received an application, or some representation as to the necessity of such a work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My attention has not been called to St. Williams, or to the necessity of a wharf there. If I were to accede to all the requests made from the other side my estimates would roll up tremendously.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Work was commenced last year to rebuild a wharf at the village of Lakefield. The work is not yet completed, and I think the department has been requested to increase the appropriation by a few thousand dollars, in order to extend that work properly. It is a good time now to do this, seeing that the work is still incomplete. Is it the intention of the government to grant further aid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman who represents West Peterboro (Mr. Stratton) has brought that matter forcibly to my attention. Although my department obtained the appropriation for the money, we transferred the work to the Department of Railways, and it is being done under that department. The question of providing for an extension during the coming year is now under consideration.

Manitoba—River Assiniboine—improvements near Portage la Prairie, $250.

Mr. STAPLES. I desire this item to stand until the return which I moved for on the 17th of February, is brought down. The minister knows that I called his attention to it before the orders of the day

were called this afternoon, and told him that this return had not been brought down. It is in reference to this particular piece of work, and we wish to get some facts before we can intelligently dispose of this item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I want to appeal to the good judgment of my hon. friend and ask him not to press that request, for the reason that these are the supplementary estimates for the current year, and it is important that they should be got through so as to close up the accounts before the 31st of March. But I will say to my hon. friend that the return will be brought down right away, and when we are considering the main estimates he shall have an opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. STAPLES. That is the reason why I do not want this item to go through, because the information I am seeking is in reference to the current year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend can discuss that on the main estimates.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not see why this item should go through to-night; we have another week before us to the end of the month.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When we come to the main estimates my hon. friend will have the same opportunity of discussing it—I will undertake that—as if we were to discuss it to-night.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I think the main estimates for Manitoba have gone through. Perhaps the minister will bring down the information before concurrence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I will do that.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. There has been an arrangement made between the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the Minister of Finance that these supplementaries shall be disposed of before the end of the month.

Mr. J. D. REID. Possibly the information we get in these returns will be such that we shall want to strike out the item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will make another suggestioon to my hon. friend for Macdonald (Mr. Staples). If he will be good enough to call over to the office of the deputy minister to-morrow morning, we will show him all the papers, and then this can be discussed on concurrence.

Mr. STAPLES. I would be glad to accede to the hon. gentleman's wishes, but I am not the only member from the province of Manitoba. The member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) has been following this matter up as well as myself. I would like a little time to investigate. There has been a large expenditure there, a very foolish expenditure, in my opinion, which was made for the purpose of securing votes at that particular time. There are many things in connection with that expenditure that we want to unearth and bring to light; then we will be in a position to take up this item intelligently.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have my messenger bring the papers here to-morrow to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. STAPLES. Can we have an opportunity of discussing this to-morrow?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On concurrence.

Mr. STAPLES. I have had some experience in the last four years, and I know how difficult it is to discuss an item on concurrence. Not much attention is paid to items of this nature on concurrence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there will be.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not think I am asking too much. It is very necessary that the work which has been done there should be completed. Take it also further down the Assinaboine river; there was public money expended on lot 160 and, according to the advice that I have had from the council of St. François Xavier, a large part of this country is going to be flooded if the work is going to be left in the condition in which it is to-day. I could go to the office and look over the papers, but my hon. friend from Portage La Prairie (Mr. Meighen), who is not here to-night, wants to get this information also, as well as other members from that province.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work for which this item is asked is to close up the balance due on the channel at Portage La Prairie for the purpose of relieving the flooding, and we do intend to do some more work next year with respect to these improvements which we believe will have the effect of preventing the flooding of the country. We are approaching very closely to the 31st March; it is desirable to have the supplementaries through and it is understood that this can be discussed upon concurrence. If my hon. friend will telephone my deputy where he will be in the morning, I will have a clerk in my office bring over all the papers and show them to my hon. friend, and to any other hon. gentlemen from Manitoba who desire to see them, and I can assure my hon. friend that he will have the fullest opportunity of discussing this matter upon concurrence. I should think that would be very much better, if he wishes to get his views before his constituents, than to discuss the question to-night. Let us get through with the items.

Mr. STAPLES. On that understanding we can let the item go. I will take the op

portunity of bringing it up some day upon the orders of the day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite right; that is a good idea.

Mr. STAPLES. I have a letter from a councillor who represents a ward in the municipality of St. François Xavier and he tells me that certain work that has been done by this government on lot 160 has been left in such a condition that unless steps are taken to secure it in some way the country will be flooded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What description of work is that?

Mr. STAPLES. I believe the banks are subsiding and that it is necessary to do some piling. The information I get from there is that the government promised to do the piling last fall. It has not been done. I am not clear as to what the nature of the work is, I must confess, and I would like to get some information as to that myself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would have nothing to do with this item.

Mr. STAPLES. No, it is further down the river. Now that we are on the supply estimates, I consider that I am quite in order in asking if it is the intention of the government to do anything at St. Laurent? Four years ago there was great activity at that place. A dredge was bought a few days before the election, it was put to work, a number of men were employed, and it was said that they were going to build a wharf for the convenience of the people of that particular constituency of Macdonald. But, on the day following the election the dredge was taken away and we have not heard anything of it since. Last October they promised to bring the dredge back. They were very sorry that they could not get the dredge at that particular time but the assurance was given to the people there that if they would vote for the Liberal candidate there would be no doubt but that this work would be completed. The people of that portion of the municipality of Macdonald accepted the promise of the government candidate to a certain extent, or at least, an adverse majority was given against me there. I hope the Minister will not deceive them but that he will go on and make good the promise which was presented to these people by my opponent. The work is practically useless as it stands. It is about half done, the people cannot get near it, and it is necessary to do certain work down across the lagoon before it is of any value whatever. I hope the minister will take the trouble to inquire into this matter and make good the promise presented to the people on the public platform last October.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have the matter looked into.

Mr. HERRON. If I may be permitted to speak on the item I would like to mention a question which affects my own riding. In some way or other I missed the discussion of the public works items dealing with wharfs and bridges in the province of Alberta. I have been informed by the deputy clerk that these items are through although I do not understand how they could have got through without my knowledge. There was in the estimates of the last two years an appropriation of about $8,000 for protecting the banks of the Old Man river at the town of McLeod. I have already spoken to the minister on this subject privately and he gave me a good deal of encouragement to hope that there would probably be an item in the Supply estimates this year, but I am sorry to say that I do not find such an item. I think we have a very strong claim upon the government to undertake and carry out this work and it does seem to me like penalizing the people of that district because they sent a Conservative at the last election. That work was promised at the time by the department here and it was held up before the people of the constituency as one of the works that was going to be carried out. Immediately after the election is over I find that the item is withdrawn. I think we have an especially strong claim to have a small amount of work done for more reasons than one. I find that the minister is very generous in granting money for works of this description in other parts of the country, but that he has done very little work of this nature in the province of Alberta. I think that in the two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta there is only about $52,000 in this year's estimates, which I think is a very small amount compared with the appropriations for works in other parts of the country. I think that we have even a stronger claim than that which I have just mentioned and that is that the government own the land, the rivers and streams; in fact, they own things above and under the water. Another reason is that the town of McLeod, that I am asking this appropriation for, in order to protect the banks of the river, occupies what was a government townsite, a townsite that this government made a great deal of money out of in the past. Another is that there is a government building on the banks of the river which will be one of the first properties to be destroyed in the event of the banks falling away. There is very great danger that the banks might be undermined to such an extent that the government building might fall down. I

would like to know from the minister, if he is not going to have anything in the estimates this year, if he will pledge his word that the estimates for next year will contain a vote for this very necessary work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is quite true that my hon. friend did call to see me and that he pressed upon my attention the necessity of doing this work at Fort McLeod. The fact that it was regarded by the government as being a necessary work would be evidenced by its having been placed in the estimates last year.

Mr. HERRON. For two years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For two years. But I have been obliged to leave it out of the main estimates this year for the reason I have already stated to the committee. We have been obliged to postpone a great many necessary public works. Probably owing to the decline of the revenue I have had occasion to consider very carefully this question among others of protecting the banks of rivers in the various provinces. We have done work of this character to a certain extent in the past when our revenues were more buoyant. On the Fraser river we divided the cost of such work between the British Columbia government and the federal government but in my judgment it is work that can hardly be regarded as federal work. It is not for the improvement of navigation; it is for the protection of property of private owners or property of municipalities and is purely local in its character. If we were to do work of this kind in the various provinces I do not know where the claims upon the federal treasury would end. Only the other day my hon. friend from Chicoutimi called my attention to the danger of a landslide on the St. Lawrence river which if it occurred would destroy property and possibly cause loss of life and he urged me to take steps to guard against it; last year the Minister of the Interior urged me to do similar work on the North Saskatchewan at Edmonton, but I felt that this was work for the provincial or municipal authorities. That is the difficulty with regard to this work at Fort Macleod. It is intended to protect the property of the people of that town. The only ground upon which I thought we might interfere was that if the bank slid away the Dominion public building would likely be the first property to be injured and that appealed to the selfish side of the department. If in order to protect government property it is necessary to do work of this character it might possibly be done, but all I can say to my hon. friend now is that it will receive careful consideration.

Mr. HERRON. If this is a work that should not be undertaken by the federal government why was a vote placed in the estimates for it two years in succession?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When we begin to get short of money we have to consider these things very carefully.

Mr. HERRON. It seems to me the elections had more to do with it than anything else.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. HERRON. The minister seems to forget that this was formerly a government townsite and although part of the unsold lots have recently been turned over to the town, yet the government made a great deal of money out of the sale of some of those town lots in days gone by.

Dredging vessels, repairs, further amount required, $100,000.

Mr. CROCKET. What will this make the total amount for repairs in the year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $245,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Were these repairs all done in government yards?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some in government yards and some in private yards all over the country.

Mr. ARTHURS. What is the average cost per annum of operating a dredge in Ontario?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It depends on the size of the dredge, its capacity, its crew, and other considerations. The cost to operate runs from $5,000 to $35,000.

Mr. ARTHURS. At Tiffin and other places, privately owned dredges earn from $40,000 to $60,000 per year. If the government can operate a dredge for from $5,000 to $35,000 then you ought to have more government dredges.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a great deal to be said in favour of that. On the other hand the private contractor seems to be able to get more out of their dredges than the government does.

Mr. ARTHURS. In money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, in work. They seem to be able to get their men to work more diligently. It has always been so, I am sorry to say, and possibly it may be so in the future. Of course there is interest on the first cost, and repairs, and so on and it is not all profit. I know a number of people who have been in the dredging business and have found it anything but profitable. Some of them have become bankrupt.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to know one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Go to Montreal and you will find them.

Mr. ARTHURS. Is it the intention to keep that dredge working?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If there is work to be done, we will try to keep it there.

Mr. ARTHURS. There is work to be done, but there is not much in the estimates for this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The vote is small, but we hope to be able to keep the government dredges working.

Dredging, maritime provinces, $225,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the minister give the names of the people to whom this money is to be paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The first item is to cover expenditures incurred in operating the department dredging plant in the maritime provinces from November, 1908, until March, 1909, according to the returns received by the chief accountant up to March 10, $72,598.

Mr. DANIEL. Why was the estimate $72,000 out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The vote was not for as much as the work has cost. Some of the dredges have been kept going later than had been expected; for instance, the 'Fielding' at St. John has been working right up to a few days ago. Very often they are laid up in the fall.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the wharfage the 'Fielding' pays come out of this vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. Why is it that the 'Fielding' is laid up at a private wharf when there is a government wharf available to lay her up at?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know that. There is a government wharf there owned by the Intercolonial Railway which is required for the use of the Intercolonial Railway and I presume the Intercolonial Railway would not allow us to lay up a dredge there as it would interfere with the use of the Intercolonial Railway wharf by vessels coming there in the ordinary course of business.

Mr. DANIEL. Was application made for the use of the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It never occurred to me to make such a request, as it would interfere with the business of the wharf.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister will find there is nearly always a vacant place there where the 'Fielding' could lie.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The railway wharf is built for commercial purposes and it would seriously interfere with its operation to have a dredge lie there permanently.

Mr. DANIEL. There is generally a place on the northern face of the wharf where it could rest. You often see pilot boats there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They can move out quickly. Then the Intercolonial Railway would charge wharfage too.

Mr. DANIEL. Not so much.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Proceeding with the items, the second is for contract dredging in Nova Scotia, as follows: At Moser river, Beazley Bros., $8,539. At Yarmouth, Dominion Dredging Company, $59,903, and at Mabou, Dominion Dredging Company, $13,-183, a total of $73,086. Then in Mahone bay there is a payment to the Poupore Company $31,052, and at McKinnon harbour payment to the same company, $4,095, a total of $35,147. In New Brunswick, at Grassy island, on the St. John river, there is a payment to S. James Gregory, $4,892, and at Gaspereau to the Maritime Dredging Company of $20,269. There is another payment for work at Miramichi bay to the Poupore Company of $3,549, and at Dalhousie a payment to A. & H. Loggie of $7,061. That makes a total supplementary requirement to be covered by this vote of $225,143.36.

Mr. DANIEL. What was the rate paid to the Maritime Dredging Company at Gaspereau ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 90 cents.

Mr. DANIEL. Were tenders called by public advertisement ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. What was the Grassy island rate ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not quite sure, but I think it was 50 cents.

Mr. CROCKET. To what depth was the dredging done at Gaspereau ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know, the work was not finished there.

Mr. CROCKET. What did the specifications call for ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the particulars here, that would be given in connection with the main estimates. It is a very exposed and difficult place to dredge, it is up at Port Elgin.

Mr. CROCKET. Can the minister state what tenders were received in addition to that of the Maritime Dredging Company ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only the one tender.

Mr. DANIEL. What was the depth of the Gaspereau river dredging and what length of arm would the dredge require ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell that to-night. It was to give accommodation to quite large steamers that go there to carry away lumber.

Mr. DANIEL. Is there much rise and fall of the tide ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is some tide and it is a very exposed place for dredging. In fact I think they lost one scow right at the beginning.

Mr. DANIEL. How far have the scows to go out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Out to deep water of course. I have not the exact distance.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the Maritime Dredging Company been fully paid for the dredging at Indian Point?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes they have been fully paid there.

Mr. CROCKET. In answer to a question which I asked the other day the minister said that the contract for dredging there was let to the Maritime Dredging Company at 50 cents, that the dredging was to be to a depth of 7 feet, and that before dredging the depth of water at that point was about three feet. What does the minister think about that as a price for dredging in such water? The other night it was stated that the department was having dredging done, I think at Port Arthur to a depth of 22 feet for 9 cents. It has been a matter of considerable comment in New Brunswick that the Maritime Dredging Company, in which the minister's friend John E. Moore is the moving spirit, has been able to get a contract at this point for 7 foot dredging at 50 cents a cubic yard, the same price as was paid to Mayes under his contract for dredging to a depth of 32 feet in the harbour of St. John at low water, and 41 cents more per yard than the department has been paying for dredging at Fort William to a depth of 22 feet. I do not know what the minister may think, but it must impress hon. members as a most extraordinary price to pay for the dredging in the St. John river, the easiest kind of dredging, to a depth of seven feet, where the depth before dredging was but three feet. I would like to know what was the purpose of this dredging.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend says that this was the subject of a good deal of comment in New Brunswick. He is evidently under the impression that when he thinks about a matter the whole public are thinking about it. The comments no doubt were limited to the hon. gentleman and his immediate party friends. It is impossible to say off-hand whether a price is unreasonable or not. We cannot very well compare the cost of dredging in one place with that of dredging in another. If my hon. friend will take up the expense per cubic yard of dredging by government dredges, he will see remarkable differences in the cost per day, depending not so much on the depth of water as on the character of the soil. You may be able to do deep dredging in many places cheaper than shallow dredging in other places. You may dredge silt, sand or soft clay much more easily to a depth of 22 feet than harder material to a depth of seven feet.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the character of dredging at Indian point?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be clay. My hon. friend must bear in mind that public tenders were called for the work at Indian point. It was advertised in the daily papers at St. John, and the only tender received was that of the Maritime Dredging Company. There is another thing to be considered. If there is a large quantity of dredging to be done, extending over a period of years, such as at Fort William, you can get it done much cheaper than you can a comparatively small quantity. The dredges do not require to be moved and towed, and you can afford to invest a larger amount of capital and get more powerful dredges. At Fort William, the material is very much softer than at Indian Head. Unless you knew the exact character of the material in each place, you could not at all compare the prices. My hon. friend is in error with regard to the Maritime Dredging Company getting the same rate as Mr. Mayes. Mr. Mayes never get so low as 50 cents. The lowest he got was 55 cents per cubic yard, and for the greater part of the work he did at St. John he got 90 cents, and he got that after public tender. Up and down the St. Lawrence, in some cases 50, in some cases 60, and in others 70 and 75 where the dredging might not be any more difficult than at Indian point. It depends a good deal on the character of the soil. At all events, the work was let after public competition and advertisement to the Maritime Ddedgrng Company, which was the only tenderer, and on the certificate of the chief engineer that the price was very reasonable.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister spoke about Mr. Mayes not doing any dredging as low as 50 cents. But Mr. Mayes put in a tender to do dredging at 49 cents, and it was not accepted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was an irregular tender, not complying with the specifications.

Mr. DANIEL. It was irregular simply with regard to having registered or unregistered dredge, and not with regard to the price. Then with regard to the Dominion Dredging Company, that work was not put up to public tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes it was.

Mr. DANIEL. Not when the Dominion Dredging Company did it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is mistaken. It was put up to public tender and Mr. Mayes tendered at 90 cents and was the

lowest. Then the Dominion Dredging Company were allowed to do part of the work at the same price.

Mr. DANIEL. They were put to work without offering any tender at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But at the same price as the other.

Mr. DANIEL. At the same time they had a very profitable contract, as the minister knows.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister does not know whether it was profitable or not. They got the same figure as the lowest tenderer.

Mr. DANIEL. They got the same figure for easy work as Mr. Mayes got for difficult work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was work exactly of the same character.

Mr. DANIEL. My information is that it was not. It was easier, softer and much more profitable. They did not put in a tender but simply were given the work at the figure put in before by Mr. Mayes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I said was this. Public tenders were called for the work upon the northern side of Sand Point slip. The notice was advertised in the various newspapers, tenders were received, and Mr. Mayes was the lowest, at 90 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. DANIEL. Was he the only tenderer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know. It was felt that he could not proceed as rapidly with the work as public interest required and there were strong demands from the port of St. John to hasten the work. Yielding to that request, the then acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fisher), gave part of the work to the Dominion Dredging Company and they went on. Mr. Mayes doing a part and they the other, and both were getting 90 cents per cubic yard. Then when I became minister, I divided the work of the extension of the 400 feet extension equally. I gave the Dominion Dredging Company the work on one side and Mr. Mayes the work on the other. The one was not any harder than the other.

Mr. DANIEL. I might remind the minister that Mr. Mayes found that he had to request a higher price than he was getting from his original tender because he struck a very difficult piece of dredging—a strip full of large, heavy boulders. But that strip did not extend up to the part that the Dominion Dredging Company did.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Boulders seem to breed there. After Mr. Mayes got through, we found a large number of boulders in the vicinity of the work he had carried on. I do not know whether they breed—like the gondolas in New York.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. DANIEL. I happened to see a plan of these boulders lying right up against the wharf, not only in the part Mr. Mayes had dredged, but where the Dominion Company had dredged as well.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was allowed $18.60 per yard for these boulders, though I do not think he had harder work than the Dominion Dredging Company.

Mr. CROCKET. I have listened to the minister's interesting statement concerning the difficulties of dredging at Indian point, and I feel sure that that statement, when heard by the people of the community who know the facts, will be very amusing to them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said it was a clay soil.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister was endeavouring to justify these manifestly excessive prices paid to Mr. Moore for the dredging, on the ground that it was more difficult than at Fort William or St. John. The fact that the depth of water before dredging was three feet and that the dredging was done to a depth of seven feet will show how much reliance is to be placed in the minister's contention. As to the prices, the contract was awarded to the Dominion Dredging Company on the basis of $17 for rock or boulders exceeding two cubic yards. and 50 cents per cubic yard for all other material. The price to Mr. Mayes was $8.60 per yard for rock in the harbour of St. John, and 55 cents for other material, 5 cents of which went to the minister's friend, Mr. McAvity.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was the first. What was the second?

Mr. CROCKET. That is the contract that was made with Mr. Mayes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. His second contract, let at public tender, gave $19.60.

Mr. CROCKET. The one in connection with which he made the agreement with the minister's friend, Mr. Geo. McAvity, whereby he agreed to pay 5 cents to Mr. McAvity for every cubic yard over 50 cents. He was willing to dredge at 50 cents a cubic yard, and entered into this agreement with Mr. McAvity to give him 5 cents a cubic yard for his influence with the government. That is all he received for doing the dredging for ordinary material in the harbour of St. John, and for rock, he was allowed $8.60. And this for dredging to a depth of 32 feet. At Indian point the minister's other friend, Mr. Moore, was to get $17 for solid rock, though it turns out there was no solid rock to be found.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) say that he received anything for solid rock?

Mr. CROCKET. No. But it indicates pretty well that Mr. Moore did not know

anything about the character of dredging he had undertaken to do— or the department either.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How?

Mr. CROCKET. I assumed from what the minister said that when the department called for tenders, it was after an examination had been made and an estimate of cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a uniform classification, so that, if solid rock is encountered, it is to be done at the rate.

Mr. CROCKET. Of $17 a cubic yard in this case?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but at the rate tendered for.

Mr. CROCKET. But the other material was to be paid for at 50 cents, regardless of whether it is hard or soft clay, sand or silt. I suppose the classification was the same as in other contracts. The minister spoke of doing a large quantity of dredging at a lower rate per cubic yard than would be paid for a smaller quantity, but I observe that Mr. Moore got no less than $48,247 out of what dredging was done at Maquapit lake.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Compare that with dredging at Fort William, where it will go to two or three million dollars.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister says, with reference to any comment made upon this subject, that, of course, I would be speaking only from what I had heard from my political friends. I have been spoken to by many in New Brunswick within the last week, and asked if it could possibly be true that Mr. Moore had received $48,247 for the work done at Indian point or were the figures which were reported a mistake ? I have heard responsible citizens of St. John, some of them leading business men there who are familiar with the work, state that Mr. Moore was getting that price for dredging that was worth not more than ten cents.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did the hon. gentleman tell these people that the work was let after public advertisement calling for tenders?

Mr. CROCKET. No. I did not think that made much difference in the circumstances. The fact is that the Maritime Dredging Company got this work without competition. There may have been tenders called for——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I say there were, and by public advertisement, with the widest reasonable circulation.

Mr. CROCKET. It is very singular if tenders were called for in such a way that Mr. Moore, or the Maritime Dredging Company were the only tenderers for the work in that locality and at such manifestly excessive figures.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders were called for by advertisement in the usual way.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. But the minister would not give a contract if he thought the tender was too high?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought it a reasonable price and the chief engineer so certified.

Mr. CROCKET. Was any examination of the work made by the engineers of the department before tenders were called for? And was an estimate made of the cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. member will look at 'Hansard' he will see that that information was given in answer to his own question.

Mr. CROCKET. Not concerning Indian Point?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the hon. gentleman say that an examination was made and an estimate prepared?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know. The information is in 'Hansard.'

Mr. CROCKET. I think the hon. minister is mistaken. I have the question here, and I do not remember framing any question in reference to an estimate of the cost. I think he has in mind the question relating to the wharfs.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; perhaps in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Crocket's) absence the question was asked. He will find it all in 'Hansard.'

Mr. DANIEL. The minister stated just now that tenders have been asked for this Maquapit Lake dredging. Is it not a fact that the Maritime Dredging Company were put to work there before tenders were asked and that tenders were only asked for after they commenced the work and had been at it for some time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister say that that is not the case?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is not the case. But, if it were the case, it would be upon this agreement—that, if they were not the lowest tenderers, they would have to leave, and that for the work they did they would have to accept the price of the lowest tenderer.

Mr. DANIEL. I have been credibly informed that the Maritime Dredging Company were put to work on that dredging

some time before tenders were called for. Under these circumstances, it is altogether unnecessary to inform the minister there was good reason why there was only one tender.

Mr. CROCKET. When were the tenders called for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are not considering any item for that, and I would not have that information.

Mr. CROCKET. Would the minister bring down the information, to show when the tenders were called, and when the work was commenced?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would be glad to do it. One word before we close, let me put this right. My hon. friend says, what is quite true, that Mr. Mayes did get one contract at 55 cents per cubic yard, and for rock for his contract was $8.60 per cubic yard. But when tenders were called for further work no more difficult than that, his tender was 90 cents per cubic yard for ordinary material, and $19.60 for rock. That was his tender, and it was in respect to that additional work on the north side of Sand point slip that the Dominion Dredging Company were allowed to do part of the work at the same price.

Mr. DANIEL. Was not $19.60 for solid rock and not for boulders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For solid rock and boulders above two cubic yards in size. For anything above two cubic yards, he was to get $19.60 per cubic yard.

Mr. DANIEL. I daresay the deputy could inform the Minister, but my memory is that for ordinary soil the figure was 90 cents, and for solid rock it was $19.60, and then there was an intermediate price.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Boulders above two cubic yards were counted the same as solid rock. Then there was another class of boulders below two cubic yards and over half a cubic yard which was reckoned at another price.

Dredging in Ontario and Quebec, $140,000.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How much was expended on Wingfield basin?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was done out of the general vote.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is there no separate amount.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Out of this appropriation we are to use $13,521 to do the work at Wingfield basin.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Could the minister tell me if there is any town, any population at Wingfield basin?

Mr. DANIEL.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Wingfield basin is a harbour of refuge, and we were strongly requested by the shipping interests to do this dredging. They regard it as an important harbour of refuge.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. To what depth has it been dredged?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Who was the contractor for dredging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The C. C. Boone Dredging Company. It was let by public tender.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How many tenders were there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give that information to-night.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I am advised there was only one. What was the price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Seventy cents per cubic yard. That would include all material except solid rock. It would include clay, hardpan, anything of that kind. There is some rock to be taken out.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Did the specifications state so much for all material except solid rock?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. When was the contract let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the 26th of June, 1908.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Were tenders called for in the public newspapers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we gave very wide circulation to the advertisement calling for tenders.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How much does the minister think it will take to complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be in connection with the main estimates. This is simply to close up the business for the present year.

British Columbia — Kamloops — Okanagan telegraph system—additional amount, $1,650.

Mr. BURRELL. What is this for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had to provide additional wiring, and this would be the freight upon the wire.

Yukon Territory—Ashcroft—canal section of Yukon system of telegraph lines—part repoling—to complete payments, $1,200.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A portion of the line was found in bad condition, and we had to spend this money. It is a part of the Yukon system.

Mr. COWAN. I would like to ask the minister if this is the work that was begun two or three weeks before the election in that constituency and completed two or three minutes past the election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know what particular work that was. I suppose it is not important just now.

Public Works—miscellaneous—compensation to Wm. Julien in full of all demands for injuries sustained by him on government dredge 'Ontario' during the season of 1907, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the case of a young man who had his arm torn off while working upon the government dredge 'Ontario.' After very careful consideration we thought it proper to provide for him.

Operating and maintenance expenses—telegraph lines—Yukon system—(Ashcroft-Dawson)—further amount required, $30,000.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How did the minister come to be so far out in his main estimate for that line? What is the revenue from the line?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have been greatly bothered in connection with the Yukon line during the past year owing to the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. The railway follows our telegraph line for a long distance and in many cases wires are strung upon trees. In cutting trees wires are thrown down the sides of the mountains and we have to keep constantly at work to make repairs. We have protested to the company and the contractors and they say they have exercised all the care possible, but notwithstanding that we had to spend a great deal of money in making repairs.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Was not this due to the mode of construction of that line in the first place? I understand that many of the poles were planted in the air and in snow banks?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not prepared to say that. It is a very difficult thing to build a telegraph line through the mountains of British Columbia away from highways.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. There was money enough provided not only to build one line but to build half a dozen if it had been properly spent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is some time ago and I cannot give any personal explanation about it.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister answer the question as to the revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $80,000 is the estimated revenue for the year. We have about $72,000 up to date.

Mr. COWAN. Would the minister kindly inform us where the supplies for this Yukon telegraph line are procured?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Principally in Vancouver. Then we have to pack them up to the different camps. We take them up by boat to Ashcroft and pack them to the north.

Mr. COWAN. Are tenders called for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are bought at market rates. They have to be packed specially.

Mr. COWAN. Are they got from a wholesale firm?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From a wholesale firm at wholesale rates.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. At retail prices.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so. They are specially put up to keep a good while. They have to be packed long distances.

Mr. COWAN. Is there a patronage list in British Columbia?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There used to be one, but I have given instructions to do away with it.

Mr. COWAN. It is still in existence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think it is. I gave directions to do away with it some time ago.

Mr. COWAN. Is it not the practice of the department to call for tenders when the quantity required is as considerable as it is here?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The department did some years ago call for tenders for supplies for this Yukon system and they got a tender from an eastern city, but the result was exceedingly unsatisfactory. A great deal of the stuff spoiled almost before it got up there and a good deal was spoiled after it reached its destination. If you get supplies into that remote country which are not perfect, if the canned meats, the cream, the milk, and butter, are not first-class and are not properly packed it is then too late to discover that they are not as they ought to be. It was found very unsatisfactory and it was decided to buy, under careful inspection, from those who could be relied upon to furnish the very best articles. This was found to give the best results.

Mr. COWAN. Then am I to understand from the minister that no inspection is made of these goods when they are purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, an inspection is made of them and we rely more upon buying from reputable firms at fair market prices.

Mr. COWAN. Am I to understand the minister to say that he cannot get tenders

from British Columbia firms and that is the reason why tenders are not called?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I did not say that, but some years ago tenders were called and the lowest tender was accepted. It proved to be very unsatisfactory and the view of the department has been that it is better to have our own superintendent make the purchase himself, get prices from reputable firms, buy from those firms. see that he only gets a good article and have the articles packed under his own supervision.

Mr. COWAN. Why was it unsatisfactory?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A good deal of the stuff spoiled.

Mr. COWAN. Does it affect the quality of the goods to advertise for tenders? Why should goods supplied by persons who put in tenders not be as good as those purchased from people who are not asked to submit tenders ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend were going to northern British Columbia and were taking supplies for his personal use, would he call for tenders or would he go to reliable firms and get what he wanted at the lowest prices ?

Mr. COWAN. I would not make my purchases from one wholesale firm and pay them retail prices when I could buy from another wholesale firm at wholesale prices.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the hon. gentleman would not call for tenders.

Mr. COWAN. You may rest assured I would get prices from more wholesale houses than one, and I would not accept goods at retail prices when I could go half a block to another wholesale house and get the same goods at wholesale prices. Will the minister tell me now whether he has purchased any goods for this telegraph system from any but one firm in British Columbia ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did go very carefully into the bills for goods supplied for this Yukon system and I got my deputy to get prices for similar goods in Ottawa, and I had explanations with regard to the different items, and I satisfied myself that the prices were fair and reasonable and were wholesale prices.

Mr. COWAN. Did you do that in the case of all the goods you purchased ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I took the goods running over a certain number of months.

Mr. COWAN. Does the minister vouch for the fact that the prices charged were wholesale prices and were not retail prices or higher than retail prices ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the particular bills I examined I was satisfied they were fair wholesale prices.

Mr. COWAN. For what year were these bills ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Last year or the year before.

Mr. COWAN. All the bills ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the bills which came from one firm in Vancouver.

Mr. COWAN. What firm was that ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is there a firm called Kelly, Douglas & Company?

Mr. COWAN. Oh. yes, there isn't any other.

Mr. BURRELL. In what year did the minister call for tenders ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was when the late Mr. Tarte was Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BURRELL. The minister has admitted that the supplies for this telegraph line are purchased practically altogether from one firm in Vancouver and without calling for tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no public call for tenders.

Mr. BURRELL. The minister admits that pratically all the business has been done with Kelly, Douglas & Company and I suppose he knows that this particular firm has an exceedingly strong affiliation with the Liberal party; in fact that it has been the mainspring of the Liberal party for many years. It is regarded as a very strong grievance throughout British Columbia that these rather important supplies for telegraph lines in the north all go to this particular firm and that other firms in British Columbia have not a chance of participating in that business. It has caused a great deal of adverse public criticism and it is looked upon as a reward for political services rendered from time to time. There are other firms outside of those in Vancouver who could furnish these supplies to the government and I might mention the Reid firm at Quesnel which does business at the very point from which these telegraph lines start. Whenever any other than the Kelly, Douglas firm, in British Columbia has endeavoured to get this business they have been told; you will have to see the member. I would like to have to-night some assurance from the minister that in future other firms in British Columbia will have an opportunity to compete for these telegraph supplies. It would be in the interest of the government itself if an end were put to the present system. I can assure the minister that the present system is almost in the nature of a scandal and were it unearthed to the bottom I quite believe there would be some startling disclosures.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very much in favour of giving different firms an opportunity

of tendering, because I realize that in that way we are apt to get goods at the lowest price. There is some difference between buying goods for use right in the city where the goods are used, and, purchasing supplies of butter and canned meats, and condensed milk, and desiccated apples to be sent to distant territory into the wilderness. I can understand how, if the department has been getting perfect satisfaction from this firm for a number of years there would be a disposition to continue trading with them, just as people continue for years dealing with the Hudson's Bay Company because they have the reputation of always carrying out their contracts to the letter. I have no doubt there are other firms in Vancouver who would do the business equally well, but I suppose there has been a disposition not to change when satisfaction has been given. I intend to look into this question in British Columbia as elsewhere, and my disposition is to have all the supplies for the department obtained as far as possible by public competition. I can assure my hon. friend that that matter will receive careful consideration.

Mr. COWAN. Then we can feel confident that the minister proposes to do away with the patronage system in British Columbia?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The patronage list has been done away with already.

Mr. COWAN. Well this firm—Kelly Douglas is it?—has been getting all the custom of the government in the Public Works Department since 1896. Is that correct?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know as to that.

Mr. COWAN. Since the minister has been in charge of this department, Kelly, Douglas & Company have been getting all its custom?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say that; no.

Mr. COWAN. On this Yukon line, I believe I heard the minister say?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said that the accounts I examined were accounts of Kelly, Douglas & Company.

Mr. COWAN. And you know of no other accounts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. These are the only accounts I examined. There are a good many and I wanted to go into the items very particularly.

Mr. COWAN. Would the minister not think it might possibly be in the public interest if an inquiry were made as to whether other firms are getting any part of the custom of his department and as to whether their prices may not be a shade better than Kelly-Douglas'?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If I thought their prices were a shade better and their goods of as high quality I would certainly buy from others.

Mr. COWAN. Will the minister give the committee an assurance that before he gives any further orders, he will ascertain from the other firms what their prices are ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will give that due consideration; yes.

Mr. COWAN. And give the committee the assurance that other firms will be given an opportunity of tendering on the next order?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I have given a very satisfactory assurance to my hon. friend.

Mr. COWAN. I have had a number of very satisfactory assurances, but I am speaking now of one particular assurance. I think the committee would be glad if the minister would assure them that the next order of his department will be open to tender from all the houses having the goods needed, and that a careful comparison of prices will be made and the best man get the order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend can rest assured that I will not make any purchases except at fair and reasonable prices.

Mr. COWAN. But always from Kelly-Douglas.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not always.

Mr. COWAN. Will the minister be good enough to assure this committee that some one else than Kelly-Douglas will have an opportunity of tendering on the next order?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can assure my hon. friend that I will give no contract to any one that will not give us the goods at the very lowest market price. How does that strike the hon. gentleman?

Mr. COWAN. I regret that that assurance is scarcely what I consider to be in the public interest. I think it is a clever assurance, but I doubt if it is in the public interest, and I doubt if the public will take it as in their interest. I believe that the public want business done by the department of the minister as a sane, honest business man would do his own business.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear, that is right.

Mr. COWAN. And I believe that a sane, honest business man would not give all his orders to one firm without calling for tenders and inquiring for prices or inspecting the goods before delivery. I do not think that is the act of a sane, honest business man in the conduct of his own business, and I believe that this committee has the right to the assurance I am asking from the minister that in future orders will be open to tender to other firms than that of Kelly-Douglas. We know who Kelly-Douglas are, we know who Kelly is, the minister knows, we all know. We know that he makes the political appointments through-

out the whole province of British Columbia for this government.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Is he Irish?

Mr. COWAN. His name would indicate that. We all know that we are only trifling when we are calling him Kelly-Douglas; we know who Kelly-Douglas is and the people of British Columbia will say that I am perfectly right in asking in a polite way that the minister will give us some assurance that some one else than Kelly-Douglas will have a chance at the patronage of this department.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not particularly take exception to the request of my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) that the Minister of Public Works should intimate to the House his decision to have public competition if that is his policy; but I do take exception to the implication rather than the direct assurance of my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), that Kelly Douglas & Company have been in any way overcharging the department. Neither my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) nor my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) has stated this to be the case. If they know that Kelly Douglas & Company have been overcharging the department, they ought to say so. Kelly, Douglas & Company is one of the largest wholesale grocery firms in British Columbia, in fact, in Canada. The firm do a business of several million dollars a year.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. gentleman knows that before Kelly-Douglas got the account of the Dominion government, Bob Kelly was not worth $1,400. He knows that as well as I do.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know anything of the kind. I am not here as an advocate of Mr. Robert Kelly, the principal partner of the firm of Kelly, Douglas & Company, who is certainly a thorn in the flesh of my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan). I do not know what prices he has charged the department. I do not know whether he has tendered or not. My hon. friend has not criticised the prices, he does not know himself whether the department has been overcharged for anything; there is simply the desire on the part of my hon. friend to attack a very prominent citizen of the city of Vancouver, who is at the same time a very prominent and active politician, Robert Kelly of the firm of Kelly Douglas & Company. If it is a fact that the firm is overcharging I am with my hon. friend and would request the Minister of Public Works to see that the public is not overcharged, whether he does it by public competition or not.

Mr. COWAN.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no pretence of anything of the kind.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend has said that public appointments in British Columbia are now made by Robert Kelly. That is not true, that is not accurate to be strictly parliamentary, and my hon. friend knows that very well. Mr. Robert Kelly is an active politician, as everybody in Vancouver knows, he is a very prominent citizen, he is one of the most successful men, in a business way, in Vancouver.

Mr. COWAN. Since he got the government account.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The government accout is a mere bagatelle in his business. All he got is the grocery and provision supplies on the Yukon telegraph line. It is probably an extraordinary thing for one minister to suggest a matter of patronage to another minister. Here is the member for the city of Vancouver who is not satisfied that these goods, whether the amount be a thousand dollars or fifty thousand dollars, should be purchased in his city. Well, I wish to say to my hon. colleague, the Minister of Public Works, that I represent Comox-Atlin, the capital of which is Prince Rupert, that Prince Rupert is on the line of the Yukon Telegraph, and Vancouver is not, and therefore to please the member of Vancouver if the department transferred its orders to the city of Prince Rupert.

Mr. COWAN. I would be delighted to see that patronage go to wherever there would be a saving for the Dominion.

Mr. BURRELL. I want to emphasize again the point—and it not only affects Vancouver—that public tenders should be invited in all cases. The telegraph line starts in the lower portion of my constituency, and the minister should give an opportunity to the dealers in that portion to tender for these supplies.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I would ask the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) to take down the figures as I give them from the Auditor General's Report and he will see what they amount to. The firm of Kelly, Douglas & Company figure in every account, and they are the only firm that figure for provisions in connection with the Yukon telegraph line. We do not know the prices they charge because only the gross amounts are given.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The details are given in their bills.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Here are the figures from the Auditor General's Report, paid Kelly, Douglas & Company for provisions:

Big Salmon	$396 83
Blackwater	399 69
Bobtail lake	633 83
Bulkley ranch	93 35
Burns' lake	242 49
Coffee creek	400 04
Dawson	370 00
Echo lake	406 00
Graveyard Point	385 62
Hazleton	374 68
Hazleton stores	310 97
Hootalinqua	234 42
Iskoot	374 46
Kitselas	308 03
Kitsumkalum	236 62
Lorne creek	224 61
Morricetown	94 86
Nahlin	413 28
Nakina	391 70
Ogilvie	236 25
Port Simpson	66 50
Prince Rupert	65 00
Quesnel	58 00
Quesnel Forks	66 78
Raspberry creek	288 98
Chesley	407 05

And in every place they charge about $25 for packing the supplies and putting them in crates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How much should it be ?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I do not know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought not.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (reading):

Stewart river	$237 37
Stonev creek	412 11
Tagish	407 80
Telegraph creek	626 96
Telegraph creek (refuge cabins)	165 95

The government pay the operator $38 and feed him on $165 worth of provisions.

Telegraph Point	$389 43
Whitehorse	131 18
Yukon Crossing	398 15
First Cabin	81 90
Second Cabin	80 83
Third Cabin	51 39
Fourth Cabin	82 93
Fifth Cabin	105 51
Sixth Cabin	105 67
Seventh Cabin	108 59
Eighth Cabin	100 68
Ninth Cabin	150 14
25-mile Cabin	366 29
40-mile Cabin	327 59

That is the end of the bills from Kelly, Douglas & Company for the Yukon telegraph business.

Mr. COWAN. Who administers the patronage of the hon. minister's department at Vancouver ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The purchases are made by the agent of the department in Vancouver. The superintendent of the Yukon Telegraph Line, Mr. Phelan, makes the purchases for the Yukon telegraph, and Mr. Keefer, the resident engineer, for the use of the dredges.

Mr. COWAN. Are they instructed to purchase from Kelly, Douglas & Company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are instructed to make their purchases at fair prices. I have given no directions to purchase from Kelly, Douglas & Company.

Mr. COWAN. In the interest of clean administration and in order to get rid of disagreeable suspicions, would it not be well for the minister to give some assurance that tenders will be called for and other firms given an opportunity to tender for the supplies of his department. There seems to be only one name on the patronage list.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then it ought not to be difficult to destroy it.

Mr. COWAN. But the smaller the list, the more difficult it seems to be to destroy it. I think it would be very much in the interest of clean administration. It would have a very beneficial effect upon the public opinion of that country. It would lead them to think that Mr. Kelly had not the minister's department in his pocket.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have already said, and it has been publicly announced, that we have done away with the patronage list in our department, and that purchasing agents have already had instructions to get prices from different dealers.

Mr. COWAN. And, in Vancouver, they are not confined to Kelly, Douglas & Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are quite open to go to any dealer. Mr. Phelan has instructions to get prices from different people. These instructions went out a considerable time ago.

Mr. COWAN. That is, instructions with regard to these supplies—

Mr. PUGSLEY. These instructions apply to all supplies.

Mr. COWAN. The instructions that apply to these particular supplies—are they. or are they not, in writing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This item applies to the current year before the patronage list was abolished.

Mr. COWAN. My question seemed to me to be rather plain. Are these instructions in writing?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. COWAN. Perhaps I have not made myself understood. Are the instructions to purchasing agents to get prices from other firms in Vancouver than Kelly, Douglas & Company in writing ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. COWAN. I am waiting for an answer by the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I must apologize—what was the question?

Mr. COWAN. I understood from the minister that instructions had been given to the purchasing agent, Mr. Taylor, to get prices from firms other than Kelly, Douglas & Company for the supplies needed for this line. I ask if the instructions are in writing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that. I said that instructions of a general character had been issued, directing the purchasing agent to be careful to employ competent men, careful as to the prices at which they purchased goods, to get the goods at lowest market rates, and to inspect them—to do everything to make sure that value was got for the money.

Mr. COWAN. Have these instructions been given to Mr. Taylor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To all the agents. There is no Mr. Taylor.

Mr. COWAN. Who is the purchasing agent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Phelan.

Mr. COWAN. Has he received written instructions to get prices from other firms than Kelly, Douglas & Company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. His instructions are general—to get goods at the lowest market, prices irrespective of any particular firm.

Mr. COWAN. Are these instructions in writing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A circular has gone out.

Mr. COWAN. To Mr. Phelan?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To all the agents.

Mr. COWAN. Can the minister bring down a copy of these written instructions?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. COWAN. When were these instructions given?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About three months ago.

Mr. COWAN. Then, we may hope that prices will be obtained from firms other, than Kelly, Douglas & Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We may hope that—yes.

Mr. COWAN. Will the minister assure the committee that prices will be got from other firms than Kelly, Douglas and Company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, no doubt.

Mr. COWAN. And that, before the order is given to Kelly, Douglas & Company, prices will be got from other firms?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the duty of Mr. Phelan.

Mr. COWAN. According to the written instructions, which the minister will bring down?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BURRELL. I do not want to bore the committee, but if I am in order, I would like to refer for a moment to the carriage of these supplies. On March 3, I put the question on the paper in connection with the carrying of these supplies up on the telegraph lines. I would impress upon the minister that the same policy I am advocating now, which every hon. member ought to sympathize with, the policy of public tender, should be carried out in connection with the carriage of goods as well as the purchase of them. It is a very big contract. It was given in 1901, the minister stated, in answer to an advertisement for tender published in the town of Hazelton. Strong complaint is made throughout the north end of my riding that tenders were not asked for in the usual way. A small notice was given in Hazelton and none of those in the Cariboo country, where the supplies start, knew anything about it. The contract was let at 17½ cents per pound for carrying the supplies. They get that price, even if they do carry the goods eight miles. And this in the face of the fact that, years ago, contractors were taking supplies for the Hudson Bay Company all through that country under more difficult circumstances, at five cents and six cents a pound, and were making money. I do not wish to assume that the minister would wish to continue a state of things that is more or less a scandal in that north country. I hope that the minister will arrange to have contracts given after notice calling for tender. If he does so, he will get this work done at a lower figure than at present

Mr. PUGSLEY. It follows from the doing away with the patronage list that we must have competition for carying supplies, for that is part of the cost of the supplies to the country. I have already given directions to the officials of my department that tenders shall be called for packing of these goods into northern British Columbia.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I dispute the assertion of the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) that goods can be packed into the interior of that country for five cents a pound.

Mr. BURRELL. I was talking last summer to a gentleman who was discussing this question. and he told me that he stood on the shores of Stewart lake and saw a packer who had packed a heavy amount of freight from Ashcroft up to Stewart lake and delivered it at that point. at 8 cents a pound, and made money. It is known all through that country, and if there is one thing that is a particular reproach to the government it has been carrying these supplies year by year without a renewal of tender, at what is conceded, even by his own Liberal friends, to be an extravagant price.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I dispute the accuracy of my hon. friend's statements. To say that goods can be carried from Ashcroft to Barkerville and further, all through a wilderness, by trails and where there are no trails, for 8 cents a pound, is to my mind an absolute absurdity.

Montreal harbour (lower division)—improvements below St. Mary's current—to pay W. J. Poupore in full and final settlement of all claims for interest accrued on deferred payments on contract for construction of high level piers and bulkheads, dated July 25, 1900, $25,242.29.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a claim for interest, and arises in connection with the construction of that large pier at Montreal called Maisonneuve pier. When the work was built there was a dispute between the government and the contractors as to a certain claim, and it was finally left to a departmental board of referees, consisting of the chief engineer, the deputy minister, and the engineer of the Ottawa river works. After hearing the evidence they awarded to the contractors a considerable sum against the government. That amount was paid, and this is for interest at 5 per cent from the time when the work was done, as found by the referees, to the time of payment.

Mr. LENNOX. Was the claim reduced?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The claim was reduced. The amount of interest is about $25,000.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. We will continue the supplementaries, beginning with the Minister of Railways and Canals. But we hope to clean up the whole of them to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 26, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT — SANITARY CONDITIONS.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 111) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The Bill I now feel it my duty to lay before the House has reference to a pernicious state of affairs which affects the people who travel in Canada, and the remedy which I propose will, I believe, be welcomed by the heads of the railways themselves, as well as by the Board of Railway Commissioners and by the general public. I have here an editorial article from a leading Ottawa paper dwelling upon the fact that the health as well as the comfort of the people who travel in Canada is affected by the sanitary state of the trains and the stations, especially the small stations throughout Canada. We have Acts of parliament which provide for the appointment of inspectors to look after the cattle, the fruit and other commodities carried on our trains, but we have no inspectors to look after the welfare of the people who travel. And now that the people of Canada are rising to the state of prosperity in which as I am glad to know the plain people like myself are getting the travelling habit, legislation of this kind is needed. The Railway Act provides that the Board of Railway Commissioners shall have power to look after the matter to which this Bill refers, but there is no machinery provided for that purpose. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), whom I am glad to see in his place, may contend that the power of the Railway Commissioners in this matter is sufficient, but I do not so read the Railway Act. There are a number of clauses providing that certain officials may be appointed by the board with the approval of the Governor-in-Council, but there is no provision for the appointment of the officers referred to in this Bill. I am sure that no person within the sound of my voice, no person who travels in Canada, but will say that this Bill is needed. It is proposed by this Bill to add a subsection to section 284 of the Railway Act providing for five inspectors, to be appointed by the Board of Railway Commissioners subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Council. The duty of these inspectors shall be to see that trains, railway stations, and buildings in connection therewith, are in a sanitary state. One of these inspectors shall be for the province of Ontario, one for the province of Quebec, one for the maritime provinces, one for Manitoba and Saskatchewan and one for Alberta and British Columbia.

The second clause is in reference to complaints under the Railway Act of which the Railway Board has cognizance. It has always occurred to me that while a large corporation, a mercantile company, a city or municipality, have power to put in force the Railway Act and ask the Commissioners to remedy the evils which may be extant, the poor man, the man of moderate means, has no such power. Therefore I ask this House to empower the board to appoint a public official, subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Council, who shall act as a public prosecutor, to whom private persons may make their complaints, and who shall examine the same, and, if necessary, lay them before the board and prosecute them.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may remind the hon. gentleman that inasmuch as this Bill calls for the appointment of certain persons, implying thereby a charge on the revenue, it ought perhaps to be preceded by the usual formality. However, I suppose there is no objection to the introduction of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

APPOINTMENT OF SUCCESSOR TO MR. WM. FORAN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to inquire of the Secretary of State whether any person has been appointed in place of Mr. Foran, who I understand has become secretary of the Civil Service Commission; and if so, whether the person so appointed was appointed upon the recommendation of the Civil Service Commision, or whether there was any departure from the Act in that regard.

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY (Secretary of State). I may say in answer to the hon. gentleman that an appointment has been made of a successor to Mr. Foran, and it was made by the Civil Service Commission.

CANADA EASTERN RAILWAY.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to make reference to an answer I gave the other day to the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames), as to the cost of the Canada Eastern. The answer, which will be found in 'Hansard,' page 2657, should not include the $25,000 which was spent on the Indiantown and Blackville Railway. The answer should be amended by striking out the words:

To put line between Indiantown and Blackville in condition for operation.

Ballast..	$10,000
Ties and rails..	10,000
Fences..	5,000
	$25,000

Mr. AMES. I would ask if the minister would be willing to make these corrections in the original statement, so that the original statement shall go into the 'Hansard' in the corrected form.

SUPPLY—THE FRUIT MARKS ACT.

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

Mr. M. BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). I desire to bring up a matter of sufficient importance to the government, and especially to the agricultural industry, to excuse me in taking up a little time of the House. I wish to deal with the question of the regulations in regard to the fruit industry. I have already, in this House, referred to the importance of this particular industry in my province of British Columbia, where we have now some 75,000 acres actually in orchard. We are practically only at the commencement of our orchard work, and of our output; and in connection with the building up of this industry, on account of the great expense in clearing land, in adopting the irrigation system, in providing fences and other things which are necessary to a successful horticultural development in our province, I need only say that the market question is for us particularly important, and that anything which tends to weaken the markets for the grower of fruit, must also weaken the whole industry. In 1905 the Minister of Agriculture took a step which I think was thoroughly commended by the industry throughout Canada, when he called together the Dominion fruit conference, a conference of gentlemen interested in this particular industry throughout Canada. That conference, I am glad to say, speaking I think for all western fruit growers, resulted in a great deal of good. It familiarized the various growers in the country with the methods and with the weaknesses of the industry which may have existed. It tended also to uniformity of method, and in one way and another, I think, strengthened the industry, and made it in a very real sense an industry recognized as national. Now, in connection with that conference the Fruit Marks Act was discussed and amended; and while we believe that the Act has operated for the development of the horticultural industry, it is perhaps natural that in the course of its operation for a series of years, some weak spots in it should have become manifest. To these I now desire to draw the minister's attention, to see whether it could be amended or interpreted in a way that would better the conditions of the industry. Now, section 319 defines what a close package is, and subsection (a) says:

(a) 'closed package' means a box or barrel of which the contents cannot be seen or inspected when such package is closed.

Now whether this is a question of law or interpretation I am not prepared to say, but I understand that the whole staff of inspectors throughout the country interpret 'closed package' to mean a package containing apples or pears only. We have a very strong feeling in the west that that clause should be interpreted and made to apply to all packages which are nailed up, and particularly to such fruits as peaches. I may mention that at the present time in British Columbia, and no doubt in Ontario, the growing of peaches has reached quite an extent, and I am informed that the inspectors do not apply the provisions of the Act in regard to closed packages to peaches, and especially to peaches which are in cases and nailed up, and this is practically allowing California, Washington and Oregon fruit to come in without thorough inspection. To give you some idea of the amount of this fruit imported into our western country, I may say that into Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta last year there were 63,000 cases of peaches imported from the United States, or roughly about 50 car loads. Our position is this: We are trying to grow and to put up that particular fruit, of which we have about 5,000 acres, in first class shape, and we are sometimes brought into competition with certain classes of fruit, including peaches, which are not graded at all; so we are at considerable disadvantage. Therefore I would urge upon the minister that the Act should be interpreted so as to include that particular fruit. Now I will refer to section 325 of the Act which defines the size of the package. Subsection 3 reads :

When apples are packed in Canada for export for sale by the box, they shall be packed in good strong boxes of seasoned wood, the inside dimensions of which shall not be less than ten inches in depth, eleven inches in width and twenty inches in length, representing as nearly as possible two thousand two hundred cubic inches.

In that connection, whether there is any trade restriction, or whether the province would have the control of that I cannot say, but I think it would be extremely desirable that the Act be amended so as to eliminate that word 'export,' so that we could ensure a uniform package throughout the various provinces and so that, when a consumer bought a box of apples, he would know exactly what he was buying in so far as the size and contents are concerned. I also want to refer to sections 320 and 321 of the Canadian Fruit Marks Act. Section 320 defines the various ways in which fruit packages should be marked. At the conference held in 1905, to which I have already referred, I think a wise step was taken in abolishing the various systems of marking such as X, XX, XXX and so on and introducing the simpler system which consisted of a series of grades, such as 'fancy,' No. 1, No. 2, and defining these grades. I think that was a decided step in advance. The first clause of section 321, which defines these particular grades, is as follows :

Every person who, by himself or through the agency of another person packs fruit in a closed package intended for sale, shall cause the package to be marked in a plain and indelible manner not less than half an inch in length.

And it proceeds to give a description of the marking. That certainly implicitly and solely applies to the Canadian packer. The next clause of section 321 says:

No person shall sell or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale any fruit packed——

Then it defines these particular grades. It has been suggested and strongly felt throughout the whole western country that while section 320 simply confines its operations to the Canadian packer, section 321 should also be legally read and interpreted in conjunction with section 320, and therefore, when we come to infringements of this particular section which provides that

No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale—&c.

I say that it does not apply as stringently as it should to the American competitor in our own market. It has been suggested that section 321 should be amended in some such way as to define how fruit has to be marked so that we can compel the United States competitor to enter our market at least on an even footing with ourselves and not have any advantage. This, of course, may be a question of law, and no doubt the minister has taken advice in regard to it from the Department of Justice. At all events, I would like to suggest that because a great many of our own people believe that it would be in the interest of the industry to alter the Act in that direction.

As this question opens up the whole subject of the kind of competition that we have to face and as I want to particularly and clearly state to the minister and the government our grievances wth regard to this matter, I shall take up the attention of the House for a few minutes in defining the position as it is to-day. We recognize, of course, that in building up this great industry in the west we have to face competition. We have to face very strong competition from the United States. There are only two ways in which the government can help those who have embarked a great deal of money, time and energy in this industry; one by means of a protective tariff and the other by means of the enforcement of the regulations. Of course, I thoroughly understand that it is not well to touch upon tariff matters now, although I hope upon a future occasion to deal with that question and to present our views to my hon. friend

the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I might mention, however, in passing, that there is one thing that I think operates a little injuriously with regard to our industry and that is that the customs officials interpret the word 'barrel' to mean four boxes. Although a barrel does not hold four boxes we find that the American competitor is only charged ten cents a case, where we think he should be charged more. It is usually reckoned that three boxes, instead of four, are the equivalent of a barrel. At a later time I think I will be able to advance reasons for greater protection being accorded to that one great staple, apples, which will secure for me the sympathy even of our northwest members, who, I know, do not want to increase the price of the articles that they consume there. But, with regard to this phase of the subject that I am dealing with now, that is the question of inspection, I am positive that I can get the sympathetic attention of every hon. member from the prairies because we are simply aiming to give the consumer on the prairies the right to expect that what he pays for he should get. In this connection we, of course, meet our strongest competition in the west from the great states of Washington, Oregon and California, which are building up an enormous industry and building it up under greater advantages in some ways—I will not go into that now—than we can expect ourselves. There are two unfair ways in which the product of the American competitor can come into contact with our own products upon the prairies. There are two dangers to meet connected with pests and diseases, and insufficient or poor grading. With regard to the question of the diseases and pests connected with fruit, I may say that in our own province the comparative immunity which we enjoy from all the serious pests and diseases which affect horticulture and inevitably affect the reputation of fruit products is simply the result of eternal vigilance along the line of our own provincial legislation. We enforce the most rigid system of inspection against the great states to the south of us which are infested with almost all the diseases and pests known to horticulture. We have something like twenty or thirty provincial inspectors who inspect, but only for diseases and pests. We found—and as this enforces the argument to some extent with regard to the grading of fruit I may mention it—some dealers and consumers taking a position of opposition to our method on the ground that it rendered the importation of fruit in large quantities a more difficult matter, but we have happily found that as year after year has gone by we have enlisted the sympathy both of the consumers and dealers. The net result has been that we have a fairly clean sample of fruit coming in from the United States, whereas, before that, British Columbia was made the dumping ground for infected fruit of all kinds. It is quite true that in achieving that end we had to reject, and are even now occasionally rejecting, thousands of consignments of all kinds of fruit, but we felt that we were justified in our position and the result has afforded us the most ample justification. We have come to the stage when we are not only supplying the wants of our own country but when we are exporting to our own northwest provinces and in a few years we will be an immense factor as regards fruit. We enter these markets in western Alberta and eastern Manitoba practically on the same terms as the United States with regard to freights. In the middle of the northwest provinces we have probably better terms than they have.

But what is the position of the United States fruit industry and the United States firms that enter our own markets? We have looked into the matter very carefully and we have found that there are a great many very large American firms that are operating in the United States and that are reaching out to control the great markets of the northwest, of Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan and, in short, are endeavouring to practically control our trade. I might give the House some idea of this. I have a letter written to the general manager of the Coldstream ranch at Vernon, one of our biggest fruit growing concerns. This is a reliable and well known gentleman, and he gives us some idea in this letter with regard to what the American firms are doing:

> The Rogers Fruit Company of Winnipeg, Pioneer Fruit Company of Brandon, and Stockton & Mallinson of Regina, are practically the one firm; in other words the stock of these concerns is held practically by the same people. They have also houses at Saskatoon and Calgary, and have just opened up at Edmonton. The chief man in connection with these houses is Mr. H. B. Finch, of Grand Forks, North Dakota, who manages a similar group of fruit houses and wholesale groceries in the Dakotas. Their chief representative, however, is Mr. DeCamp, who is the manager of the Winnipeg house, but looks after their Canadian business generally. This is the combination you referred to in one of your previous letters as handling so much of the Washington fruit.
>
> I took occasion yesterday to interview Mr. DeCamp, with the object of finding through their means a more extended market for the product of the Okanagan and British Columbia orchards. I was somewhat astounded to see the large quantity they had brought in from Washington into the Winnipeg and Brandon markets, of small fruit such as plums, prunes, peaches, cherries, &c. Winnipeg had taken over 150 cars. They had also done an enormous business in Washington apples.

Although we would prefer that the men who handle the fruit in our Canadian Northwest were Canadians, yet we are not simply

complaining that they are Americans or that we have to face this competition. The position is this: These great firms operate on a tremendous scale and they control to a very considerable extent the great fruit centres in Washington and Oregon. This year, in Washington and Oregon they had a very heavy crop and a slack market as the people had not recovered from the financial depression which visited the United States two years ago. Somewhat similar conditions existed in our own country and the American operators naturally reached out to send their surplus to the Canadian market and so control our trade. The Canadian growers were of course vitally affected, and we have some reason to claim that the American fruit did not meet us on even terms in our own market. We have been told that amongst the causes which operate against the purchase of large and increasing quantities of British Columbia fruit is, that the American box weighs heavier than the Canadian box and that the purchaser of American apples gets more for his money. The American box averages from 51 to 53 pounds whereas the British Columbia box only gives 45 pounds. The Canadian Act defines the dimensions of our boxes to be 20 by 10 by 11 inches inside measurement or 2,200 cubic inches. The California box is exactly of the same size, but there are a great many different types of package in the states of Washington and Oregon, some of them being a little smaller than the Canadian box. I am not at all sure whether it would not be a wise provision for the protection of our own industry that when this American fruit is sent into our markets the packages should be made to conform in size to our packages. However that may be, I want to give some facts which I think will enable the House to see that the argument that the American package contains more fruit than does our package cannot be well sustained. Shortly before I came east to attend the session of parliament a carload of Washington apples came to our district and I sent a careful man to weigh these apples by the box and give me the weights. It is of course known to every fruit man that the weight of a box of apples is always variable from the fact that some varieties will weigh heavier than others, and that the method of packing and the size of the apple will cause a difference in the weight. I had about nine varieties of these American apples weighed and it was found that the American boxes ran all the way from 53 pounds (the highest) down to 43 pounds; the large majority of them weighing 45 pounds, 46 pounds, 47 pounds, and 48 pounds. Judging from this there is no good reason for the contention that the American boxes contain a greater weight of fruit than do the Canadian boxes.

Then another reason given why the American apple meets with success in our market is, that their system of packing is better and that the quality of their apple is superior to the quality of the Canadian apple. Well, I could give the House any quantity of testimony from dealers in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, that other things being equal, as far as quality and freedom from disease is concerned they would prefer the British Columbia fruit to that grown in Washington and Oregon. I will admit that there is some excellent packing done by the American growers and handlers of fruit, but at the same time it is not a question of the size of the package or the excellence of the packing, because packing does not mean grading or freedom from disease, and to give the consumer what he has a right to expect we have got to have not only good packing so far as the appearance goes, but we have got to have honest grading and freedom from disease. It is in this that the British Columbia grower is at a grievous disadvantage. We have gone into this question very thoroughly and I would like to quote the opinion of one of our own inspectors who was sent from the Department of Agriculture of British Columbia into the Northwest to make a careful examination into this matter. The letter is written to our chief inspector, and he says:

Waneta, B.C., 21st Dec., 1908.

Thomas Cunningham, Esq.,
Provincial Fruit Pest Inspector,
Vancouver, B.C.

Dear sir,—I beg to submit the report of my recent visit to Alberta. There is no provincial law providing for the inspection of imported fruit in Alberta. The province therefore becomes the dumping ground for the culls and diseased fruit from the United States and from the eastern provinces of Canada.

Unfortunately the Dominion Fruit Marks Act in so far as Alberta is concerned is almost a dead letter, no effort being made by the resident inspector to enforce the requirements.

In jobbers' warehouses and retail stores throughout the province I found thousands of boxes of apples from the United States and from British Columbia which in no way complied with the requirements of the Fruit Marks Act, and which were distributed and sold without hindrance.

There are large quantities of eastern Canadian apples sold in Alberta, principally from Ontario and a few from Nova Scotia, which seemed to me to be culls and diseased fruit, unsaleable in the east. They were certainly not graded as marked, were full of worms, covered with apple scab, and in many instances with San José scale.

Large quantities of apples imported from the United States were poorly packed and graded and infested with codling moth, apple scab, bitter rot, and in a few instances with

San José scale. I may say that I also found a considerable quantity of apples from the United States splendidly packed and graded and entirely free from disease.

I would like also to quote the opinion of another inspector who went into the districts of Lethbridge and McLeod where he carefully examined the conditions. He says:

Lethbridge.—Here I found a few British Columbia apples of good quality, pack and grade, but the American article predominates; in some cases the packing and grading of the American fruit were excellent, but the fruit diseased, one box apples (Wolfe River), of fine appearance, well packed and graded, placed in a prominent place in the windows of the Hudson Bay store, was covered with spots (bitter rot). Other American apples and pears were of poor quality, and in many cases contained codling moth larvæ and apple scab in abundance.

The Dominion inspector had been at this place, but had taken no action, only instructed the importers to put their name on the box before sending them out of their warehouse.

Now, although I think we are learning fairly fast how best to pack our fruit, and while a large proportion of it is very well packed, unfortunately there is yet something to be learned. However that may be we have very good reason for the belief that a large proportion of the United States fruit is bad both as to disease and grading, and that owing to the inadequate number of inspectors under the Fruit Marks Act, a great deal of fruit has been sold as No 1 when in reality it was not of that quality, and yet, it came into competition with our really superior fruit, under that brand.

In this connection I might add that the general manager of the Coldstream ranch in Vernon, a very large concern indeed, sent a competent man out to Alberta to get a fair and clear idea of the conditions there, and I would like to read this extract from his letter. I might add that this man was in every respect absolutely reliable. He wrote as follows :

W. Crawley Ricardo, Esq.,
Pres. Coldstream Valley Fruit Packing Co., Ltd.,
Vernon.

Dear sir,—I beg to inform you that I have visited Calgary and Edmonton and during my visit to both these cities have seen a large amount of American fruit. All this fruit appears to me to be what would usually be graded as No. 2 and in some cases the writer would certainly not let it leave his packing house as anything but No. 3, if such a grade were packed by us. Though small and in a great many cases very mis-shaped, the colour was good and the pack very excellent—in fact from a casual look at a box of this fruit you could hardly see where one apple ended and another began; besides which, in no case that the writer noticed was an apple packed either at the top or bottom of the box which showed any deformity or flaw and it was only by moving one of the sides or taking out several apples that you found these. So far as colour was concerned, some of the Jonathan were excellent, their only fault being size. I am informed that these can be purchased in Washington, Wenatchee or Yakima at sixty to seventy cents there..

This gives a little idea of the state of things, but to make assurance doubly sure —because the point has been raised that very little of this fruit comes in and that in the main we simply have to face first-class fruit— I suggested to the general manager of the Coldstream ranch that he should send one of his good men to the National Apple Show at Spokane, where the leading fruit men in that country exhibit their products, and have him go to these men as if he were a land seeker interested in their valley and find out from them exactly what class of fruit they would ship into Canada. He did so, and these were his instructions:

Mr. Frank Rayburn,
Fruit Foreman, Coldstream Estate Co., Ltd.

Dear sir,—I shall be much obliged, when you go into Spokane, if you can get me definite information what the Americans are selling No. 1 stock for.

By the enclosed letters from Mr. Lanigan, assistant freight traffic manager, Winnipeg, you will see that dealers claim they are getting No. 1 at 65 cents and 75 cents per box f.o.b, Yakima.

I am anxious to get the following information:—

1. What the Americans are selling their No. 1 for?
2. Where their number ones are going to?
3. What class of fruit they are shipping into our territories; if it is their surplus stock, or their straight No. 1.

When you get this information, please get from the most reliable people that you know.

The answer this man procured was that they were getting for their No. 1 stock, not 65 cents or 70 cents, but $1.50 a case f.o.b.; that this fruit was going to Chicago and New York and Europe, and that they were shipping to our country their second-class and surplus. Mr. Ricardo wrote me as follows:

M. Burrell, Esq.,
Grand Forks, B.C.

Dear Mr. Burrell,—The following information is what I secured through our foreman, who went to Spokane show; he went down to the Hotel Spokane, the headquarters of the Yakima people, as a land seeker, and got the answers to my questions. He told them that he had been through the Northwest Territories and had seen their fruit; they were emphatic that it was their 2nd class stuff and surplus.

Yours sincerely,
W. CRAWLEY RICARDO.

I may say that all those statements can be corroborated from other sources. Let

me quote now from a paper published in the town of Kelowna, B.C., concerning the conference of fruit-growers and railway people over the question of markets and freights. Mr. Lanigan, of Winnipeg, freight manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was asked various questions about the condition of the market, and in answer to the question why British Columbia was not doing more business he said:

At first he thought it was because of the Ontario fruit, but afterwards he found that less and less Ontario fruit found its way to the Winnipeg market. Then he thought it was because too large prices were asked for British Columbia fruit. Finally, however, he satisfied himself that neither of these causes was the real reason. The real competition in Winnipeg was the Washington, not the Ontario fruit, and the American fruit was driving the others out of the market It was not because the foreign fruit was better, but because the growers of Yakima Valley and Wenatchee Valley were dumping their second grade fruit at prices which were too tempting for the dealers. Thus any reduction in freight rates would not help them, for it would be immediately met by the American roads. They already had the advantage in a less freight rate and in a ten cent duty This, however, was more than counterbalanced by the way the Canadian grower was handicapped by the law. He was obliged to pack and grade his fruit in a certain way, and the Fruit Marks Act, which was originally adopted to protect the Ontario growers, who did not suffer from American competition, did not apply to British Columbia fruit arriving here in closed packages. He read a lawyer's opinion in support of this view of the law.

Briefly, that is the case I wanted to put before the minister. I am positive that the hon. gentleman is desirous of building up this great industry and promoting the interests of fruit growers all over the country. We have felt this position so keenly that I have had petitions and requests re amendments to the Fruit Marks Act. Let me read one of these from the Okanagan Board of Trade :

Whereas, it is desirable in the interests of the consumer and the competing Canadian grower that United States fruit growers should grade and mark their fruit in conformity with the regulations of the present Canadian Fruit Marks Act;

And whereas, it is believed that the present Act does not apply to imported fruit:

Be it resolved, that the Okanagan Board of Trade urge upon the Dominion government the advisability of so amending the Act as to make it apply to fruit coming from the United States.

In closing I would like to say that whether we suggest an alteration of the Act, making it apply to the United States competitors and compelling them to live up to it, or whether this amendment is necessary or not, it is absolutely necessary to have a larger staff of inspectors to see that the grading and packing is properly done when the American fruit comes into competition with our own. At present the position is this: We have one inspector for the whole of Manitoba and one for Saskatchewan and Alberta. That is, we have two inspectors for these three great provinces and one in British Columbia. To show how absolutely ineffective this staff is, take the case of British Columbia alone. In that province we are having a large amount of fruit constantly coming from the United States, and owing to the geographical character of our country and the fact that the Great Northern is running branch lines into it, the American fruit can get into our market cheaper sometimes than can our own fruit. It is absolutely impossible for one inspector in the whole of British Columbia to begin to see one-fiftieth part of the fruit which comes from the great state of Washington alone. I myself have seen case after case of consignments imported in absolute violation of our own Fruit Marks Act—without any mark, without any of the names of the fruit, without anything to show where grown, very often carelessly packed, but they were sold in the open market without restriction, while we were held to the provisions of our own Act.

It is true that the Inspector of British Columbia has urged, when representations have been made to him on this subject, that anybody can enforce this Act; but we know that whilst this is perfectly true, it will not work out in practice, that in a small community no private individual will take on himself the onus of the objectionable work of laying information against people in the same town with whom he is perhaps on familiar social terms. People will not do it. Thus it is manifestly impossible for one inspector in British Columbia to begin to reach anything like all the importations entering that country to compete with our own fruit growers, and not fulfilling the conditions of the Act which we are forced to live up to. This does great harm to our own province. We had hoped to be able to solve this difficulty in the province. Our own provincial Board of Horticulture suggested to the minister that we would be glad, without expense, to allow our own provincial inspectors who are inspecting for disease and pests to carry out the inspection under the Fruit Marks Act, as well. The minister, I suppose as a matter of principle, did not see his way to accede to that suggestion and the matter remained in abeyance. One inspector for the whole of British Columbia is hopelessly unable to cope with the work. In Alberta and Saskatchewan we also feel that the present provision for inspection is hoplessly inadequate. Two inspectors simply cannot do more than occasionally

perhaps take samples from one or two consignments and very small samples at that. I personally know what it means to inspect a large shipment of fruit, a carload, for instance. If you take anything like reasonable time to inspect it so as to ensure having the whole cargo in accordance with the Act it is a slow process, but with 150 cars in Winnipeg from the United States alone, and perhaps immense quantities at Calgary, Regina, Portage la Prairie and other points, it is easy to see it would be impossible for two inspectors to nearly cover that territory, and they apparently leave it to the dealers themselves to mark this fruit in accordance with our regulations as they see fit. The temptation is, of course, tremendous, especially to the American dealers, to mark the fruit at the highest grade even if it does not justify such marking, trusting that the violations will not be discovered, as the fruit is scattered over an immense territory. The two inspectors have to inspect not only the fruit from the United States, but in addition all the fruit that comes from British Columbia, in order to see that we live up to that Act, and that the consumer on the prairie is getting what he is entitled to get, a No. 1 grade fruit all through the package. They have also to inspect the very large quantity that comes from Ontario. We know that although many aggressive men in Ontario are sending out an admirable quality of fruit and grading it truly, I do not think my Ontario friends will take offence when I say there are a number of men in Ontario who are constantly sending out very inferior fruit, not graded according to the provision of the Act. It is quite impossible for two inspectors to cope with the inspection of that immense quantity of fruit and extent of territory.

I am quite sure that the minister will give very careful consideration to the suggested amendments to the Act and to its interpretation. What we ask in regard to the inspection is that the government, now that the fruit industry has assumed such important dimensions should have at least two inspectors in Manitoba, one each for Alberta and Saskatchewan and two additional inspectors for British Columbia, that is seven in all. It would be desirable and in the interests of the industry if one of these was made chief inspector of this whole western section, and if possible it would be advisable that the man should have his residence in British Columbia because the greatest competition that we, as fruit growers meet in the Northwest is that of the box packages from California, Washington and Oregon, and a British Columbia inspector, thoroughly conversant with our method of box packing and inspection, would be more capable of dealing with the similar packages from the United States.

Mr. BURRELL.

We have now in British Columbia 75,000 acres under orchard. A fair valuation of these lands would be $15,000,000. I predict confidently that in ten years' time that great industry at the very least will be valued at $100,000,000, and it is growing with a rapidity not witnessed in any other portion of Canada. We are asking and obtaining the best class of settlers from eastern Canada, and from Great Britain, and a large number of our good friends from the prairies are going in there to take up their residence and practise horticulture. When we get these men into the province they have to realize as all others who have been in this business for years and years have realized, that it takes not only intelligence and perseverance but long years of waiting before you begin to reap the results of all your work and investment of capital, and therefore an industry of this kind is deserving of the greatest consideration on the part of the government. We have to surmount many difficulties and we are trying to do so, but I do not think we should have to surmount difficulties which could be wiped out of existence by acceding to the legitimate request we have made. Any difficulty in the market end would simply have the effect of discouraging the building up of this industry and the settlement, along the very best lines, of our British Columbia lands. We all deprecate as disastrous to the industry any competition of this kind, if we can prove as I think I have proved, that that competition is absolutely unfair to those of us who are building up the fruit industry of British Columbia. I sincerely trust that the minister will accede to these very moderate requests. They are made not in any political or party spirit but with the sole desire to build up what I believe can now be truly designated a national industry and I trust the minister will see that in meeting our wishes he will be carrying out the suggestions and aims set forth at the Dominion Fruit Conference of four years ago.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (Lambton E.). In supporting the position taken by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) which I am sure the House appreciates. I would urge upon the minister the necessity of appointing more inspectors in the east as well as in the west. We appreciate the extent to which the British Columbia fruit growers have been pushing ahead in the last few years. In 1894 there were in British Columbia only 13,000 acres under fruit while to-day there are over 100,000 acres, and fruit trees were planted at the rate of 1,000,000 per annum in 1907 and 1908.. We must, however, remember that out of the 21,000,000 fruit trees in Can-

ada in 1906 the province of Ontario had 14,000,000, two-thirds of the total number. To impress on the House the importance of this subject, I shall quote a few statistics furnished by the provincial government of of Ontario with reference to the fruit industry of that province. In 1904, 55,000,000 bushels of apples were grown in Ontario At three bushels to the barrel, that would be about 18,000,000 barrels. Last year, according to the same authorities, only 13,000,000 barrels were produced.

However, my reason for calling the attention of the minister to this matter is that of all the fruit packed for consumption last year, out of possibly five million packages, only 43,000 packages were inspected, and in the year 1906 only 11,000 packages. I know that the number of inspectors has been increased by four. But this is an increase for the whole Dominion. I took the opportunity to go down to the fruit division to make some inquiries of Mr. McNeill, of that division, and I shall give the House the benefit of some of the facts which I elicited from him. In British Columbia, as the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) has stated, there is only one inspector, while there are twenty-six provincial inspectors in that province taking care of the fruit which comes in from the United States. There is one inspector for Alberta and Saskatchewan and one for Manitoba. As to Ontario, each inspector is given a district. Mr. McNeill marked off on the map the outlines of the several districts, for each of which there is an inspector. Huron district, for instance, covers part of Lambton, part of Middlesex, Huron and Bruce. This includes the important ports of Goderich and Sarnia. There are probably a hundred points in that district, in addition to these two important ports. I need not go further in order to show the impossibility of one man beginning to look after the fruit in that district. I am satisfied that the minister will see that in order to do justice to this work it will be necessary to have one man who, during the few months of the fall, would be able to give all his time to looking after the exports of fruit from Sarnia and another from Goderich, besides providing for adequate inspection of the rest of this district. The inspector in this Huron district is Mr. Bryan. Then, Mr. Furmigan has the counties of Essex, Kent, Elgin, Norfolk, Haldimand, part of Lambton and part of Middlesex, perhaps, as a whole, the most productive fruit district in the country. Yet, there is only one man to look after that extensive district. I am sure the minister will see that it is practically impossible for one man to begin to cover even a considerable portion of that district. There is another inspector who has his central office in Toronto. The city of Toronto itself must afford work enough for one man, but this inspector is to cover also the counties of Welland, Lincoln, Wentworth, Brant, Peel, Halton and several others. So, I might go through the list of those who have charge of the different districts in Ontario to show how impossible it is for them to cover even a reasonable proportion of their districts within the time at their disposal in the fall of the year. When the minister looks at this question from the business standpoint, I am sure he will find it necessary to greatly increase the inspectors in these districts. It ought to be possible not only to have these inspectors look after the fruit, but educate, or, at least advise, the packers, and assist them to send out a better class of fruit. I desire to read part of one of many letters that I have received from prominent shippers of fruit in different parts of the country. I am sure the minister has received many such communications from prominent shippers of fruit in Ontario and elsewhere, urging the necessity of increasing the number of inspectors. The writer of this letter represents one of the very largest fruit growers' associations in Western Ontario. He says:

> Last winter, I visited the Northwestern markets, such as Winnipeg, Brandon, Regina and Calgary. I saw large quantities of fruit, most of it marked No. 1, which we would not pack as No. 2; in fact, most of it was not better than we would use in the evaporater. I do not think I saw one single barrel packed as we would pack it or that was properly marked No. 1. You can easily see that this kind of packing is ruining the market for those who are packing right, causing suspicion to fall on all packers of Ontario apples. I have talked this matter over with nearly all of the reliable fruit shippers and co-operative associations of Ontario and find that practically every one of them condemns the present inspection under the Act and desires that we be given district packers who shall be responsible to the government for the reputation of the district assigned to them.

He then goes on to call attention to other matters in relation to the shipping of fruit. But, this subject that is now before us is the one that I hope the minister will deal with in the near future. The letters that I receive go to show that a large portion of the fruit shipped to the western provinces is very carelessly packed, and that the inspectors are not able to cover a reasonable portion of their several districts. Take the export trade, covering about 1,200,000 barrels, a small proportion of which are examined at the port of Montreal, and, in addition, the enormous number of barrels packed and distributed in the different districts of the Northwest and it is clear that it is not fair to place the honest packers, these men who have reputations at stake and who have been building up this business for many years, in the position in which they are placed as a result of this at-

tempted inspection. These men find that irresponsible packers, small packers who ship out by carload lots, are sending their goods into these different markets in competition with goods that are fairly and honestly packed. We must take either one position or the other—we must either increase the number of inspectors and compel the bulk of the shippers to live up to the Fruit Marks Act or abandon the Act altogether and allow matters to go back to where they were before, or, if you are going to discriminate in favour of the careless packer, you can depend upon it that you will find plenty of these men who are ready to take advantage of the Act to ship their goods under it. I am aware that the minister will say that he has increased the fine for infringement of the Fruit Marks Act. That is a step in the right direction. But the minister can understand that shippers, who have not a reputation at stake and whose standing is not lowered by being compelled to pay a fine, if there is money enough in it, will pay the fine and continue to do things in direct opposition to the Act. Let me call the attention of the minister to the fact that out of twenty-one inspectors in the whole Dominion there are ten who are almost entirely confined to the city districts, five at the ports of Montreal and Quebec, one at Port Arthur and Fort William, one at Toronto, one at Vancouver, one at Halifax and one at St. John.

I am satisfied that I have given sufficient grounds for urging upon the minister the necessity of investigating this question, and I am sure he will see the wisdom of appointing at once a number of extra inspectors, not only in the western provinces but in the eastern provinces, to compel shippers of fruit to live up to the Fruit Marks Act; otherwise he may depend upon it that the Act is going to do an injury to the honest packer who is endeavouring to acquire a reputation as a packer of fruit, while the man who is careless in packing, will receive an advantage over him, because he will enjoy the advantage of the reputation secured by the honest packer. I do not need to mention exports to the old country. I know the minister fully appreciates the fact that many shipments which went over last year were far from being up to the standard. His own report states that a number of those shipments were far below the standard; in fact you will find that one of his superintendents of division says that the fruit is not up to the average of the other years. This superintendent also puts in a number of letters from different districts in England showing that the fruit sent over to the old country has not been up to the standard, and if we do not have a better enforcement of the law we cannot expect to hold our present advantage in that market.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I appreciate the spirit which has inspired the remarks of the two hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House. I recognize their criticisms as a perfectly fair and friendly effort to secure an advantage to the very important fruit trade of this country. I do not wish at all to take exception to the slight criticisms that have been levelled against the administration of the Fruit Marks Act. That Act and its administration are not probably perfect, and I court criticism and advice in respect to its administration. I must, however, point out—and I hope the House will pardon me for dwelling upon the subject, inasmuch as many of the members now in this House were not present when that Act was under discussion—I must point out that the Fruit Marks Act does not contemplate a complete inspection of our fruit. That Act defines certain grades and marks which must be put upon the fruit in closed packages, and certain requirements in regard to which the whole package must be equal to the showing face. It defines the law under which everybody who packs fruit must act, and everybody who packs fruit must live up to that law and carry out the exact definitions in the Act, or else they are committing an infraction of the law. Under the Fruit Marks Act anybody can take exception to the dealing of the packers, and it is especially open to anybody who buys fruit to see to it that he secures what he purchases, in accordance with the marks defined under this Act. At the time the discussion occurred in regard to that Act when it was put through parliament, it was clearly announced that there could be no effort on the part of the department to secure complete inspection of all fruit in our trade. The reason given was that we would have to have an army of inspectors, all competent men, and men who could only be employed for a small portion of the year. This, it was pointed out, involved an impossibility —I use the word advisedly—it would be an impossibility to secure a large number of inspectors during the rush of the fruit trade to inspect all our fruit, and then drop them off at the end of that trade, and let them seek employment elsewhere for the rest of the year. It would be impossible to obtain a sufficient number of thoroughly competent men under those conditions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would ask the minister whether it would not be possible to obtain men like those who are in charge of packers for the different companies? They obtain competent men for a period of two or three months, for about $75 a month. Might it not be possible for the minister to obtain a similar class of men, who thoroughly understand the packing of fruit, to

take charge of a certain district, for say, $100 a month, for a couple of months?

Mr. FISHER. I do not believe they could properly inspect all the fruit. There is another reason, why it is impossible to inspect all the fruit. Such an inspection would so interfere with the trade, with the transport of the fruit, that the trade could not stand it. I do not say that the trade would not submit to it, but it could not stand it. I would point out that during about two months of the year, in an average season, there are anywhere from half a million to two million barrels of apples passing through the port of Montreal, and it would be impossible to inspect even specimens of the different lots, while they are loading, or to hold them until they have been inspected, without seriously interfering with the progress of that fruit to market. There are some other points where it would be almost equally difficult to make such an inspection, but Montreal is the chief port. These are practically impediments to adopting the idea of a complete inspection of all our fruit. The other objection is the difficulty of obtaining competent inspectors for that purpose. I would point out in answer to the suggestion of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), that all the men who pack fruit, the dealers, who buy orchards and get men to go into those orchards and pack fruit, tell me that it is with the utmost difficulty they can get men at all competent for that work. The only excuse they give us for packing some of their fruit improperly is the difficulty of getting just such men as my hon. friend alludes to. If I were to try to engage from 200 to 300 such men for two or three months of the year, I would not be able to secure qualified men. When it comes to deciding upon the quality and character of the fruit packed we require first-class men, because lawsuits might arise in consequence of their proceeding against packers, and unless our inspectors were absolutely reliable, some of the packers might suffer unjustly. Therefore, I say it was distinctly understood when the Act was passed that we did not intend to make a complete inspection of all fruit. That being the case, why do we inspect at all? First of all, because the Act was intended for the purpose, chiefly of the export trade.

Our credit and reputation in the English market, to which nearly all our apples go, had become very bad. We were there denounced as sending forward apples with a good face in some instances but with wretched fruit in the middle of the barrel. We were also accused of sending forth apples which were marked with some designs indicating that they were of the best quality when, as a matter of fact, they were very inferior. We were also accused of sending forward fruit which was called by one name, but which really was of a different variety. All these things had brought Canadian fruit in the English market to such a low class that something had to be done. It was therefore specially for the purpose of guarding our export trade, and as being a matter of trade and commerce, that this parliament undertook to pass the Act. The Act was framed with that special design, and, incidentally, in the process of watching the fruit trade for that purpose, it was quite possible for the inspectors to also, to a certain extent, although in a lesser degree, help and watch the local fruit trade. It was understood that whenever the inspectors were able to do this I would be only too glad to allow them to do it and thus help to protect the home consumers as well as the export traffic. But there is this difference between the export market and the home consumer. The purchaser of our goods in a foreign country finds it very difficult to come back on the exporter here in Canada. The home consumer can do that easily. In Ontario, in Toronto, or in any of the smaller towns there, a man who buys a barrel of apples and does not find it up to the proper standard is generally within a few miles, or, at most, within a hundred miles, of the man who packed the barrel and he can easily protect himself, whereas, the purchaser in the foreign market could not, and as a matter of fact, would not try to protect himself against the individual packer in Canada. But the whole of the Canadian export trade would suffer by reason of the reputation which would come to it from the defects which he had found in the purchase that he had made. Therefore, for the sake of protecting our reputation and credit in the foreign market it is necessary for us to have this inspection as regards our foreign trade.

Since the inception of the Act some matters have come to my notice which have induced me to go a little further. There was a large trade between the prairie provinces and Ontario on the one hand and British Columbia on the other. This was a trade which it was almost difficult for the purchaser to deal with as the export trade and we therefore felt that it was our duty to assist in guarding that a little. We put an inspector first of all in Winnipeg and afterwards one in Calgary for the purpose of protecting the people in these markets against the sale of inferior fruit. We were urged to do this especially, because, having begun with the export trade, we were told that dealers in Ontario and British Columbia would deliver into these markets, which were very good markets indeed in view of the prices, fruit which they did not dare to send forward for export because it would be subject to our inspection. We, therefore, took it upon ourselves to appoint an inspector in Winnipeg and one in Calgary for that purpose. We have an inspector in British Columbia for dealing

with the export fruit trade of that province and officers in the maritime provinces, in Quebec and Ontario for dealing with the export trade there, these being the great fruit exporting provinces of the Dominion. I think it only right that this explanation should be given particularly as the general tone of the complaints of my hon. friends who have spoken would leave in the mind of those who do not understand the question the impression that it was the intention of the Act to inspect all of the trade, when, as a matter of fact, it was avowedly not the intention of the Act and it was a duty which the department has never undertaken and was never expected to undertake.

Having given this explanation I might say a word or two with regard to what we are doing. My hon. friend has spoken of the vast number of packages of fruit shipped. I have no doubt the figures he has given are correct. As a matter of fact the figures I have show that the number of individual packages inspected during last year is a little over 41,000 by all the inspectors. That is about 2,000 to each inspector in round figures. This inspection goes on for about three months in the year and then we employ the inspectors, except the temporary ones, for another three months. During that time they do not do nearly as much as they do in the three months in which the active packing of fruit takes place. But although that was the number of actual packages inspected, the shipments included nearly 700,000 packages; so that practically we had to inspect, with our staff of inspectors, what was equivalent to about 700,000 packages of fruit. The result was that we were obliged to take out a large number of prosecutions, and this year I have insisted upon those presecutions being put through to the utmost limit except where there was a first offence or where there seemed to be mitigating circumstances. All through in the administration of this Act I have been desirous of taking it for granted that the packers wished to live up to the Act and that if they did not do so it was usually due to ignorance or carelessness. Therefore, in the case of a first offence, we generally allowed the thing to go, giving the packer a warning, pointing out to him what the requirements of the law were and insisting upon his fulfilling those requirements. For a second offence, however, during the last season I do not think we have dropped any. My hon. friend asks for more inspectors. That, I think, is the burden of the request laid before us now. I would be quite willing to do this, and I think that perhaps the time has been reached when the necessities of the case are such that I will have to do it. Last year I did it to a certain extent. I added three inspectors to the province of Ontario in consequence of the representations which were made to me.

Mr. BLAIN. Who were they, may I ask?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Furminger, Mr. Bryan, Mr. Smith and Mr. Moore. One of these, however, replaced an inspector who died. I did this partly because it was represented to me, which was true, that there was a considerable export of fruit from western Ontario across the United States boundary line, especially at Niagara. We have tried to keep the inspection for the export trade scattered through the country, partly on the railways converging at Montreal, but chiefly in the port of Montreal, which is the great export port for all the fruit of Ontario and Quebec. We also have had a good deal of this work to do at Halifax, St. John and some other places in the maritime provinces, where there is an export trade. In addition to the inspection of the ports, which is the most convenient for the administration of the department, we have had several men travelling about in Ontario dropping on to shipments of fruit anywhere and everywhere, and the reason we have been doing this is that, the law being what it is, any man who ships apples is open to attack and we wish to attack him in any way without warning and without letting him know that he was going to be caught. For that purpose I have had travelling inspectors going about in Ontario especially and the maritime provinces and an inspector in British Columbia doing the same kind of thing, for the purpose of catching people. That is a deterrent. It shows the shippers and packers that they are never safe, that they may at any time be caught, and if they are caught they will be prosecuted and fined. It was never intended or expected that we could inspect all the fruit; but the law being what it is, it fixes a standard, not only for our inspectors, but for purchasers from abroad. Therefore, it gives an opportunity for the purchaser to protect himself and an intimation to the packer what he must do, not only to comply with the law, but to do justice to the trade and the purchaser and himself. That is the object of the Act. I would be very sorry indeed to think for a moment of dropping the administration of this Act. Possibly more vigorous administration may be required, but that means more expenditure of money, more numerous appointments of inspectors, and I would remind some hon. gentlemen that when the Act was first introduced I was met with the taunt that the object was simply to provide places for government supporters. I explained that I was only appointing inspectors when absolutely necessary and was going to appoint none except efficient men. Since the Act has been in force, I have never had a complaint as to the efficiency and good character of

any man appointed under the Act. The only complaint I have had is that I have not made sufficient appointments. I may say that we have tributes to the efficiency of this Act from outside the country.

I shall not go back to the old reports from England on the first Inspection Act, or quote again what has been often stated by our American competitors, but I will say this, that at present, in a number of states in the Union, the fruit growers have asked for legislation similar to our Act, and the American Federal authorities have been petitioned by a large number of the state fruit growers and the Pomological Union of all the American states, to pass an Act modelled on the lines of the Canadian Fruit Marks Act. This, it seems to me, is a fair tribute to the good lines of this Act and its successful working. In a general way, that administration has accomplished much for the object intended. I know that its administration has been carried on with a single eye to the improvement of the fruit trade, and that the officers of the department, the chief inspectors and all the officers under them, have been working to the best of their ability for the proper enforcement of the Act and the benefit of the trade. I believe myself that it would be in the public interest if more inspections were made and I propose to stimulate more frequent inspections by one means or another. If we cannot overcome the insufficient number of inspections without additional inspectors, I shall not hesitate to appoint additional inspectors where they seem to be required, and ask parliament for the necessary money to enable me to do so. But I do not think that I could appoint any more with the money at my disposal, and I want to keep within the vote if I can. I appreciate the statements made to-day and the reports that have come to me from other sources, and I appreciate the fact that the matter is of sufficient importance to the fruit trade to warrant my taking the responsibility of spending a little more money than parliament has voted, if that be absolutely necessary for the proper accomplishment of the work. There are, however, one or two other demands for inspectors to which I shall allude. A considerable number are from people who want to be appointed inspectors themselves, no doubt a laudable object, but I do not propose to regard very seriously such applications because the desire to be inspectors probably influences their applications. There is another demand which also I do not feel called upon to grant. I have had representations from a large number of dealers asking me to appoint inspectors to go into their orchards and see that their packers comply with the law. To those people I say that it is just as much a part of their business arrangements and management to see that their packers comply with the law as to see that their book-keepers keep their books properly, and it is no part of the duty of the government to pay for that part of these people's business. I have therefore disregarded the applications of a good many men who have urged on me insistently that the government should appoint inspectors whose business it would be to go about in the orchards and see that the packers pack their fruit according to the Act. The law is there and the packers and their employers know it, and it is their business and not that of the department, to see that they fulfil the law.

There are one or two points brought up by my hon. friend from British Columbia, which I shall deal with for a few minutes. Regarding what he said about the Act itself, he gave an interpretation of the clauses 320 and 321 in which I do not quite agree with him. The Department of Justice has informed me that the Act does apply to imported fruit and we have always administered it in that view. I have the instructions here which we give to our inspectors, and this is what these instructions say:

To Fruit Importers and Commission Merchants.

Importers of fruit are warned that the Fruit Marks Act, referring to the grading and packing of fruit, and sections 4 and 5 of the Act 'Respecting the Packing and Sale of certain Staple Commodities,' referring to the size of fruit packages, will be strictly enforced. Importers of foreign fruit will be held responsible for the packing and marking of the fruit which they sell as well as for the size of the packages.

Copies of the Fruit Marks Act and the Act 'Respecting the Packing and Sale of certain Staple Commodities' may be had, free, on application to the Fruit Division, Ontario.

That was a circular sent to my inspectors on the 5th of April, 1906. It has never been rescinded or modified. The inspectors thoroughly understand it, and it is their duty to follow it. Last May, a year ago, there was a correspondence from Calgary, and in that correspondence one of the inspectors there wrote asking some questions and describing something that was going on there. This was the answer sent by Mr. Alexander McNeil, Chief of the fruit division:

I have your letter of May 21 with reference to the foreign fruit coming in. In such cases as this, the dealer is held responsible for the fruit. In the case of closed packages, he must put his name and address on the outside of the packages and will be held responsible for the grading and packing. In the case of berries and baskets, he will be held responsible for the proper marking of the packages.

As the cubic contents of this basket as you give the measurements will be 48 cubic inches, and as the legal standard requires 55½ cubic inches it will be necessary for the

McPherson Fruit Company to stamp all such boxes with the word 'short' as required by law. No doubt, they will recoup themselves for the extra labour from the shippers.

I presume you are supplied with copies of the Inspection and Sale Act, part IX.

The House will see therefore that the instructions of the department to their inspectors, and the action of the department generally has always contemplated that the Act applied to imported fruit just the same as the home packed fruit. We have asked our inspectors to always carry out that idea. My hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) spoke about a possible amendment to section 321. There is no doubt in our minds whatever that under section 321 the package has to be marked as required by the provisions of this part of the Act, and the imported package has to be marked exactly the same as the Canadian package. Section 320 is a direction for the packers in this country before they send out their fruit, and section 321 says:

No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, any fruit packed in a closed package and intended for sale unless such package is marked as required by the provisions of this part of the Act.

That means that whether the package be imported or packed at home, as long as a person has it in his possession or offers or exposes it for sale, it must be packed in accordance with the provisions of this Act, so that the Act applies to all packages no matter whence they come. In the administration of the Act we have held the person who is the agent or the purchaser from the importer the responsible person against whom to have recourse if there is any infraction of the Act because of course we cannot go to a foreign country to prosecute. My hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) speaks of the grievances of British Columbia. I have no doubt whatever that he can appeal fairly to the people of the prairie provinces just as he can to me for sympathy in the difficulties—I would not like to call them grievances—which the fruit men of British Columbia have experienced in their laudable and legitimate efforts (with which I have the greatest sympathy) to capture the market in the prairie provinces. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrell) speaks about the tariff, and I shall not enter into that question further than to say that I propose to represent to the Minister of Customs what I think is a fair thing, namely, that four boxes of apples contain a larger quantity than a barrel, and that if the duty is to be levied on boxes it would be much fairer to count three boxes to the barrel than to count four.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. I will make that representation to the Minister of Customs and ask that he shall issue an order that the duty should be levied in that way which I think is right and proper. If it is not done at the present time I have no doubt it is because of some misconception on the part of the officials. My hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) spoke about the provincial regulations, and here let me compliment the province of British Columbia on the regulations they have enacted for the purpose of shutting out and suppressing insect pests and disease in fruit. In that respect British Columbia has taken the lead of all parts of Canada. It is in the purview of the provincial legislatures to so enact and the province of British Columbia has gone very far in that direction and has I think administered its law wisely and well.

The Fruit Marks Act is not specially aimed at protecting us against fruit pests and it only incidentally does so by directing the condemnation of apples or other fruits which are rendered inferior in quality by reason of having in them these fruit pests. As to the enforcement of the Act, the local inspectors in British Columbia have a perfect right to prosecute under the Act if they so desire. If fruit is being sold anywhere in British Columbia which is not marked and packed in accordance with the provisions of the Fruit Marks Act, anybody and everybody whether he be an inspector or not can lay an information or take out a prosecution under the Act. We have received from our inspectors at Winnipeg and Calgary a good deal of information on the subject, and that information has led us to believe that as a rule the American fruit offered on these markets has been packed quite in accordance with the provisions of our Act. I do not mean to say that there is no bad American fruit put upon these markets, but at all events our inspectors have not reported any such. I do not suppose for a moment that they inspect all the fruit, but we certainly have had reports from them showing that in a general way the American fruit is well packed and fulfils all the conditions of our law. I took occasion a little while ago to send a circular to all the dealers in fruit in the three prairie provinces and with one exception they all reported that the American fruit arrives in good condition and is packed in strict accordance with the requirements of our law. It may be said that these dealers are prejudiced as they handle American fruit, but at all events that is the information they have sent us. One dealer did report that he had seen some American fruit which was not quite up to the standard.

Mr. BURRELL. Were they wholesale or retail dealers?

Mr. FISHER. They were mostly wholesale.

Mr. BURRELL. They are largely American firms.

Mr. FISHER. They may be prejudiced, but of course I cannot say as to that. Let me say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrell) that as a general rule the British Columbia fruit, is, I believe, well packed and properly marked. I remember that some years ago I was in British Columbia and having seen a good deal of the fruit there I considered, and so stated it in the east, that the British Columbia fruit growers could give a lesson to the rest of Canada in the putting up of fruit. They had seen the example of California long before we in the east had; they profited by it and as a general rule they put up their fruit very well. The last time I was in the province of Alberta in the fall of the year I saw boxes of British Columbia fruit, and, when I saw it in competition with the American fruit I must say that personally I would have had no hesitation in buying the British Columbia fruit in preference to the other. My experience on that occasion led me to believe that British Columbia can successfully supply these markets with fruit just as soon as they are able to grow enough for the demand. I venture to think that the chief reason for such a large quantity of American fruit being sold in the prairie provinces, is, that British Columbia up to the present time could not supply the market. Although British Columbia has gone so far ahead, as my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) has described, in planting trees and providing for a large production in the future, it is my belief that British Columbia does not now produce enough to supply the market of the prairie provinces.

As a matter of fact, according to some returns I have seen, a considerable quantity of American fruit is imported into British Columbia, and sold in that province, not because it is better fruit, not because the British Columbia consumers would prefer it, but because at certain times and seasons there is not enough British Columbia fruit of some kinds to supply the market of British Columbia, and certainly not enough to supply the prairie markets. A large quantity of fruit has been sent from Ontario into the prairie provinces especially of late years. To-day the Ontario fruit growers are making great strides in the prairie markets. During the last season I have had an Ontario man inspecting in Winnipeg. He has made reports upon the fruit trade in Winnipeg and the prairie markets generally. He found some fruit arriving from British Columbia in very bad condition, chiefly because the people there did not seem to understand how to pack it in the car and how to see to its transportation. I am of the opinion that when fruit is to be shipped by rail, even in refrigerator cars, it is essential that it should be cooled before it is placed in the car. I would also say that some carloads of small fruit arrived in Winnipeg last season from British Columbia in a state of mush. They had been seriously heated in the car, and had been packed in such a way that there was no circulation of air amongst the packages, while the American fruit coming into the Winnipeg market the same day was in perfect condition because there was provision to allow the circulation of air between every two layers of baskets, and because the fruit had been cooled down as low as it could be cooled with safety before being packed in the car. This hint may account for a great deal of the bad fruit that has arrived in the prairie provinces from both Ontario and British Columbia. I propose that that inspector shall go about in Ontario and give the fruit shippers and packers of Ontario the benefit of what he saw in the Winnipeg market last season. Before the next shipping season begins I hope he will be able to lay the information he has acquired in this way before the Ontario people so that they may learn what conditions have arisen in their fruit trade with the west in the last season, and by some means I hope to lay the same information before the British Columbia shippers.

I am glad of what has been said here to-day. I appreciate the spirit in which the remarks of hon. gentlemen have been made and sympathize with the views expressed, and I shall try during this coming season, as I did in the past season, to bring about a larger measure of close inspection of the fruit trade. I hope that we will be able to remove any difficulties that may exist in this respect.

Mr. F. LALOR (Haldimand). I would compliment the minister on his fair description of the administration of the Fruit Marks Act, and the manner in which he has approached the question before the House. Any remarks I shall make will be not in a spirit of fault-finding or hostile criticism, but with the object of remedying any grievances that may exist. I do not believe that the Fruit Marks Act is as rigidly enforced as it should be, because we have not enough inspectors to properly carry on the work. I am glad to hear the minister promise to try to increase the number and to give us more rigid inspection. I believe that an inspector should be appointed in each county during the packing season. This could be done as there are plenty of men in almost every county competent to inspect apples and these men may be selected and engaged only for the packing season. In that way a higher standard could be attained because I believe it to be of immense importance

that the buyers in the British market should feel sure that when buying Canadian apples he is getting inspected fruit packed according to the Canadian law. To create such a feeling in Britain will give us a great advantage in the British market over the American shipper. Therefore I am in sympathy with the Inspection Act and in favour of increasing the number of inspectors, if the minister can see his way clear to do so. I was surprised yesterday to learn, from an answer given in this House, that some 37,000 barrels of American apples were imported last year into the Canadian Northwest. I was sorry to learn that because the Canadian west should in the future be one of the best markets for the apples of Ontario, and it is unfortunate that we are losing all that great Northwest trade. I suppose we are labouring under great difficulties in the way of freight rates to that country as compared with the American shippers and it would be a great advantage to the Ontario apple producer if the duties upon apples going into the Northwest from the United States were made a little higher in order that we might gain that market.

I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) complaining of lax inspection of apples in British Columbia, because Ontario shippers are afraid to send apples into British Columbia owing to the inspection there.

Mr. BURRELL. That is provincial inspection.

Mr. LALOR. That may be. I wish to call attention to an industry which is of great importance to the farming community and which is growing more rapidly than almost any other industry, the evaporating of apples. In almost every part of every county in Ontario you will find that within the last few years an evaporator has sprung up. It is not the better class of apples that waste on the trees, they are packed and shipped. The apples that are allowed to waste are those that do not come up to the proper standard for shipment. The safeguard against that is the evaporator. These evaporators are being located all over Canada; the industry has grown faster than any other that I know of; and I do not know of anything of greater benefit to the farmers than the establishment of an evaporator within his reach, because it takes this class of apples, which would otherwise be wasted, at a fair price. These apples are evaporated, done up nicely and are sold partly in Canada and partly for export. This year, I am sorry to say, that industry is in a most unfortunate position. Unless some remedy can be found, I cannot see much hope for the extension of the evaporated apple business in Canada. The principal difficulty we labour under in this business is the German surtax. I am not saying this in a spirit of fault finding with the position of the government in the matter. For, I wish to say at once to the government that their position is the position that I take; it is a position in which I am prepared to support them. I believe their stand was a proper one and that in the interest of the country, we should retaliate and let them have surtax for surtax. But the German market, unfortunately is our chief market for the export of evaporated apples. The Germans have placed this surtax of one-half cent a pound on evaporated apples going into that country, and the result is that more apples are offered for sale in Canada than the country can take. There is to-day a great surplus of last year's crop, and one dealer is competing with another to see who will sell evaporated apples the cheapest, in order to get rid of them before next season's pack comes on. So far as I am concerned, I have ten carloads of evaporated apples today in New York that were shipped for export to Germany. They are held in bond. The surtax is almost prohibitory, and the result is that we cannot get rid of our surplus stock, and we do not know what to do with it. There is no way by which, at as little cost, the government could assist a Canadian industry as by helping the men in this business to pay this surtax on evaporated apples. The evaporated apple industry, I believe, is the one industry that is suffering on account of this surtax. Our manufacturers, I believe, are getting benefit from it, and it would be a pity on their account to remove it. Our farmers who export wheat and other products are not suffering as a result of it. But this growing evaporator industry, the immense importance of which to the farmers I have already pointed out, is placed in such a position by this surtax that it greatly needs assistance. I would like to see the government render that assistance by paying a certain portion of that surtax, in order that the surplus of evaporated apples may be got rid of. When you consider the enormous quantity of dried fruit brought into this country, you can see the effect it has upon the evaporated apple business. The growers of small fruits suffer to an enormous extent from the importation of American fruit. No less than 1,600,096 pounds of strawberries and blackberries were imported into this country last year. The duty is not heavy enough. This market should be secured to the Canadian fruit grower. We have ample facilities for growing fruit, especially small fruits, and I believe that the tariff should keep out the American fruit to as great an extent as possible, and give the market to our own people. It is a wonder to me that the growers of small fruits have not agitated before this for the increase of duty on this class of fruit. As to the evaporated apple trade, I speak from experience as one connected with it, when I say that it is suf-

fering greatly from the German surtax. It would not cost the government much to assist this industry in the way I have suggested.

Mr. SPROULE. What quantity is imported?

Mr. LALOR. I have not the figures at hand. But I know that a certain quantity is imported, particularly from California into British Columbia and the west. To-day, probably about 400 cars of evaporated apples are packed in Canada every year. They represent an enormous quantity of green apples. Probably 200 cars are used in the country and the rest are exported, largely to Germany. At a cost of about $25,000 a year, the government could pay the surtax imposed upon the evaporated apple products and relieve the Canadian industry. This would do almost more than anything else, as I have already suggested, to assist the farmer in getting rid of the apples that otherwise would be lost. I cannot speak too highly of the advantage of the evaporator to the farmer. I believe that advantage is as great as that afforded by the canneries. I believe the government would be wise in deciding to assist the people engaged in this business.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL (South Oxford). It is very pleasing to see the spirit in which this subject has been debated, for it is so seldom that we find both sides of the House agreeing so thoroughly on any matter as to-day. We know that the work of the fruit inspectors has been most helpful to the apple industry as well as to the industry of growing small fruit. I do not propose to quote, as I might quote at length from different sources, to show how the work that has been done by the inspectors since they were appointed in 1901 is regarded. The fact that our friends of the opposition are asking for an increase in the number of inspectors is the clearest proof that good work has been done. I have a very high appreciation of this trade, its growth and possibilities. I agree heartily with the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo concerning the possibilities of the apple industry—and I suppose the same applies to small fruits—in the province of British Columbia. We feel that there are as great possibilities in the province of Ontario. We know that the fruit of British Columbia is of very fine quality, very handsome, perhaps even more so than the Ontario fruit or that of Nova Scotia. But we know that it is not finer in quality. Ontario, I think, produces the best all round apples, perhaps not as fine in appearance, but for flavour, for texture, and for keeping quality, I do not think there is any part of the Dominion of Canada that produces finer apples, or possibly as good. The possibilities of development in Ontario are very great, yet I am sorry to say we have been making but very little progress of late years. The number of new orchards that are being set out is very small, comparatively speaking; the older orchards we have are not producing the quality of fruit that they should produce, and there is something lacking with this industry. Now, I do not blame the Dominion government, I do not blame the Ontario government, either one of them entirely; I think perhaps the fault lies primarily at the door of the producer, at the door of the grower.

Mr. OLIVER. The packer?

Mr. SCHELL. No, not the packer, you have to go far behind the packer to find the root of the trouble. If we are going to put this industry where it should be, and if we are going to have our inspectors do their work satisfactorily in the future, we have got to produce a better quality of fruit. The inspectors have done about all they can do, except as a deterrent in future. The educational work has demonstrated that our fruit has to be put up according to a certain standard, and packers, buyers and dealers understand that. But until we get a better quality of fruit, a more uniform quality, there will always be a difficulty in the enforcement of the Fruit Marks Act, and our growers will not obtain the value that they should obtain from their orchards.

I think that in the first place more educational work should be done. The farmers already know something of it from reading in the newspapers, and from the example of their neighbours in spraying their orchards and taking proper care of them. But as a rule, our farmers have not gone systematically into the work of spraying and caring for their orchards as they should do. I believe the provincial government of Ontario, assisted by the Dominion government, should take up this work more energetically in the way of imparting education, instruction, and making demonstrations with a view of putting this industry on a better footing. I understand that the provincial government of British Columbia have taken a very strong stand in relation to their fruit industries, and I think they are far in advance of us in the province of Ontario—and I am now speaking particularly for that province. It is the provincial government of Ontario that have primarily the charge of the educational institutions, and it is their duty to do more in the way of sending out inspectors and instructors. If the apple industry, the fruit industry, of that province were properly handled, instead of exporting one million barrels of apples, out of the ten million or fifteen million we produce in that prov-

ince each year, we should export seven or eight million barrels, or at least we should have that number fit for export. We know as a matter of fact that we have not more than 25 or 30 per cent of really No. 1 fruit and have not had for many years. With proper spraying, with proper cultivation, with proper pruning, instead of growing 25 or 30 per cent of No. 1 fruit, we should grow 75, 80 and 90 per cent, and we could do it, because it has been demonstrated in a number of cases. In my own county of Oxford I know a few orchards where spraying has been systematically conducted for a number of years, and it is a common thing for those orchards to produce 75, 80 or 90 per cent of No. 1 fruit. Instead of having a million barrels to export we should have four or five millions, and instead of receiving a revenue of a million dollars a year for our apples in Ontario, we should be receiving six, seven or eight million dollars a year, not saying anything about the possibilities of development, because the province of Ontario is especially adapted to the growth of apples on a paying basis. I have in my mind an orchard, in my riding, of eight acres, the product of which was sold for $1,300 on the trees, the owner did not put a hand to the picking, to the teaming, nor to the boarding of the help, but sold the fruit on the trees for $1,300 in cash. I know another orchard in the county of Norfolk for which I offered $4,500; the owner did not sell to me, but he realized over $5,000 for that orchard. It was a large orchard of some thirty acres, but only a small portion of it was in bearing, and I am satisfied that that man realized nearly $300 for every acre he had in bearing. I might mention other cases where spraying has been followed to great advantage.

I do not see why this industry should not be developed as our dairy industry has been developed. In the province of Ontario the provincial government took that matter up, they laid out the province into districts and appointed an inspector for each district. We have 65 or 70 dairy instructors in the province of Ontario, and to-day we occupy a foremost position among the nations of the world for the production of a high class quality of cheese and butter. Why should we not have the same thing done in connection with our apple industry? I am glad to see that the Minister of Agriculture has already arranged for two of the inspectors under his charge to go out next week into the county of Oxford, and deliver addresses, and give instruction and information bearing on this subject. I have had this matter under consideration for several years, and I have come to the conclusion that the provincial government has not been doing its duty in connection with the fruit industry in that province. I have also felt that, while perhaps the Dominion government is not primarily charged with educational work, still some of their inspectors, who are expert men, might be employed to a greater extent in educational work when they are not engaged in the work of inspection. Why should they not be sent out into various parts of the province and give instruction, give demonstrations, give information that would be advantageous to our farmers, and show them how they could improve the productiveness of their orchards, and obtain better financial results? I know from personal experience in spraying, and from observation, that it is possible to double the profit of an ordinary orchard. Take any orchard in the province of Ontario that has been neglected, that has not been properly sprayed and cared for, and in a couple of years you can double the crop of fruit, not only double the crop, but you can increase the value of the crop by at least 100 per cent. If this were generally done throughout the province, instead of producing ten million barrels a year, we would be producing twenty million barrels per year; and instead of so large a quantity going to the evaporator—and we have heard to-day about the wonderful development of the evaporating industry—these apples should go into the market, and be bringing 50 or 75 cents a hundred instead of 10, 15 or 25 cents. Instead of receiving a revenue of a million dollars a year, we should be receiving ten million dollars, and we could do this if the trees were properly sprayed, properly cultivated and handled. I do not wish to dwell further on this subject except to say that the transportation problem has been solved. We have the best transportation facilities that any people possess—I do not care where you go. We have the best line of steamships operating between the port of Montreal and European ports that is to be found operating between any ports in the world. These steamships are better than those sailing from New York and Boston. We have that clearly demonstrated by our shippers. We could have got a rate of from 10 to 12 cents less via New York or Boston than via Montreal any time for the last twenty years, and I know what I am speaking about because I have quotations and I have shipped from New York and Boston. Shipments by New York have involved a loss, while the carriage by way of Boston has sometimes been satisfactory, but not always so. They have some splendid boats operating between Boston and the European market, but, take the boats as a whole, we have better service from Montreal or Quebec than they have from either of these American ports. No finer boats for the carriage of fruit are to be found than the Empresses sailing from Quebec or than the boats sailing from Montreal.

Mr. LALOR. What do you think of the freight rates to the west?

Mr. SCHELL. I think they are too high and I think that the railway companies of this country should give us better rates. Especially is it unfair that when the fruit gets to Winnipeg local rates prevail from Winnipeg to western points. That is an absolutely unfair condition that I think our Board of Railway Commissioners should take up and deal with. We should have a through rate to Calgary, Edmonton, Brandon or Regina, as well as to Winnipeg, and I think it is an absolutely unfair condition that is maintained to the detriment of the shippers of Ontario fruit. The rate is high anyway, and I think we are entitled to a through rate just as much as we would be in shipping any other commodity. I hope that this government, operating in connection with the government of Ontario and, if necessary, with the government of Nova Scotia, if their system is not what it should be, as well as with the government of British Columbia, will take hold of this industry and spend money upon it. Every dollar they spend they will get back ten times over as the result of better educative work. I do not know of any industry in which there are greater possibilities of development. I do not know any way in which the government can spend money and receive a better return. Instead of having complaints about poor fruit and inspectors not always giving satisfaction either to the shippers or the buyers, if we get the fruit right there will be no difficulty about the inspection, and if we had the clean fruit they have in British Columbia and in some of the western states there would not be much difficulty about inspection. There the fruit is comparatively clean. They have not the scab and coddling moth to the same extent that we have in Ontario. By solving the question of the production of a good quality of fruit at home we will rid ourselves of the difficulty, annoyance and heart burnings in connection with poor fruit that we sometimes see put up and shipped to the markets that should never leave our own orchards except to go the evaporator or cider mill.

Mr. J. B. BLACK (Hants). Mr. Speaker, I have only a word to add to what has been said. I am more than pleased that this subject has come up to-day. This is the fruit grower's day. We have sometimes a lawyers' day, we have always a political partisans' day and during the last few years I believe we have had, once in each session, a doctors' day. I am very glad therefore that to-day we have a fruit growers' day. I think that much good will come of it. I am very glad that this question has come up. It is one in which I am personally deeply interested, coming from a country where fruit growing is one of our chief industries, where fruit growing is one of our most paying industries, where the apple tree is indigenous to the soil, where it will grow wild in the fence corners alongside of the morning glories and the wild roses, where you can scent the apple blossoms for a hundred miles in one direction without losing sight of the blooms all the way. It is one of our paying industries. Apple growing in Nova Scotia is as good as owning bank stock even if bank stock is good. My hon. friend (Mr. Schell) who has been telling us about the superior fruit, the unapproachable fruit of Ontario, I am sorry to say, wound up with a hard luck tale about bad fruit, miserable, scabby fruit, wormy fruit, unintelligently cultivated and unintelligently packed. I would advise our friend to send his fruit growers either to British Columbia or down to Nova Scotia to get some lessons in intelligent fruit growing and intelligent and honest packing. I am also glad that this question has come up because it has developed that the only fault which the Fruit Marks Act has is that there are not enough inspectors. I remember that not very long ago, at least one of the voices that was singing the praises of this Act to-day and finding no fault with it at all, was criticising this Act very energetically and very earnestly, and I also remember that it was attacked very bitterly. But the hon. gentleman who was then criticising the Act declares to-day that the only fault to be found with it is that there are not enough inspectors. The outfit of inspectors necessary to examine our apple crop would be something like the outfit of surgical instruments that a surgeon would need. It could not be complete. I presume the inspectors were appointed to look after four classes of the people in the fruit business—the ignorant grower, the ignorant packer, the careless packer and the dishonest packer. The want of education, I think, is one thing that has made the inspector necessary at all. If our people were sufficiently educated in the art and skill of growing apples properly, of growing them for their own profit, of growing them in a businesslike way, I think we would have very little trouble about the quantity of inspectors. In so far as Nova Scotia is concerned I have nothing but good words to say for the Fruit Marks Act. We have not many inspectors there, not as many as would like to be appointed, but I think possibly that at the present time we have about all that are necessary. We exported from the port of Halifax last year between 600,000 and 700,000 barrels of apples and so intelligently is the fruit grown and so honestly is it packed that the two or three inspectors that are employed in Nova Scotia, one of whom is at the port of Halifax, are all that are

necessary. I have it on the authority of the chief inspector that while in some cases fruit packers are being fined every year, the fact is that dishonest fruit packing is growing less and less all the time. As in other businesses, so in the fruit growing business, education and intelligence are necessary, and if my hon. friend from Ontario inquires into the sad situation he paints he will find that the trouble in Ontario is that while the soil is fit and the conditions favourable the people are not growing the fruit intelligently. The hon. gentleman told us that $300 per acre was paid for land, and he seems to consider that an enormous sum. Let me tell him that down where I come from you cannot buy an acre of orchard for $300.

Mr. SCHELL. The statement was that the fruit itself was sold at $300 per acre.

Mr. BLACK. I could mention an orchard in my district on which last year the fruit sold for $4,000. However, that makes very little difference, for what I was getting at was the importance of intelligence in growing fruit. The fruit growers in my section of the country are educated and intelligent men and we have B.A's. and M. A's., graduates of our colleges, engaged in the industry. The result is that fruit growing in Nova Scotia is not only a paying business now, but that year after year we find our export of fruit growing larger and the quality of the apples getting better. Perhaps in some sections of the country where fruit is not so intelligently grown and where perhaps it is a little more dishonestly packed there may be more inspectors required, but in Nova Scotia we have no fault whatever to find with the Act and indeed we think it has proved itself to be a very great benefit to the industry.

Mr. D. A. GORDON. I have listened with much interest to the statements made by hon. gentlemen as to the many evils that confront us in the fruit growing industry, but as they have offered no remedy I trust I may be pardoned for making a suggestion which I think will bring about a cure for these evils. We realize that all through Canada apples and oranges are of the same value. I had occasion to state in the House recently that last fall apples in my locality sold for from 8 cents to 25 cents per 100 pounds, and I have before me a report of the market in Great Britain from which it will be seen that at the same time apples sold there for as low as one shilling per barrel. In my belief the remedy that would enable the apple crop to be marketed in a manner so as to bring to the growers the greatest return would be to introduce proper cold storage facilities nearer the points where the apples are produced. Until that is done I do not think the apple crop can be made to bring to the growers that return which it ought to bring.

Mr. BLACK. That is what we do.

Mr. D. A. GORDON. I am very glad to hear it. We all know what a benefit the cold storage system has been to the cheese industry and my suggestion is that the Minister of Agriculture should adopt similar methods in relation to the apple growing industry, and that educational stations should be established so as to teach the growers how to produce the best crop and how to market it in the best condition when it is produced. I urge this view of the case upon the Minister of Agriculture and I trust he will take steps in that direction.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I was somewhat amused at the speech of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Schell), because, while he told us in one breath that transportation had reached a high state of perfection, in the next breath he said that the facilities for transportation to Winnipeg and the west were wretched, that the freight rates were exorbitant and that the fruit was not well handled.

Mr. SCHELL. I did not say anything about the handling of the fruit; I only spoke about the question of rates.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Schell) told us that we had the best system of cold storage in the world, but if that be so, how is it that so many shipments of fruit to England last year have been reported as being in bad condition when they arrived at their destination. I think that could be minimized greatly had we better cold storage and better care of the fruit on the voyage. The hon. gentleman blamed the Ontario government for not doing as much as he thought they ought to do in this direction, but I think that with him it depends a good deal on whose ox is gored. He thought the federal government was doing everything all right but of course he thought the Ontario government was doing everything all wrong. My belief is that both governments might do more than they have done, and, while we may provide cold storage and proper transportation we must also remember that proper culture of the fruit is a most important thing. There is something needed beyond all that, and that is the proper cultivation of the ground and its proper fertilization. Compare our orchards here with those in southern California. In the latter you would not see a blade of grass growing, they are practically cultivated all the time. The cultivation of the soil is not only looked after but the increase of moisture, and all that is needed as well as spraying and other devices. My hon. friend

from Oxford (Mr. Schell) gave as an instance of what might be accomplished in the fruit line, what has been done in the manufacture and export of cheese. No doubt that is the case, but was the excellent work done in the cheese line all done by government? Not at all. It was done by the united efforts of the governments and the cheese men themselves. For years back, in the county my hon. friend represents, the cheese manufacturers have had their own men in the field lecturing and instructing, and that, combined with the work done by the government, helped to accomplish what has been attained in that business. It was owing to the united efforts of the people belonging to the cheese associations and of both the federal and local governments that the trade in that commodity was so much improved. If we desire to accomplish something similar in the fruit business, we shall have to do it largely on the same lines. Last year we exported 1,600,000 barrels of apples, which must be only a small fraction of all that we grew and that we might have exported if the prices realized paid the expense. Besides we exported 6,000,000 pounds of evaporated apples. I do not know at what price these are sold elsewhere when picked, but in my county they sold at 25 cents a hundred during last year. That was a very small price, but the apples taken to the evaporator are not of a quality which would do for barrelling. They were practically the product of the orchard not fit for other markets, and although sold at inferior prices, if you add these prices to those obtained for the good exportable apples, you have a good average. To my mind what is required is a more rigid inspection and more inspections. I agree with the hon. minister that it would be altogether too much paternalism to send inspectors into every orchard to show the people how to pack their apples. That they ought to learn themselves, and it is something which their own innate honesty ought to dictate to them. But the apples should be examined periodically to see if packed and graded according to law, and to punish those individuals who violate the law and in that way destroy the reputation of Canadian goods. We want more inspectors and we require a better system of cold storage. We want cold storage places in which to keep the apples and then have cold storage transportation both in the cars and on the steamers. We also require men at every port to look after their loading and unloading, to see that they are not exposed, to see that they are kept in proper condition, and when they reach their port of destination to see that they are taken charge of and put into cold storage again until they are sold. In addition to that, we require better freight rates. Our freight rates are entirely too high, both ocean and railway. They take away a portion of the profit which otherwise would go to the exporters and the growers of the fruit. When these things are done, we shall have better results. We also ought to make greater efforts to find out markets abroad. In that way we could do something which would enure to the benefit of our fruit growers and exporters. In addition we should have an increase in the duty upon imported fruit so as to keep a lot of foreign fruit out of the Canadian market. We are entitled to have our own markets for our own people. Should the government operate along these lines, they will be doing something which cannot fail to benefit the trade generally.

Mr. W. O. SEALEY (Wentworth). I have been much interested in the discussion we have had on the Fruit Marks Act and its administration, and I am glad to find that the department has been endorsed all along the line for the good results accruing from the Fruit Marks Act and its administration. The only complaint apparently seems to be that there are scarcely enough inspectors, and scarcely enough work done along the line of inspection, that the packers are not watched quite close enough. The very satisfactory explanation of the work of the department given by the hon. Minister of Agriculture renders it entirely unnecessary on my part to supplement it, but I shall take the liberty of drawing attention to one phase of the case which has come to my notice in the way of local observation. The packers and shippers, as a rule, so far as one can judge at home, who complain most loudly of the lack of effort on the part of the department and of the infraction of the law by others are generally the greatest sinners themselves. The large shippers are constantly complaining in order to induce the inspectors to be exceedingly hard on the smaller packers and shippers and in that way draw attention away from the quality of their own work. But so far as I can observe, the greatest infractions of the Act are committed by the packers and buyers who purchase by the orchard rather than by the barrel. When they buy by the orchard, they get the whole product, and they consider it most profitable to take everything which they can have the slightest chance of selling. Whereas when they buy by the barrel, they are far more cautious, the inspection is far more rigid, and consequently the result is much better. If I could venture to offer a word of suggestion or caution, it would be that the department should impress on its inspectors the advisability of paying rather most of their attention to those localities where the practice is to buy the orchards outright. I am not suggesting that that is not a satisfactory and simple

way of adjusting between the grower and the packer and shipper, but, so far as my observation goes, that is where the greatest mischief results. Not that the other methods are entirely satisfactory by any means, but this method is open to a great deal of abuse. I am sure that we are all pleased to have the assurance of the hon. minister that if any more inspectors be required, even though the appropriation be exhausted, he will not hesitate to appoint them, and if he does the House will have still greater confidence in him and his administration of the department, even though there be an overdraft. While the remarks and suggestions in this House have been largely with reference to the watching of the transhipping of the fruit and of the operations of the packers, I think the idea of the large packers and shippers in each locality is to get the government inspectors to do the work of inspecting the small packers and shippers from whom they buy, an expense and duty which should fall on the large packers themselves as a business transaction. While I agree with and am glad to endorse the Department of Agriculture in going to the extra expense proposed, it is just a question how far the department, in the public interest, should be encouraged to devote its energies to looking after the small packers for the benefit of the large packers and shippers.

We can all endorse most heartily the proposition to provide increased cold storage accommodation, especially in the vicinity of fruit growing centres, and I am satisfied that this matter is, as we were assured, engaging the consideration of the department and that we may anticipate a further improvement at an early date. I would again suggest that the department have their inspectors watch more closely the packers who are in the habit of buying apples on the trees and to whose interest it is to pack as many apples as they can.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FORT ERIE AND BUFFALO BRIDGE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 69) to incorporate the Fort Erie and Buffalo Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

On section 9—Union with another company.

Mr. SPROULE. The power given here is to unite with 'any other company incorporated for similar purposes, under the laws of Canada or the province of Ontario, or under the laws of the United States or the State of New York. In the case of railways, we usually compel the company to name the roads with which amalgamation is to be permitted. It prevents them negotiating with any others without coming to parliament. In this case, we give a free hand. There may be nothing in it, but I do not see why we should grant such wide powers.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). This Bill provides for a bridge only for foot passengers and vehicles, I believe. It did not come before the Railway Committee, but was dealt with by the Committee on Private Bills.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CEDAR RAPIDS MANUFACTURING AND POWER COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 94) respecting the Cedar Rapids Manufacturing & Power Company.—Mr. Boyer

On section 1—Expropriation powers—time extended.

Mr. PERLEY. It does not seem to me that we ought to pass this Bill in the shape in which it appears before us. A charter was granted to this company in 1904 as a power company in connection with the Cedar Rapids on the St. Lawrence river. They were given until this year to make use of certain expropriation powers that were given them. Now, they come back and ask us to extend these expropriation powers until 1914. Their charter gives them very large powers with regard to using the water at Cedar Rapids. If they wish to develop the water-power, they ought to do it, and should not come here to ask us to extend these rights for five years. That would mean that the development of this power might be tied up for that length of time, even though for merely speculative purposes. We ought not to grant expropriation powers extending over so many years unless the parties have shown their good faith, and have shown that they intend to go on with the work.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This matter came before me by reason of an application that the company made to have their plans approved of. It appeared that some time ago, before I became minister, there had been a partial approval of the undertaking, and the parties were of opinion that before they could actually expropriate land they would require, under the statutes, approval of the plan of their works. In view of the fact that we have an International Waterways Commission to whom all questions relating to waters which are wholly or for a part of

their course boundary waters between the United States and Canada, are usually referred, I thought it would be well to refer the matter to that commission. The matter was accordingly referred. If it had not been that I took that view, I think I should have felt it my duty, upon the report which I had from the engineers of my department, to approve of the plans, and the company could have proceeded to expropriate the property. Under these circumstances, I scarcely think it would be right to refuse to the company the extension of time. It may be, the time asked for is too long. It does seem to me that it is unreasonably long; but I think they might fairly be given a reasonable extension. I was informed, and I have no doubt it is the case, that the company already owns a very considerable part of the land rights necessary for the development of the water-power at the place where they propose to develop it, but that they desire to exercise their rights of expropriation in regard to additional property. Parliament having granted them the power by their Act of Incorporation, and there having been delay because of the reference by me to the International Waterways Commission, and and as their time expires early in the coming summer, so that it would have been difficult for them to exercise their powers of expropriation in the meantime, it does seem to me rather reasonable that an extension should be given.

Mr. PERLEY. Have they shown any evidence of ability to build the works necessary for this power? It is very easy for people to get plans,—it costs very little to do that, and then endeavour to get somebody to buy the rights they have.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The people who are interested in the property that is to be developed, and whose names I do not now recall, but who are very respectable people, gave me very positive assurances that they were ready to go ahead and were most anxious to have their plans approved, but I thought it was only courteous to the government of the United States that the plans should be submitted to the Waterways Commission. If I had not taken that ground I do not imagine that they would have been here asking for an extension of time. It seems to me though that the time asked for is longer than they need. If it were shortened by two years I should think it would be ample.

Mr. A. HAGGART. Does this give the promoters of this Bill anything in the nature of a blanket to the exclusion of others who might develop the property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would as to that particular property.

Mr. PERLEY. Does not the minister think it is time we stopped granting these charters giving rights to water-powers when we know that every day these water-powers are growing in value? They are one of the great assets of this country. The question came up not long ago in the House with reference to a western charter. Before long we will use these water-powers in place of coal, or at any rate, for heating purposes. Is it not time that we stopped granting these charters to private individuals which give them the practical ownership of large water-powers which at the present time are no doubt largely vested in the Dominion? The persons to whom we give these powers very likely do not propose to develop them at all, but they have sense enough to see that before long they will become of great value.

Mr. PARDEE. The company have already acquired, without expropriation, nearly all the land necessary and the only portions that are outstanding of the land required are portions which are owned by non-residents. These non-residents are holding out for an excessive price for the lands which are proposed to be purchased. It will be seen, therefore, that the company have done something to cary out the objects for which they are incorporated.

Mr. PERLEY. I would like to ask the hon. member who has this Bill in charge whether he knows that himself?

Mr. PARDEE. I only know that it was stated before the committee and I have a letter from the person who is acting as the advocate of the company in which he says that that is really the state of affairs at the present time. Of course, I could not say it from my own knowledge.

Mr. MADDIN. I do not think that what my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) is contending against is so much the right to expropriate lands as the right to hold these waterways for a period of five years. In view of the fact that the government has taken steps at this session to preserve our natural resources, and has added to the standing committees of the House three committees having that object in view, I think it would not be a bad idea to submit this Bill to the committee on waterways and forestry to say whether, in their opinion, it is wise to allow a company to blanket a water-power for five years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems to me that it would be scarcely fair to this company to do that. Parliament has already given it this charter and has clothed it with the power of developing this water-power and acquiring lands. In pursuance of that authority they have gone ahead, and they have, as I was informed, acquired practically all the land which is necessary for

the development of these powers. We ought to treat this company just as we treat other companies. We scarcely ever refuse to give a reasonable extension of time, parliament having once granted the charter. With regard to the question raised by my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), I think it is one of a great deal of importance. I think it is a question that is worthy of a good deal of consideration as to whether steps should not be taken for the public control of the various water-powers, particularly the valuable water-powers of the country, but before we should refuse to private individuals the opportunity of developing these powers and rendering them available to industrial purposes which, of course, is a matter of very great public advantage, the government ought to be prepared to undertake the responsibility of their development. My hon. friend will see that if we were to refuse to private companies the authority to develop power without the government being prepared to move forward the result would be to prevent any development at all. We have granted a great many charters to private companies and it seems to me it would not be reasonable to stay our hand just at the present time whatever may be decided upon in future. Having once granted a charter to this company it seems to me that it would be only reasonable that parliament should grant an extension. But I would suggest to the promoter of the Bill, if he is present, that the time be made 1912 instead of 1914. I think that would be ample time to enable this company to exercise all the powers which they might reasonably exercise under the charter in so far as the expropriation of land is concerned.

Mr. PERLEY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who is in charge of this Bill whether there was any opposition to it in the committee?

Mr. PARDEE. An hon. gentleman who was present tells me there was no opposition at all.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says that they got this power from parliament and that they should not now be refused an extension of it. They got their charter but they allowed it to lapse. They acquired it when there was very little attention directed to the water-powers of the country, but since then, the necessity has become more apparent of having some supervision over these very valuable assets belonging to the provinces, in most cases, although, I presume, in this case, this being on the St. Lawrence river, it would probably come under federal authority. But, I think that the provinces should have control over these water-powers. It seems to me that these properties belong to the provinces; therefore, I should think the provinces would have the right if they saw fit to lease them. I do not believe they should be given away for nothing. It is a mistake and is not good business. They should be leased so that they would yield a very considerable revenue, as time went on, to the province. The province of Ontario, at least, is considering the question of how far to go in taking charge of the water-powers which belong to the province and this, together with the interest which has developed lately in the federal parliament in regard to the question, as well as the public attention which has been directed to it, should cause us to be much more cautious now in dealing with the question than we have been hitherto. Since this charter has run out and they have done nothing, I do not think it would be any very great hardship if we allowed it to die and allowed the property to revert to the province or to the Dominion as the case may be.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is in error as to the charter running out. If it had run out there might be some force in what he has said, but the charter has not run out. They came here some time ago asking for the approval of their plans, and they had still quite a number of months within which to exercise the rights contained in the charter. The charter will not expire until some time in June next.

Mr. SPROULE. This is the last session and it is practically an expiration of the charter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If I had approved of the plan when they came to me, they would have had ample time to expropriate the land before the charter expired. But I thought it proper, as a courtesy to the government of the United States, to refer the whole matter to the International Waterways Commission. What they feel is that there will not be a report from the commission in time to enable them to expropriate the land before the charter expires, and that is why they come here. But I think the extension they ask for is too long, I think it should be made not longer than 1911 or 1912.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister seems to have only one anxiety, that is, to give them a renewal so that they may expropriate the land. What strikes me is that we are giving them forever, practically, control over the water-power, and if we did not renew the charter at this session of parliament it would die. Since they have kept, practically, the whole limit of the time without taking advantage of it, except doing some preliminary work, I do not think it would be any great hardship, in view of the fact that we are on the eve of starting a new policy with regard to these waterways, if we kept the waterway in the hands of the authorities that own it.

Mr. PERLEY. I raised this question merely on general principles. I have nothing to say against this particular project, I do not know who the gentlemen are that are interested in it. But I agree with what the minister has said. We want to get our powers developed as fast as we can; if the government do not do it, we must find some private corporations to do it. But we ought to consider carefully whether, in the future, we ought not to insist that before we grant any such charters, some evidence of good faith should be given, and some evidence of the ability of the parties to put the work through. We ought to take the stand that no charters of this kind should be granted giving valuable water-powers, when the promoters wish to get them simply for the purposes of speculation, because we all know that these water-powers are going to be of immense value. However, in this case there seems to be no opposition to the Bill in committee, and I think we might agree with the minister's suggestion that the date to which the expropriation powers are extended should be changed from 1914 to 1911. That would give them ample time. If they really mean business, two years are lots of time for them to do all they want to do.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I move in amendment, in section 1, line 4, to strike out the word '1914' and substitute therefore the word '1911.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid the motion cannot be accepted without notice, and so far as I know there has been no notice. In the case of a private Bill in Committee of the Whole, there must be notice of any amendment of any serious importance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Might it not be done by unanimous consent?

Mr. SPROULE. If not, then move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would prefer that the committee rise, rather than make a precedent by which possibly I should find myself bound.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I give notice then that I will move this amendment at the next meeting of the committee.

Progress reported.

THE CANADIAN NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 75) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

On section 1,

Mr. GRAHAM. There was a question raised in the committee with respect to this Bill. And the Railway Committee was unanimous, that the only possible way to deal with the Bill along the line suggested by that committee was to report the fact to the House and let the Committee of the Whole House deal with it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The proper course would be the one indicated in the previous Bill, and that is that the committee should report the Bill to the House and the House should deal with the change on the ordinary procedure.

Mr. SPROULE. Was this amendment made in the Railway Committee?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was unanimously adopted by the Railway Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. That covers it all. The Railway Committee recommended the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Railway Committee was unanimous. but they thought they could not take that course without reporting to the House. If the Committee of the Whole House approve of the change and was unanimous, but they thought they would be perfectly in order.

Mr. PERLEY. What section?

Mr. GRAHAM. Subsection E.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. For the particular understanding of the situation I think I should read what appears in the the report of the Railway Committee.

In accordance with the requirements of rule 105, your committee call the attention of the House to an amendment which they have inserted in the last mentioned Bill authorizing the Canadian Northern Railway Company to construct a line of railway from a point on its constructed line at or near Sudbury, southwesterly to a point at or near Little Current, as such provision does not appear to have been contemplated in the notice or petition for the Bill as reported upon by the examiner of petitions for private Bills.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it a question whether proper notice was given?

Mr. GRAHAM. No notice was given.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no objection to the Bill going through. I was not in the Railway Committee and do not know what was said there, but I do not think we should exercise some extraordinary powers here to-night with respect to a case where there is no notice, if our action is to be cited as a precedent on some other Bill. That is all the objection I have. If it be distinctly understood that it should not be quoted as an authority hereafter, I have no objection.

Mr. FIELDING. How can my hon. friend bind all the members not to quote it?

Mr. GRAHAM. This course would not be taken were it not that some of the older members on the Railway Committee said it was perfectly legitimate and had often

been taken. If the committee thinks proper, we can refer the Bill to the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. What advantage would that be when we already know there was no notice. The only proper thing would be to cut out the clause of which there was no notice, because otherwise we shall be establishing a bad precedent which undoubtedly will be quoted in the future.

Mr. PARDEE. Rather than have the clause cut out we would hold the Bill over and give the notice.

Mr. GRAHAM. Possibly it is just as well to let the clause stand in order that we may see if it has not been the practice of the House to take this course in cases where the Railway Committee have been unanimous. We can look into it a little further at the next meeting of the committee.

Progress reported.

THE CANADA LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

On the order:

House in committee on Bill (No. 56) respecting the Canada Life Insurance Company.

Mr. FIELDING. That Bill should stand. The committee have reported that the notice is insufficient, and I understand the promoters contemplate giving the necessary notice. At all events the Bill cannot be proceeded with at present.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will it be proceeded with on Monday?

Mr. FIELDING. The Bill should stand until the promoters have given such substantial notice as will satisfy the House.

Progress reported.

THE KOOTENAY AND ARROWHEAD RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 80) respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—Mr. George Taylor.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. On section 1.

Mr. GOODEVE. I propose to move the amendment of which I have given notice:

The Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company shall within two years after the passing of this Act construct fifteen per cent of the mileage of the unconstructed portion of the railways which it was authorized by section 7, of chapter 70, of the statutes of 1901, to construct and shall complete said railways and put them in operation within five years, and if the said fifteen per cent of mileage is not so constructed, and if the said railways are not so completed and put in operation within the said periods respectively, the powers of construction conferred upon the said company by parliament shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said railways as then remains uncompleted.

The day on which this Bill was considered before the Railway Committee there was at the same hour a meeting of the Banking and Commerce Committee which was dealing with the Insurance Bill, and a meeting of the Standing Orders Committee which was dealing with the Canada Life Bill, and as a large number of the members were present at these other important committees there were few at the Railway Committee and my amendment was defeated by the very narrow majority of only two votes. Hence I consider I am amply justified in asking the House to now reconsider this Bill. Then again, by an amendment passed in the Railway Committee they were granted five years to build the railway from Lardo via Duncan up to Arrowhead, which is really the uncompleted portion of the original charter, and by that amendment they say to the House that they are commencing to construct a short line of railway which will be a connecting link between two portions of the railway already connected. There is the further reason in support of my amendment that in 1906 they obtained from parliament an extension of three years for the construction of this portion of the railway, and in that three years they have done absolutely nothing. There is the further reason, that in addition to the privilege of bonding the road for $25,000 a mile there was granted a large cash subsidy per mile which has been paid over to them for that portion of the railway which has already been built. There is a still more important reason and it is that when this charter was first asked for in 1901, there was an influx of prospectors and capitalists into that district in the Kootenay country in anticipation of the road being immediately constructed. This is a very mountainous district having a large number of very beautiful lakes, and minerals being discovered there the prospectors felt that the word of a great corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway could be relied upon, and so they brought in a large amount of machinery at great cost to develop these mines, only to find that they had been deceived and that the railway would not be built. In addition to that a large number of agricultural settlers have gone into that district on the same understanding and these men have been there for nine years deprived of the fruits of their capital and their labour. I would call the attention of the House further to the fact that there appears in the daily press an article in large type, said to be authorized from headquarters, stating that the company were about to rush this railroad to completion, and with the permission of the committee I shall read that article:

We have news from a reliable source that one of the objects of the Canadian Pacific Railway in stopping work on the Kootenay Central is to rush the construction of the Arrowhead and Kootenay Railway, connecting Revelstoke with the Crow's Nest road, and making Revelstoke the most important railway junction in the province of British Columbia. It is stated the Canadian Pacific Railway now recognize this road must be built without delay if the road is to be in a position to handle the big grain business which is now being developed between the western prairies and the Pacific coast.

There is something very sinister in this article with reference to the reason why the Canadian Pacific Railway did not build the Kootenay Central. Let me say that just a few weeks ago we had before the Railway Committee a Bill applying for an extension of time for the completion of the Kootenay Central Railway and I objected to the extension being granted without a provision being inserted that the road should be commenced within a certain time. Would you believe it, sir, that at that time the Canadian Pacific Railway actually put men to work and announced in the press of the district that they were about to rush the Kootenay road to completion, but just as soon as the Bill passed the House without any provision of the kind I wanted there was a telegram sent out there and the men who were working on the road were withdrawn. In this very same press which announced that the Kootenay Central Railroad would be constructed, we find the statement now made that the reason for the withdrawal of theses men was that th Canadian Pacific Railway Company were about to construct the Arrowhead and Kootenay railroad. We are peculiarly situated in this part of British Columbia in that the railroads have to follow the easiest lines to get through the great mountain ranges and make connection with the outside world, and although these pieces of road are short in themselves it is necessary that they should be constructed in order to develop that part of the province. The amendment which I offer is a fair and reasonable one, inasmuch as it simply asks that they shall construct only 15 per cent of the total mileage covered by this charter, and no doubt some of the members of the committee will be surprised to learn that 15 per cent amounts to only six or seven miles. That does not seem much of an enterprise for a great corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway to undertake in view of the fact that in their notices in the daily papers and in this very Bill itself they say they will commence the construction of this railroad within two years, and complete and put it in operation within five years. When the Bill was before the Railway Committee the Minister of Railways very justly told us that he had received resolutions from boards of trade urging him to make provision that the company should construct this line immediately. There has been discussion in the Railway Committee over the formation of some definite scheme to compel companies applying for charters to demonstrate their bona fides by constructing within a reasonable time the railways covered by the charters they ask for, and to my mind there is no simpler way of meeting the difficulty than to provide that a small percentage of the total mileage shall be constructed within a specified time. Surely there can be no hardship in the amendment I offer when it allows this company two years to construct 15 per cent of a road which they themselves declare they will have completed and running in five years. My amendment should appeal to the sense of fairness and justness of every man in this committee. It is not very much of a penalty, indeed it is no penalty at all to ask this company to show their bona fides by constructing within two years 15 per cent of the mileage included in the charter. If I had a map I could show the committee that this line runs from Lardo to Arrowhead. The Arrowhead branch has already been constructed under another charter and runs from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Revelstoke to a point on the Arrow lakes, a portion of the Columbia river. By completing this small link of 40 miles they will have a line giving access to that rich tract of country, opening up mines and agricultural lands. The settlers who have gone in there and the capitalists who have invested money there will be enabled to reap some reward for their labour and investment. I appeal to the committee for support of this amendment as a business proposition.

Mr. MILLER. How many miles will the 15 per cent make?

Mr. GOODEVE. Between six and seven. I understood from Mr. Thompson, representing the Canadian Pacific Railway, that there were 40 miles to construct, so the 15 per cent would make about that distance.

Mr. MILLER. What particular benefit would it be to the people there to have these six miles constructed?

Mr. GOODEVE. It would be an absolute guarantee that the company would complete the 40 miles from the head of one lake to the foot of the other. The amendment would be no hardship on the company as they say they will complete the entire 40 miles within this five years.

Mr. PARDEE. How many miles of the road is built now?

Mr. GOODEVE. About 33 miles from the head of the lake up to Larder. As a

result of the building of that road they have erected an immense sawmill at the foot of that lake and are doing an enormous trade. The road is paying well and the mill employs some 200 men. That suggests another and a reasonable argument for the construction of the road; the border of the lake is surrounded by some of the finest timber in Canada and there would be other sawmills as well as the one to which I have referred.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the subsidy from the Ontario government to the Lake Superior Branch of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.—Mr. Turriff.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

To provide 100-ton track scale at Aston junction, $2,500.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). There has never been a scale at this point. Hon. gentlemen have seen some discussions on weights of lumber and it was decided to install this scale.

Mr. BARKER. Does the minister think it proper to charge a scale of this kind to capital account on a road that has been running for 50 years? It seems extraordinary that you cannot get a new chair for an office on the Intercolonial Railway without charging it to capital account. This practice I think is contrary to the rule upon railways and should be stopped.

Mr. GRAHAM. Absolutely the same thing is done on other railways, it is an addition, it is not even a renewal.

Mr. BARKER. You might charge to capital account a new handle on a door. It is one of the ordinary articles required on a railway. No company ever thinks of charging any of these things to capital. It is a monstrous thing, and would not be thought of in any institution except one that is trying to produce a political effect by showing a surplus.

Mr. FIELDING. The amount involved does not affect the principle. The question is not whether the amount is large or small but whether an amount of this kind is a proper charge to capital. If it is a betterment of the road, it is a legitimate capital charge.

Mr. BARKER. The principle is well understood, that every institution of this kind should endeavour, as far as possible, to close its capital account. The principle is not, as the hon. minister seems to think, to charge every new thing to capital. When a railway is fairly on its feet, fairly in operation—I wont say after it has been running for fifty years, but after it has been running for ten years—it is never thought right to charge every little thing of this kind—a $2,500 scale—to capital. There would be no end of it. On that principle, if you put a new wheelbarrow on the platform at a station, you would charge the amount to capital.

Mr. FIELDING. And that would be perfectly right. If you have an addition to the stock of the railway, anything that adds to the permanent value of the property it is a proper charge to capital. From the hon. member's (Mr. Barker) large knowledge of railway affairs, I am sure that he will see, on consideration, that this is a matter of principle, not a matter of amount, and that his contention is not well founded.

Mr. BARKER. I have given the thing consideration, and I speak of my own knowledge when I say that large concerns of this kind that are fairly in operation, going concerns, when they want some little thing for the service—a few more trucks around the station or anything of that kind costing a few thousand dollars—never think of charging the amount to capital. What would be the result if they did? Take a concern like the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, which, perhaps, has no capital account; they could not provide these things that are necessary. These concerns spend thousands and thousands in this way, and the amounts are charged up to maintenance or revenue. It is not necessarily maintenance in a going concern, such expenditures are a proper charge to revenue. I venture to say I can produce to this committee—not at the moment, of course—quotations from authorities on railway operations to establish what I say.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. member will look at the Intercolonial accounts, he will find many expenditures of a similar character charged to capital. And, if they be betterments, I do not think the point admits of any doubt. Sometimes there may be a question as to whether the amount represents a betterment or not. Where a renewal is charged to capital, of course, that is open to criticism. But, if you add a mile to your road, a new station, or anything that will make the property more valuable than before, that is, I submit, a legitimate charge to capital. Of course, no company would want to open a capital account for these trifling things, but if it had an open capital account, these items would be properly chargeable to it.

Mr. BARKER. That is just the point. An ordinary railway has no open capital account, and no company should have an open capital account that has used its capital in establishing a railway system; it

should make the business bear itself and carry itself along. Of course, if they are going to add a new branch, that is a different thing, but to say that every petty appliance, or every petty accommodation along fifteen hundred miles of railway makes it necessary to keep an open capital account is wholly unreasonable; it would never be thought of. If a company were converting their whole bridge system from wood to steel, or replacing a sixty pound rail with an eighty pound rail, they would charge the difference to capital. But hon. gentlemen opposite a few years ago, charged the whole eighty pounds to capital.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. BARKER. Yes, they charged the whole eighty pounds to capital, and credited the concern with the scrap rails.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not what the hon. member said a moment ago.

Mr. BARKER. They threw the old rails in the scrap and credited them. That is not the principle on which the accounts should be run.

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot see the difference, as a matter of principle, between an additional rail to the road and an additional scale to the road. The mere fact that the amount is small does not alter the principle. As I have said no company would open an account for these small amounts, but, when there is an open account, you must choose whether you will charge the amount to one account or to the other. In this case, which account should be chosen? Surely, capital account, for this is clearly a betterment. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) says there should be no open capital account. Well, we have to differ from him on that point. The hon. gentleman asks what would a railway company do in this case? The Canadian Pacific Railway, for instance, have regularly charged to capital items that the hon. gentleman says, in the case of the Intercolonial, should not be charged to capital.

Mr. BARKER. I do not think the hon. minister can find a single instance of that kind. Say, after ten years, the Canadian Pacific Railway comes here to get authority to issue new capital, does the hon. gentleman suppose that, in the meantime, they have not been buying trucks and other things necessary for the road?

Mr. GRAHAM. And they are adding to capital account every year.

Mr. BARKER. When an extremely large expenditure is to be made, one that would put the companies into difficulties, it will be made with a capital expenditure. But this is like a manufacturing establishment putting in a glass window in its office and charging it to capital.

Mr. FIELDING. If it was an original window, it certainly should be charged to capital. Or, even if there was a window, and the company improved its property by putting in a plate-glass front, it ought to charge it to capital.

Mr. BARKER. No manufacturing company in the country would think of keeping open a capital account for such charges—taking down an old front door and putting in a new one.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a renewal.

Mr. BARKER. In precisely the same way, an old railway company takes it for granted that, in the carrying on of its business, there are many articles that are to be added new and that they will buy, but they never think of keeping such things in a capital account. And the sooner this railway gets down to that principle, the sooner we shall be able to compare earnings or losses upon this road with the earnings or losses on privately-owned railways.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) does not see the difference between adding a rail or a scale. The road cannot run without rails, but it can run without scales.

Mr. FIELDING. No, it must weigh its freight.

Mr. SPROULE. It can use the scales it already has in other places. It may be a convenience for the traffic at this particular place to have a new scale, but the work was done without it before. A scale I would not regard as a betterment of the road at all, but merely an improvement for the handling of freight. The additions to the roadbed, stations, and so on, I take it would be betterments of the road, but I do not think that an added scale here or there should be regarded as a betterment of the road.

To provide siding for passenger cars at Gibson, $4,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this the whole cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. The work is done by ourselves.

Prince Edward Island Railway—extension to wharf at Souris—further amount required, $23,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the Souris wharf for which a contract was let in 1907, and there is a balance of $23,000 due on it. The entire cost will be about $71,000.

Mr. FRASER. Would the minister say if this work has been let by tender, and if so, who were the tenderers, and what were the amounts?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contract was let on a lump sum and schedule. The tenderers were Hugh Macdonald, of North Sydney, $71,000, and E. A. Walberg, $55,830, but under the schedule it amounts to $71,000. But the entire amount, with the schedule added, was less than the next tender.

Mr. FRASER. This work, then, was let to E. A. Walberg at $55,000?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, it was a lump sum with the schedule prices. That is an approximate amount.

Mr. FRASER. Can the minister tell us exactly what the work did cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. The final estimate has not come in, but it is about $71,000, perhaps a few dollars under that.

Mr. PERLEY. What is the original estimate of the cost of this wharf?

Mr. GRAHAM. Our own engineer estimated it at $75,000. The work is now finished.

Mr. FRASER. Is the department aware that the concrete work of this wharf has cracked during the last five or six months, and that the wharf is practically useless for any purpose at the present time, and was useless during navigation last fall.

Mr. GRAHAM. Some little time ago the crack my hon. friend refers to was caused by a vessel striking the pier. It is not at all serious.

Mr. FRASER. Is the department aware that this wharf is not fit to be used in its present condition, and was not last fall.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is not the report we have from our engineers. The chief engineer himself visited the wharf last summer, and says it is in good shape.

Mr. FRASER. I am speaking of the crack and the condition the wharf was in at the close of navigation. When the wharf was said to be finished, it was left very much unfinished. The top of the wharf is not finished, it will require two feet of clay or earth to make it fit for teams. The crack was here last fall, and the wharf was practically useless for shipping purposes at the close of navigation, and for some time previous.

Mr. GRAHAM. Putting a little earth on top is not part of the contract at all. It is a matter of opinion as to the wharf not being useful, my hon. friend is the first who has raised that. Of course, he understands that it is not part of the contract.

Mr. PERLEY. If there is something that is not in the contract, we want to know what the completed wharf will cost.

Mr. GRAHAM. The wharf has been used, it is a question perhaps of putting some gravel on it, or something of that kind.

Mr. FRASER. Is it the intention of the department to leave the wharf in the condition it was in last fall?

Mr. GRAHAM. We will ask our engineer to give us a report after seeing what my hon. friend says, and if there is anything else to be done, we will do it.

Montague branch—land claims, $6,851.51.

Mr. GRAHAM. This claim and the Murray Harbour branch land claim, and the Vernon River branch land claim, are Exchequer Court judgments. This Montague branch is a small branch six miles long which was opened in 1906. There were certain land claims taken to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. FRASER. How long have these judgments been standing against the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. Since April and May of last year.

Lachine canal—further amount required to rebuild slope walls, $78,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This matter was thoroughly gone into on our main estimates for the canal, and there is in the main estimates already passed an amount to finish this work. That contract was let some years ago for rebuilding these slope walls with concrete, making them practically new walls. After the Cornwall accident last summer our engineer made a thorough examination of these walls, and I asked him to rush the work, because I became alarmed that there might be some other accidents to our canals.

Rideau canal—improvements, $16,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This amount is to cover the following expenditure which was rendered necessary by damage caused by ice and water during the spring freshets in April last:

To partially rebuild the retaining dam at Black Rapids lock station.. ..	$12,500
To repair the bulkhead at Manotick.	1,500
To rebuild the apron below the waste weir at Edmond's lock station.. ..	500
To repair the submerged portion of the bulkhead at the head of Newboro' cut..	500
To repair the embankments at Burritt's Rapids and Kingston Mills lock stations..	1,000
Total..	$16,000

Carillon and Grenville canals—repairs to gap in Carillon dam—further amount required, $25,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Those who were here the other evening probably will remember my explanation that I would take $25,000 out of the main estimates and make the amount in the main estimates $15,000, explaining to the committee that I would put $25,000 in these supplementary estimates because I could use it this year, we having advanced that much with this work.

Railways and canals—income—miscellaneous—to provide for expenses preparing plans for the reconstruction of the Quebec bridge—further amount required, $10,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. We had $25,000 voted last year. This is intended for the work of the board.

Mr. BARKER. Who are preparing these plans? Have you a staff of experts preparing them?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Board of Engineers, Messrs. Vautelet, Modjeska and Maurice FitzMaurice, and they employ their own staff. We do not even make a recommendation to their staff. I want to let them accept the full responsibility. They have asked us for $10,500 more than they have expended this year up to date.

Intercolonial Railway expenses — further amount required, $500,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This estimate was made some time ago. We have got to a period at which we can reduce that by $150,000.

Mr. BARKER. This is for working expenses?

Mr. GRAHAM. Working expenses. There will be a considerable discussion no doubt on the main estimates on the item for working expenses. This will make the item $350,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. How did you underestimate so much last year for working expenses? Was that due to the election?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, that was the estimate they gave me. But we had a supplementary vote last year to make the amount up to $9,000,000. They underestimated the year before about $1,500,000.

Windsor Branch Railway—maintenance—further amount required, $7,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are relaying the Windsor branch with a heavier rail out of revenue account.

Mr. SPROULE. What weight of rail are you putting down there?

Mr. GRAHAM. It has been a 56-pound rail and we are replacing it with 67-pound rails that we have at the present time.

Mr. BLAIN. Where are the rails manufactured that are put down on the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. They are all manufactured in Canada, either at Sydney or the Soo.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the price now?

Mr. GRAHAM. $32.50.

Militia and defence—chargeable to income—pay and allowances—further amount required, $170,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). This is simply a readjustment of the vote. We are not increasing the vote of the current year a single dollar, but some votes were larger than were required and others were smaller. It is proposed to take these votes, amounting altogether to $300,000, and not to use certain votes which I will read which were voted for the current year and are not required.

Engineers' services.	$ 90,000
Militia stores..	65,000
Dominion arsenal..	60,000
Customs dues..	85,000
Total..	$300,000

This vote is required for the permanent force.

Mr. CROSBY. What has been done with regard to the money which is now due to the men at Halifax? Has any arrangement been made by which they will get paid within a short time?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The moment this vote passes the House, I understand from the Minister of Finance, the Auditor General will be ready to issue a cheque.

Mr. CROSBY. They will be able to get their money to-morrow if we pass it to-night?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. Then I will be very glad to see it passed.

Annual drill — further amount required, $105,000.

Mr. ROCHE. I would like to ask the minister if the annual training school for students in the city of Winnipeg has been held at the usual time this spring?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not absolutely certain, but I think it has. At any rate if it has not it will be held now.

Mr. ROCHE. I understood when I was home that the school had not been held at the usual time, but that it had been postponed until April or thereabouts.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is possible.

Mr. ROCHE. There was a great deal of dissatisfaction among the young men who reside in the country and who will be busy

with their farming operations at that time of the year. They will be debarred from attending the school by reason of the postponement.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I hope that will not be the case, but when this vote has been taken the school will be called at once.

Transport — further amount required, $12,500.

Mr. DANIEL. What transport is this—material or persons?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is the ordinary transport connected with the camps and schools.

Royal military college—further amount required, $12,500.

Mr. BARKER. Why is there more money required for the Military College?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is not a vacant place in the college and one or two instructors have had to be added.

Post Office Department, $240,000.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). This is required to meet the expenditure for rural mail delivery, the opening of new post offices and new postal routes, particularly in the western provinces, and the increased frequency of existing services on existing routes.

Mr. BARKER. How much for each of these services?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Between $80,000 and $85,000 is estimated for rural mail delivery; the balance is for the other purposes. Demands are pouring in every day for the opening of new post offices, particularly in the western provinces, which affords an excellent barometer of the progress of the west.

Mr. CROSBY. Is the Postmaster General providing for additional accommodation in the Dartmouth post office where it is so badly needed?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) called my attention to this matter yesterday and pointed out that the Dartmouth office is quite too small for the business done there. This morning I asked the deputy minister to get a report from our inspector at Halifax and I will try to convince my colleagues that something should be done this year.

Mr. BLAIN. I would remind the Postmaster General that there is a request before his department for the opening of a post office at Mount Pleasant in Peel county. I would also ask the hon. gentleman to have his inspector examine into the mail routes in that county. These routes were established a great many years ago; since that time some new railways have been constructed necessitating a rearrangement of the mail service, to which I think with benefit to the public the other mail routes might be made to conform. The committee will be surprised to know that in some parts of that old county of Peel the people have not yet a daily mail service. It would be in the public interest if the Postmaster General would have his inspector make an adjustment of the mail routes, and while it would not increase the general expenditure much it would be a great convenience to the people.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) has already written to me on the subject, and I will certainly ask the inspector to make a report.

Mr. SEXSMITH. In October last there was considerable talk about the erection of a new post office in the village of Lakefield where the postal accommodation is very inadequate, but I fail to see any appropriation in the estimates for that building although the Postmaster General is providing post office buildings in many places with not half the population of Lakefield. I trust that in the near future he will erect a post office there.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The erection of a post office comes under the Department of Public Works, but of course on the recommendation of the postal authorities. I will make a note of the request of my hon. friend.

Mr. BURRELL. I wish to direct the attention of the Postmaster General to the mail contract up the Cariboo road in British Columbia.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is that the old trail?

Mr. BURRELL. Yes. In reply to questions which I asked in the House I was informed that the present contractors receive $24,750 per year and that the contract had not been let by tender since 1897. This is probably the most important mail contract in the west.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the mileage?

Mr. BURRELL. The mileage with the side routes must be 400 or 500 miles. In 1862 or 1863 the first contract was let going up to Barkerville, about 280 miles north of the main line at Ashcroft. This is the country built up by the great mining rush in 1858 and 1859. From 1862 until 1896, this very important mail contract had always been let by open tender and for periods of four years. Prior to 1896, from Ashcroft to Lillooet, which is a separate line, about 36 miles, was let with the same contract; but as the country got developed, the policy was adopted—I think a wise policy—of letting these 36 miles by four year contracts separately and letting them direct by the government. In 1897 this big

contract of $24,750 was let to an eastern firm and since that time, probably the minister hardly realizes the fact that there have been absolutely no calls for tenders at all, and in addition the branch lines, of which there are quite a number, have not been let separately, as they should have been, by four years contract, but were merged in this main contract. There are four of these branch lines—one from Clinton via Big Bar and Dog Creek to Alkali lake, 112 miles and return; another one from the 150 mile house to Harper's camp; another one from the 150 mile house to Quesnel Forks; another to Alexis creek, Chilcotin. I want to speak of what I regard as an evil, and that is having these side lines merged in the main contract. The past practice has been for the company which has the main contract to sublet these lines by yearly contract. Take No. 4 from the 150 mile house to Alexis creek as an example; this line is 172 miles return trip, and it takes the contractor five days to do it. That contract has been sublet for $1,100. The passengers and express matter are so small that they add very little to the contractor's profits, and we think it rather absurd that a man, only equipped with four horses, should be doing 172 miles round trip in a country such as that Cariboo district. It is practically impossible, under the circumstances, for him to give a satisfactory service. It is bad enough in ordinary times, but in bad roads and bad weather it is impossible. The question may be put, why did this man take the contract at so small a sum? The answer he gave to this question was that he had learned his lesson and would never do it again. Next year of course, the company will again let out that contract at as small a figure as they can.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the starting point of the main contract?

Mr. BURRELL. From Ashcroft. The letting of these side contracts is on an entirely wrong principle. They should not be sublet by the year. The result of this practice is that a number of people will tender who do not realize that they are tendering at absurdly low figures, and they get stuck and lose money, and at the end of the year they throw up the contract. In the meantime the public is badly served and there is profound dissatisfaction through the country. The proper practice would be that which was always pursued prior to 1896, namely, to let each of the side contracts directly by the department for four years after calling for tenders. The contractor has then time to equip himself in good shape for doing the work and will give better satisfaction. I wish now to say a word about the mail contractors. I am not putting it too strongly when I say there is throughout the whole of that country very strong resentment regarding the methods followed. I am not saying whether this company is getting too much or too little; but I would point out that a large and important company of that kind, with ramifications of one kind or another, can exert a very strong political influence, and very naturally will exert it on behalf of this government which gives it this $24,000 per year contract without any call for tenders. The district of Cariboo is really worse off to-day than in former days because this company while having a monopoly, though not perhaps giving a worse service than the people formerly had, is charging higher fares. Formerly return fares were given at reduced rates but there are none such to-day. If that contract were thrown open to tender, there should be some fixed rate of fares in the public interest because the only possible way the people have of transportation over that 280 miles is by this means. I remember that when this matter was up before, the minister said that the policy of his department was to let all the contracts by tender, but no public tender has ever been invited for this important work since early in 1897. And a peculiar thing is that it is a Toronto firm which has the contract. What would my hon. friends from Ontario think if there was a contract north of Toronto for a 280 mile mail route to be let and if that contract had been let by tender 12 years ago to a British Columbia firm, and instead of new tenders being invited every four years, that contract were renewed from year to year without tenders and without any opportunity being given any Ontario firm to bid for it? I am sure the minister will see that the Toronto people would, under the circumstances, feel that they had a very strong grievance. The contract was renewed early last summer. I do not know whether it is possible to cancel that contract, but at all events I hope that when the time comes to renew it, the minister will see his way clear to deal with it in that spirit in which he promised to deal with all those matters and throw it open to public competition. I am expressing the opinion, not only of my own friends, but of the minister's all through that country, when I say that he would give profound satisfaction to the people of that part of British Columbia,—a part which is not served by railways—if he would throw open that important contract to public tender and also adopt the policy of letting all those side lines directly by four years' contracts in the same manner.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman has made what I call a very fair criticism of this contract. In 1897 my predecessor, Sir

William Mulock, advertised for tenders and this company, the British Columbia Express Company, which is a Toronto firm, were the lowest tenderers and the department awarded the contract to them. This is a peculiar section of the country and the contractors have to make quite an outlay in order to cover that immense territory. It is a very difficult country to travel over. The contract has been renewed twice since 1897, because this is a four year contract. The last time it was renewed, I think on representations made to the postal authorities at Ottawa—for I do not know enough of the country to decide such a contract myself—that if we advertised for tenders we would receive tenders but not from any one who would be in a position to cover that immense territory as well as the present contractors do it. I must say that we have not received any complaint as to the manner in which the contract is carried out. The government decided to renew the contract with this firm. However the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrell) comes from that section of the country and the grievance which he ventilates is in reference not to the main contract but to the side lines which are sublet by the British Columbia Express Company. His representations have been noted and I will see that the company carries out the contract, not only according to the letter but in the spirit in which it was given. I think my hon. friend will agree that this company gives a very good service. The proper way, I know, is to call for tenders, the law is clear on that; but the law also says that when a contract has been faithfully carried out the Postmaster General is at liberty to renew it at the same figure. I cannot increase the amount involved in a contrcat, but I can renew a contract at the same figure, provided the public interest is safeguarded. I can give a similar instance in the Yukon. We have two large contracts there, one with the railway company. Of course we have always renewed the contract with the railway company, and we are practically at their mercy. They are equipped with mail cars and are in a position to carry the mails over their railway to the best advantage; but the mail has to be carried part way to Dawson city by the lakes and the river. We have tried to cut the contract in two, calling for tenders for the lake and river section and allowing the railway the usual mileage allowance, but we cannot succeed because the railway company is the only one sufficiently equipped for the carrying out of the balance of the contract; so, although the amount is large, it has to be paid, and we make no profit out of that district. That is to say, the expenditure exceeds the revenue, but, of course, we have to give postal facilities to the Yukon Territory. There is another somewhat similar case in the Yukon. If it is true that the British Columbia Express Company farms out the side service at a much lower rate than the one paid to the company by the department, then undoubtedly there is room for improvement.

Mr. BURRELL. I hope the minister does not think I am impugning his bona fides in the matter?

Mr. LEMIEUX. On the whole the hon gentleman admits the service is good.

Mr. BURRELL. If his line of argument was good in this present case, it was equally good in 1896, when other men had the contract, for not changing then, but the department then took the ground that it would be advisable in the interests of the country to throw this contract open to tender. They then threw down a company with a large equipment.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Was not the route changed and extended?

Mr. BURRELL. The former company had only the main contract, but the department included the branch lines instead of letting them separately. I think there is no doubt there would be bona fide tenders if the minister called for them from men who would be able to carry on that work. It might happen that they would find it necessary to purchase a large portion of the present contractor's outfit, as happened when the contract was changed before; but I am positive it would be in the interests of the country and of the government to pursue the usual method of throwing the whole matter open to tender.

I would call attention to another small contract from Lytton up to Lillooet, a distance of 40 miles, which was also renewed without tender. I knew, of course, that the minister was not familiar with the country. I am familiar with every foot of it and appreciate the sentiment of the people there, and I have no axe to grind, political or otherwise. I simply desire to satisfy the general feeling of that whole country, and I assure the minister that his general policy is just as applicable to that country as to any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. CROTHERS. I may be a little out of order and a little late in the appeal that I desire to make to the Postmaster General, but I was not present when the main estimates were up and possibly I may be allowed to speak now. I desire to make an appeal on behalf of the letter carriers of the city of St. Thomas. I have been observing the Postmaster General for a couple of months, and am inclined to think that he is disposed to be fair, and kind, and even generous. In fact, I had formed that opinion of the Postmaster General before I had the pleasure of seeing him, because he was kind enough to appoint these letter carriers in the city of St. Thomas just two or three

weeks before the elections, and they assisted me materially in distributing campaign literature. They all voted against me, but they are good fellows and they are doing good work and working long hours. I am sincere about this. These men are living in the city of St. Thomas, where the cost of living is about as high as in Ottawa. I do not think there is another place of its size in Ontario where the cost of living is as high as it is in St. Thomas. There are reasons for that which I could mention. These letter carriers are receiving $1.50 per day. Now, does the Postmaster General think that a man with a wife and family can live, and live decently in a city like St. Thomas, on $1.50 a day? I believe that the servants in the Postmaster General's Department, are the only class of public servants of Canada who, as a class, are under paid. The people of this country ought to be ashamed of themselves to take the services of postmasters and letter carriers for the paltry pittances they pay them. I know the case of one man who travels twenty miles a day each way—forty miles a day—carrying the mail, and he gets $230.

Mr. LEMIEUX. By tender?

Mr. CROTHERS. Possibly. I have heard a good deal about tenders since I have had the honour of a seat in this House. In many cases, the answer seems to be regarded as complete when it is to the effect that tenders were advertised for and the lowest tender was accepted. I do not know that that is a conclusive argument in a great many cases. I think the officers of one of these public departments ought to be in a position to instruct the head of the department what is a fair price to pay for the fair services they render, and, if the tender is very much more than a fair price, the department ought to refuse to accept it. On the other hand, in these other matters, I do not believe in the people of this country taking the services of public servants for a great deal less than they are actually worth. If the Postmaster General will excuse me for repeating. I would appeal to him as a man on behalf of these men—not political friends of mine, but decent men, putting in long hours and not adequately paid. Men breaking stone on the street get more than do these people who are working long hours delivering mail matter to the people of St. Thomas.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is an old English dictum 'Fine words butter no parsnips.' I intend to act, not say much about the letter carriers. I will ask the hon. member to wait until next week, when something will probably be done for the letter carriers.

Mr. MARSHALL. I desire to speak also with reference to the postmasters. I have been looking into the matter, and I find that in East Elgin there are eight post offices, the keepers of which receive eleven cents a day, and no rent allowance. That is too bad. These offices are open from eight to ten hours a day. I am pleased to say that the Postmaster General has changed the mail routes so that people are able to get the daily papers. There are nine places in which the rent allowance is $6 a year. But I draw particular attention to these eight places where the postmasters receive eleven cents a day and no rent allowance. The hon. minister the Postmaster General has a surplus. I know what he will say—that the revenues from these post offices do not warrant raising the salary. But I do not see how they can afford to keep the places open for the length of time they do and give the public good service, unless their salaries are increased. I have no political object in advocating this, these people are not supporters of mine, but they speak to me about this frequently. I have mentioned the matter to the minister privately, but I feel it my duty to take advantage of the discussion on this item to bring the matter before the minister in this way. I do not know whether he will feel like making a promise to raise the salaries, particularly of those who get no rent allowance. I would like to hear from him on the subject.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I could not give an answer at once; I should need to look into each case. If the hon. member will send me the names, I will investigate. Sometimes it happens that, in our 14,000 offices a mistake may be made as regards the rental and fuel allowance. And, as my hon. friend (Mr. Marshall) knows, the salary allowances are based on the revenue of each office. So, it varies. Some years, an office will receive the allowance, but if, next year, it is below a certain figure, it is deprived of the allowance. We must have a rule that applies automatically to every office. But, as I have said, mistakes are sometimes made. If the hon. member will send me the names, I will look into the matter.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would like to make a similar plea on behalf of the postmasters and mail carriers of New Westminster. I would ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) whether it is not possible for him to use his influence with his colleague the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) to have the fair wage clause, of which we hear a good deal in connection with the Department of Labour, applied to the transactions of the Post Office Department, so that the department might have the experience that private employers all over the country have when they are working on contracts for the government. It is quite proper that private employers should have the experience to which they

are treated by the Minister of Labour. When the government lets a contract to a private employer, it puts him in a situation that the employees shall be paid a fair wage, which is stated so that there may be no mistake. I would suggest that the Minister of Labour have the Postmaster General do something of the same kind, and, that when contracts are awarded, particularly for the carriage of the mails, he should not ask that it be done at the lowest price, but fix the rate, so that the mail carriers may be paid a fair price for their services, which we can well afford to pay for. I am quite aware that the Postmaster General is one of the most progressive of ministers, and that he has made many improvements in his department. I do not want to appear as crowding him too much, but I think it would be a good idea to act on the lines suggested and to increase the pay of this staff.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will bring the Postmaster General and the Minister of Labour together, and if they do not agree, I will take them before a conciliation board.

Further amount required (including compensation to the following railway mail clerks for medical and other expenses and loss of personal effects: E. A. Hartling, $118.50; C. E. O'Reilly, $468; W. W. Frost, $20; J. H. Kelly, $76, and A. Chabot, $20, $80,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This amount is to complete payment for the current year, $1,000; travelling charges and expenses of inspectors and other officials, $39,297; stationery, printing, advertisements, special postage stamps, $10,000; various items of miscellaneous expenditure, such as letter carriers' uniforms, wages of labourers, charwomen, telephone and telegraph messengers, $20,000. The balance is to pay certain of our mail clerks who have been injured during their service on board trains. Mr. Hartling was employed as a railway mail clerk since September, 1895, and in an accident on the Intercolonial in April 1903, and again in 1907, he lost his clothing and other personal effects. Mr. O'Reilly also met with an accident on the Intercolonial on the 26th of February, and he asks for this amount to pay medical and other attendance, lost clothing, and mileage allowance. Mr. Frost was employed as a railway mail clerk, and met with an accident on the Intercolonial, as did also Mr. Kelly and Mr. Chabot. These various items make up the amount of $80,000. The accounts have all been verified by the Auditor General. The committee will notice that some of these accidents took place some years ago, but we did not know whether the amount should be paid by the Post Office Department or by the Railway Department. We had to get the opinion of the Minister of Justice, who decides that they should be paid by the Post Office Department.

Mr. GOODEVE. This item furnishes another argument in favour of increasing the salaries of railway mail clerks. These men are subject to railway accidents more than the ordinary citizen, because they are nearly all the time on railway trains. I have received a circular and letters from mail clerks asking for the consideration of the department. They have to make very long runs, and suffer many hardships, as well as being exposed to danger. I would ask the minister, when he is dealing with other employees in his department, if he will kindly consider the railway mail clerks.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I received a delegation the other day, and I have a memorandum of the Railway Mail Clerks' Association, which is being considered.

Mr. PERLEY. Is the minister able to form any estimate of the profits from the special issue of stamps?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would not venture to give a figure. If the hon. gentleman will put a question on the Order Paper, I will procure the information.

Mr. PERLEY. Last session when these estimates were up, the Postmaster General said a few words with regard to the possibility of providing a special stamp to be used at Christmas time for the benefit of the movement against tuberculosis. At that time, when I asked him a question, I thought the Postmaster General gave an answer which was fairly favourable, and that he was really thinking of doing something of the kind last Christmas; but as he did not do so, I suppose he must have changed his mind.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have not changed my mind on the subject. I think I informed my hon. friend privately last year when the question came up, that the reason why I thought it unadvisable to issue a special stamp for the benefit of the tuberculosis hospital, was that we had just issued a series of stamps in connection with the Quebec Tercentenary. Besides, it is not considered advisable for any country to multiply special stamps; in fact, it is considered infra dignitatem by the Postal Union to issue special stamps unless it is for such purposes as that of last summer. But I can assure my hon. friend, and all the friends of the hospital fund, and of the movement against tuberculosis, that it is my desire and my aim to help as much as possible that deserving movement. If it is clearly demonstrated that the issuing of such a special stamp, as is issued in Denmark, and I believe in one or two

other countries in Europe, would yield an amount which will substantially aid that fund, then I am open to conviction. In fact I have been reading many papers on the subject, and I hope that the time may come when I shall be able to realize the hon. gentleman's wishes.

Mr. PERLEY. I would call the attention of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) to these remarks of the Postmaster General. I hope he has been listening to them.

Mr. JAMESON. I have received a petition from the railway mail clerks, and while I do not desire to take up the time of the committee at this stage, I find another feature is presented by the correspondence susequently received, and that is in respect to a class of clerks who have not passed the examination and are not on the regular staff, but are nevertheless performing the services of those officials. It appears they are receiving very meagre remuneration, although they are obliged to travel long distances, and are subject to the same chances of accident as the others. They respectfully request that the minister will consider their petition for an increase of salary when he deals with the permanent clerks.

Further amount required for miscellaneous expenditure, 1908-9, Department of Labour, including printing and stationery, allowance to correspondents, travelling expenses, &c., $6,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This amount is required to meet the estimated expenditures to the end of the financial year. The expenditure is due to the heavy travelling expenses of the various officers of the department and to the increased charges for printing, &c.

Amount required to provide for the expenses of W. L. Mackenzie King, M.P., as a representative of Canada at the Joint Opium Conference at Shanghai, China, $5,500.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This amount is required to provide for the expenses of Mr. Mackenzie King as the representative of Canada at the joint Opium Conference at Shanghai, China. The committee knows the object of the conference. For some years there has been a desire to suppress the use of opium and morphine in China, and the great powers, especially Great Britain and the United States of America, have decided, with the consent of China, to call a conference in order to study the question as to what are the best means of suppressing that evil. Canada was invited by the foreign office in London to join that conference. Mr. Mackenzie King was especially well equipped to take part in it. He had studied this question of the opium traffic and last year we introduced a Bill into this House to suppress it in Canada. Mr. Mackenzie King is now in China; he has taken part in the conference, as usual, to his credit and to the credit of the country to which he belongs. I have not yet his report, but from what I have seen of the cables that appeared in the London 'Times' Mr. Mackenzie King has been one of the leading men in the conference.

Mr. DANIEL. Who are taking part in the conference?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The conference is between the different nations, Great Britain, the United States, Germany, France, China and Japan, and perhaps others, but I name the large powers which have interests in the far east. The object of the conference is to suppress gradually the use of opium and morphine.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the official language ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The official language is English.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose we shall have details of this expenditure later on?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes; Mr. King is accompanied by a secretary.

Civil governnemt—Governor General's secretary's office—contingencies—further amount required, $6,000.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). This is an additional sum required for the contingencies of the Governor General's office chiefly due to the increase in the cost of telegrams. There has been a very large amount of cable business.

Office of the Auditor General—contingencies —clerical and other assistance—to pay the following extra clerks from the 28th June, 1909, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act:—C. M. Low, M. A. Reid, D. M. Gibson, W. M. Greenshields, E. M. Stitt, E. M. Fraser, Bertha McCuaig, M. Macdonald, Isabella MIntosh, L. Chartrand and H. R. Washington, $500.

Mr. FIELDING. Under the Civil Service Act the Auditor General had employed a number of temporary clerks who could only be employed, according to the strict wording of the Act, for four months. When the four months expired, to comply strictly with the Act, he would be obliged to dismiss these clerks and bring in others. As they were engaged in work that was rather urgent, checking the election officers' accounts, the Auditor General came to me and said that he thought it was undesirable that these officers should go. I agreed with him that he should continue them for a short time, although I pointed out that it would necessitate a special vote as they are not employed in strict accordance with the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BLAIN. This is an item in regard to which my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) wished to make some remarks.

Mr. FIELDING. I would suggest that the item pass and an opportunity will be given to the hon. gentleman to discuss it at a future time. I would like to get this through this evening. It is only $500.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from North Toronto mentioned this particularly to me and said that if it came up he would like to have it stand over.

Mr. FIELDING. It will delay the Supply Bill. If my hon. friend presses it I cannot insist upon it going through, but I will give my hon. friend the assurance that there will be abundant opportunity for discussing it and I hope he will allow it to pass under these conditions.

Mr. BARKER. Of course we ought to get rid of those words 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' I thought we had got rid of them.

Mr. FIELDING. I think we have got rid of them pretty well.

Mr. BARKER. Is there any need of having them there ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is the old form. If my hon. friend thinks it will help to leave them out I will not object.

Mr. BARKER. Who appointed these clerks ?

Mr. FIELDING. The Auditor General.

Mr. BARKER. Appointed by himself ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I think so. The practice in past years was for the Minister of Finance to appoint them. I was away at the time and I think the Auditor General appointed them himself. I know nothing to the contrary.

Mr. BARKER. There would be every objection, from my point of view, to the government appointing any clerks in the audit office.

Mr. FIELDING. They have always been appointed by the government.

Mr. BARKER. I think that is a mistake. The commission that has been created should appoint the staff in the Auditor General's office.

Mr. FIELDING. The Civil Service Act makes no distinction between the Auditor General's office and any other office.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not intended that these clerks shall continue to be employed beyond a certain period?

Mr. FIELDING. No, the vote is only $500 for the whole of them.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought that possibly that was for the reason that the fiscal year terminates on the 31st of March and you only require to make provision for five weeks.

Mr. FIELDING. They are only there for a short time and only for the special purpose of dealing with the accounts of the election officers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Assuming that the circumstances are such as the hon. Minister of Finance has disclosed, the case is not as grave as I thought it was. But I think it is extremely desirable that we should not see this memorandum appearing in the estimates. It has been of frequent occurrence in the past although, I am glad to say, it has been of rather infrequent occurrence this session. It seems to me that it should disappear altogether. My attention was directed to this item by my hon. friend from North Toronto who desired to make some inquiries in regard to it.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not see that the words are very important and they can be stricken out. We have to get authority to pay the money.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board—contingencies—further amount required, $2,000.

Mr. FIELDING. The sum required for the year was under-estimated and we need an additional vote.

Marine and Fisheries Department—amount required to pay salary of Mr. Oswald L. McLeod at the rate of $800 per annum, $363.41.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. McLeod was appointed on the 18th of October, 1898, and owing to his special qualifications in the hardware trade he was to receive a salary of $800, but only $500, the usual salary of a temporary clerk was allowed, the Department of Justice being of the opinion that he should rank as a temporary officer. Considering the nature of Mr. McLeod's work it was thought he should have a salary of $800 and this vote is to give him that salary. It was impossible for him to present himself for competitive examination because no examination was held, but he will do so at the next examination.

To complete voters' lists for general election, 1908, $22,000.

Mr. BARKER. Is this to pay the King's Printer?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

To provide for promotion of W. A. Lalonde from permanent messengers' staff to third-class clerk at $800, $166.66.

Mr. BARKER. Has this officer a certificate?

Mr. SPEAKER. He was the personal messenger of the late Speaker, and at the

close of last session he was placed in charge of the blue book-room.

Mr. BARKER. Did he require to pass an examination?

Mr. SPEAKER. He was appointed at the end of last session before the Civil Service Act came into force.

To provide increases in the salaries of the following officers and clerks of the House of Commons from April 1, 1908. J. B. R. Laplante, $700, R. R. Tremblay $200, E. Query $200, E. Naubert $100, $1,200.

Mr. BARKER. Are these increases in accordance with the statute?

Mr. SPEAKER. These increases were granted by the Board of Internal Economy before the Civil Service Act came into force.

Debates, $25,000.

Mr. SPEAKER. Last session was the longest session in the history of this parliament and the cost of publishing the debates was greater than usual.

Mr. BARKER. Does this include salaries?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Additional amount required for steamship subsidies between Canada and Great Britain, $15,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This subsidy is payable in proportion to the number of passengers and according to the class of vessel, so that it is not a fixed sum, and this additional amount is required to close up the accounts for the year. It is the ordinary Allan and Canadian Pacific Railway subsidy.

Further amount required for the construction of an ice-breaking steamer for the Northumberland straits, $215,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have passed a contract for the construction of this icebreaker for the sum of $500,000, and this amount of $215,000 is to pay the progress estimate due before March 31.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. There is an item in the main estimates?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. Next year we will pay the balance of the contract.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. We can have any discussion we like on the main estimates?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Amount required to pay the pension of the pilot, F. X. Lamarre, from October 1, 1908, to March 31, 1909, at the rate of $300 a year, $150.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a sum which has to be paid this pilot for his superannuation.

Lime Kiln crossing—further amount required to pay the outstanding account in connection with the chartering of tug for Lime Kiln crossing, $2,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The sum of $10,000 has been put in the estimates to provide for this expenditure. It was expected that the service would expire October 1, but it extended to December 8.

Mr. BARKER. Is that also in the main estimates?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Further amount required for the care of sick seamen in marine hospitals and the building and repairs to marine hospitals, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Owing to an epidemic of smallpox and scarlet fever, it has been necessary to have added $5,000 to the vote provided for this year.

Mr. JAMESON. What building is the hon. gentleman doing?

Mr. BRODEUR. We are not doing any building. This is a general vote put yearly in the estimates for the care of sick seamen and the building and repairs to marine hospitals. That is the way it is always worded.

Marine biological stations—to provide for unforeseen expenses in connection with the construction of biological stations at St. Andrews, New Brunswick, and Vancouver island, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have built two stations, one at St. Andrews and the other in British Columbia, and this amount is to pay the balance due.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. What will be the nature of the work carried on at this station in British Columbia?

Mr. BRODEUR. These stations are for the purpose of studying the habits of the fish. The expenditure is under the control of scientific men, who are good enough to devote a part of their time to those researches. The board is composed of Prof. Prince, chairman, and a number of other university professors.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. There is one line in which a station of this kind could do very useful service. The most important of the fishing industries in British Columbia is that of the sockeye salmon. We have been making large expenditures during a number of years in the effort to construct enough hatcheries to increase the supply of the sock eye, but notwithstanding all these efforts, and although proper attention has been paid to preserving the sockeye from depredation by fishermen or otherwise, we find that the supply of the salmon is not increasing, but remains about stationary. The conclusion seems inevitable that there must be some cause for this which has not yet been recognized. There must be some cause, apart from any suggestion of failure of the hatcheries to secure to us an abundant supply of salmon. So far as we can

see, the hatcheries are doing good work, and if there were no cause operating against them, we should have a yearly increasing supply instead of the supply retrograding or remaining stationary. Would it be part of the purpose of a station of this kind to pursue investigations to ascertain whether there are other fish preying on these salmon in their haunts between the time they leave their hatching grounds on the Fraser river and their return four years later? If we could find out what fish prey on the salmon and devise means of dealing with them, and guard against the efforts of the hatcheries being made nugatory, this station would be worth many times the money proposed to be spent on it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am very glad that my hon. friend has brought this to my attention. I shall take care to communicate his observations to the professor in charge. So far as regards the work done, we have obtained very useful information regarding the life and habits of the fish and no doubt the matter my hon. friend has brought to our attention might be properly investigated by the board. I shall bring it to the attention of Professor Prince and the other members of the Board.

To provide for expenses in connection with the International Fisheries Commission, including an amount equivalent to the difference between $2,800 and $4,000, being an increase to be granted to Prof. E. E. Prince since December 1, 1908, $5,400.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the purpose of paying the expenses in connection with the International Fisheries Commission, and also to provide for the salary of Professor Prince. He was formerly paid a salary of $2,800, but in view of the fact that he has been appointed International Commissioner, it was thought advisable to increase his salary to $4,000.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Will the hon. minister state the general scope of this commission?

Mr. BRODEUR. The commission was appointed in virtue of a treaty signed in the spring of 1908. That treaty provided for the appointment of two commissioners, one by the American government and the other by the Canadian, for the purpose of drafting regulations covering what are called the boundary waters, that is to say, the waters which divide Canada from the United States, waters like the southern part of the Strait of Georgia and the Strait of San Juan de Fuca. Then there are the great lakes of Ontario with their connecting rivers and a part of the St. Lawrence which is boundary water. There are also some lakes in the province of Quebec and in the States of Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine, the River St. John, the River St. Croix and Passamaquoddy bay. The two commissioners were formally appointed, Mr. Bastedo on behalf of Canada and Dr. Jordan, of Stanford University, California, on behalf of the American government. Mr. Bastedo later accepted a position in the Department of Trade and Commerce and resigned his position on the International Commission. Professor Prince has been appointed to represent Canada. The two commmissioners have held some meetings and Professor Prince is leaving in a few days for the west to meet Professor Jordan. Professor Prince has been instructed to confer while in the west with the provincial authorities of British Columbia.

Mr. DANIEL. Why is the whole of the St. John river included in that treaty? Only a small portion of the St. John river forms part of the boundary between the two countries and the greater part of it is far away from the boundary. I have never heard any reason why the whole river should be included in the treaty. The minister knows that Grand Falls creates a perfect block to any sea fish going any further up the river and yet the boundary portion of the St. John river is away above Grand Falls.

Mr. BRODEUR. The part of the St. John river which is in the state of Maine is, I understand, of great importance to the fisheries, and at the same time some works are being carried on on that river and its tributaries which were detrimental to the interests of the fisheries. It was considered advisable on that account that we should have an opportunity of seeing that proper regulations were made in that part of the river for the purpose of protecting not only our own fisheries, but also the fisheries in that part of the river which is in the state of Maine. Of course if we were going to make regulations with regard to the part of the river in the state of Maine, it was also advisable that the commission should have the same authority on that part of the river which is in Canada. That was why the St. John river was included and the probability is that it is more in the interests of Canadians than of Americans to have that river placed under the control of the commission's regulations.

Mr. DANIEL. That is merely with regard to the control of lumber mills and sawdust.

Mr. BRODEUR. Sawdust particularly. My hon. friend is aware that the sawdust thrown in that part of the St. John river which is in the United States is detrimental to the fisheries, and of course this would give the commissioners an opportunity to deal with that important question, which affects most seriously the interest of our fishermen.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it a fact that there can be no regulation now with respect to

the fisheries of the St. John river without the consent of the commissioner of the United States government and that that would extend even down to the harbour of St. John?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not necessarily. If the commissioners make no regulations with regard to the part of the river which is in Canada, or make regulations with regard to certain things, such as the size of mesh, it would not prevent our making regulations also with regard to close seasons or otherwise. It will of course give jurisdiction to the two commissioners, if they find it advisable to make regulations.

Mr. CROCKET. As I understand, any regulations promulgated by this International Commission become effective without the consent of this parliament.

Mr. BRODEUR. If I remember rightly the treaty provides that the federal governments of the two countries will have to pass legislation to make the regulations of the commissioners effective. The regulations will have to be submitted to parliament to become effective.

Mr. CROCKET. And have the approval of parliament before becoming effective?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know that they would have to receive the approval of parliament. Of course it would come to about the same thing, but I think a clause of the treaty provides that in order to put those regulations in force, parliament will have to enact the necessary laws.

Mr. CROCKET. But we cannot have a regulation without the consent of a citizen of a foreign country. Even the regulations prohibiting and fixing the time for fishing in the St. John river must have the consent of a citizen of a foreign country.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not necessarily, because if the Commissioners do not agree upon the regulations which ought to be put in force, each country will be absolutely free to make the regulations which it considers advisable in the territory which is within its country.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. On what points would Professor Prince consult the provincial government of British Columbia?

Mr. BRODEUR. On the general question of fisheries there, on the nature of the regulations which they would consider best designed to protect our fisheries.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Have they authority in the matter of regulations?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. The provincial authorities have nothing to do with the drafting of regulations, but the government thought that it would be advisable to have a conference with the provincial governments before these regulations should be formally drafted. My hon. friend knows that by the British North America Act and by the judgment of the Privy Council of 1898 it was formally decided that the regulation of fisheries was entirely under the control of the federal government; no regulations can be legal except those passed by the federal authorities and as a consequence the provincial authorities have nothing to do with the drafting of regulations. And, as they have some proprietary rights in the fisheries, I thought that, before the regulations were formally adopted, we should have a conference with the provincial authorities. My hon. friend, perhaps, is aware that, some time ago, I had a conference, along with Professor Prince, with the representatives of New Brunswick, Quebec, and Ontario, and discussed the questions which might be raised when these regulations came to be drafted. Our intention was also to call representatives of the British Columbia government, but as British Columbia was far away from the seat of the Dominion government, I thought it would be more advisable that Professor Prince should see the provincial authorities when going to California to meet Professor Jordan to discuss with him the question of regulations. It is simply a matter of courtesy, which, I think, has been appreciated by the provincial governments in having these conferences before framing the regulations.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The reason I asked was because, last summer, there was a very deplorable condition of affairs on the Fraser river. Both the Dominion and provincial governments were attempting to enforce regulations, which regulations were conflicting in their terms, so that the Dominion government inserted in their licenses certain conditions for complying with which the provincial government carried the licenses into court, and vice versa.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And what was the result?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The matter is under appeal, I believe, and is expected to be argued in London in June.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What did the Supreme Court decide?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I am not a lawyer, and it is a very difficult thing for a layman to attempt to give a synopsis of a judicial decision.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may tell the hon. gentleman what was done: We did pass regulations as a result of the British Columbia Commission, which were to be enforced last year. At the same time, I was surprised to hear that the provincial authorities thought

it advisable to issue licenses, to which they attached some regulations. The result was, as my hon. friend has stated, a conflict of jurisdiction which, I believe, must have created a great deal of dissatisfaction. But we were not to blame in that respect, because we acted within our rights and jurisdictions in providing those regulations. The matter was submitted to the courts, first a stipendiary magistrate, who upheld the action of the provincial authorities, and condemned the fishermen under the provincial regulations. This conviction was appealed to the county court which reserved the decision, declaring the regulations ultra vires, and that the licenses themselves, as a consequence, were illegal. An appeal was made by the provincial government to the High Court or Supreme Court of British Columbia, and I was glad to hear that the judgment of the magistrate of the county court was confirmed and the licenses were declared null and void. I am not aware that the case is appealed to the Privy Council. I am not surprised, however, because, when negotiations were entered into with the provincial government authorities and we tried to settle the conflict of jurisdiction, we were told that they intended to bring this question before the highest court in the realm. But I was not aware that the appeal had been made to the Privy Council.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. That is my impression. I am speaking from newspaper report, but it has every appearance of correctness. I should have thought that the minister would try to reach a modus vivendi, so that there would not be a continuation of this state of things another year. Has any agreement been reached?

Mr. BRODEUR. Unfortunately, we have not been able to reach such a conclusion. The provincial authorities claim that they have the absolute right to make regulations and issue licenses, and there was some talk that the matter should be submitted to the courts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the condition of the law? Have the provincial government the right to issue licenses but not make regulations?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And the Dominion government has power both to issue licenses and make regulations?

Mr. BRODEUR. My reading of the judgment of the Privy Council is that the provincial governments have the right to issue licenses. It was formally enunciated in the judgment that the right to issue licenses existed also with the federal government. At the same time, we maintain that we are the only authority having the power to make regulations, and the judgment rendered by the court in British Columbia confirmed the position that we took on the question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do both governments have the right to insist on the payment of a fee in connection with the licenses?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have both governments, or rather both legislatures, the right to impose certain penalties if these licenses are not taken out?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman will understand that that is a point likely to lead to confusion.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have heard in this parliament for the last four years, or ever since that decision was rendered, that some other question was to be submitted to the courts in order that the whole subject might be cleared up, and I have understood that negotiations have been going on from time to time to bring that about. But it seems to be very slow of consummation. It seems extremely desirable that so confusing a condition of affairs should be remedied at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is very unfortunate that this conflict of jurisdiction exists with regard to the fisheries, because I am quite ready to believe that it will have a bad effect upon our fisheries that we do not know exactly where we stand. The governments cannot act with the same interest as they would otherwise. Negotiations were held some years ago to submit to the court one of the questions raised, namely, whether the proprietary rights in the fisheries within the three-mile limit should be under the jurisdiction of the federal authority as maintained by this government. The question, however, was never submitted to the court. Another question was raised, also, whether the provincial authorities had the right to make regulations or the right to issue licenses and attach to those licenses conditions. In British Columbia, for example, there were conditions as to the fishing on Sunday. This was one of the questions submitted to the court, and the result was that the regulations made by the provincial authorities as to the fishing on Sunday were held to be illegal. A license should simply issue for the purpose of collecting fees, but it should not undertake in any way to regulate the manner in which the fisheries are carried on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was the subject taken up at the conference between this government and the provincial government some three years ago?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know, I was not there at the time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was there, and the reason was this, that all the provinces were not interested in the question. The provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were in no way interested, and as the interests of Ontario were different from those of the other provinces, it was thought better that the question should be left over for a further conference between the Dominion government and the provincial governments which were directly interested. I may be allowed further to say that the ground upon which it was held that the provinces could issue licenses was that they had a proprietary interest in the fisheries, and that therefore they had a right to say that no one should take fish except under license from the provincial government. But having a proprietary right was one thing, and the power to make regulations as to the mode and time of fishing was quite another; and the judicial committee held that, as a result, both governments can issue licenses, the provincial authorities simply giving the right to take property which belongs to the province, and the Dominion government having the right to regulate the fisheries under the provisions of the British North America Act, which expressly gives that power to the federal authority.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If that is the only result, it must be conceded that the fathers of confederation exercised a remarkable ingenuity in getting the whole subject into an extraordinary muddle.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. For the information of the committee I may say that the fishermen did not suffer financial loss last year on account of the double licenses, because it happened that the Dominion fee of $10 prevailing before last year was then reduced to $5, and the provincial fee then first in force, was also $5, so they only paid $10 the same as before. I referred just now to newspaper reports about taking this case to London, and I think the minister will be glad to learn of another newspaper report which is to the effect that for this season the provincial government proposes to accept the Dominion regulations and to issue licenses as a matter of collecting revenue only, and to make the licenses state on their face that they are subject to the Dominion regulations. I would ask the minister whether Professor Prince, when he goes west to meet Professor Starr Jordan at San Francisco, will go with carte blanche to make any arrangements he may think wise, or is he limited by instructions from the government?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think it would be advisable to state what Professor Prince's instructions are.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Not the nature of the instructions, but whether there are any limitations.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would not like to make any statement with regard to that. It is a matter of negotiation with the American commissioners, and I hope my hon. friend will not press for an answer.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think we need to fight shadows. It is right the minister should not divulge what the instructions are, but there can be no harm in the minister telling us whether he has allowed this gentleman to go down there without instructions, or whether he has taken the precaution of giving him instructions; whether he has given him a line of conduct to pursue, or is letting him act of his own will. There is no state secret there. Parliament has a right to know whether the government has taken reasonable precautions that the rights of Canada shall not be sacrificed.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would not like to make any statement with regard to that. Every hon. member who knows Professor Prince must feel confident that he would not sacrifice unduly the interests of Canada. If the government can give him instructions in the matter—because that is a point under the treaty,—I do not know whether it would be advisable for us to give him formal instructions. But I may assure my hon. friend that having due regard to the experience of Professor Prince, of his vast knowledge of the fisheries, and having regard also to his character, he will do nothing which will at all jeopardize the interests of our Canadian fisheries.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Could the minister tell us whether it is the federal or state authority that has the right to fix regulations on the inland lakes, as to size of nets, amount of fee, and territory to be covered by the license?

Mr. BRODEUR. We are informed by the American authorities that the regulations with regard to fisheries on the boundary waters which are mentioned in the treaty, fall entirely under the control of the commissioners and of the federal authority. Formerly, all the regulations concerning fisheries were under the control of the state authorities, that was part of their jurisdiction under the constitution. But in virtue of another provision in the constitution, it is stated that the federal authority have the right to make treaties, and when those treaties are ratified by the Senate, they come into force and fall entirely under the control of the federal authority.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Could the minister say that by virtue of this treaty the right is taken away from the local authorities?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a very serious question my hon. friend is putting to me

when he asks me to interpret the constitution of the United States. If he will read the correspondence which is brought down he will find some letters from the Secretary of State for the United States to the effect that the federal authority has full power to regulate the fisheries under the treaty.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is the minister relying entirely on the information given by the Attoney General of the United States; is he acting on the assumption that the local legislatures have no jurisdiction with reference to fixing the amount of the fee, the size of the net, the close season, and all matters pertaining to the fisheries? Is he accepting the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States as absolute with regard to those matters?

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, I suppose we should not accept an opinion given by the Attorney General of the United States, but that we should accept the opinion which would be given here by our Department of Justice. If Mr. Root affirms the American central authorities have power to deal with that question we must assume that he is correct.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has any intimation come from the local legislatures that they have agreed to that view of the law?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know exactly what communications have been exchanged between the federal authorities and the state authorities.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the minister say now that these powers are being exercised by the local legislatures?

Mr. BRODEUR. Formerly.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. And now?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not now.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. They will until the regulations come into force?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, of course.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the minister admit that the local legislatures in the Dominion have the power to fix the amount of the fee and require license for fishing?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have always had the power to issue licenses. That power has not been taken from us but the provincial authorities have the same power too. That is the result of the judgment of the Privy Council.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is it a fact that the provincial authorities now do fix the amount of the license fee in the Dominion?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, not in all provinces because there are some provinces where they do not issue licenses. In New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island they do not issue licenses. The licenses are issued there entirely by ourselves. In Ontario and in some parts of Quebec they issue licenses and in some other parts of Quebec we issue them. In Ontario the provincial authorities have taken upon themselves to issue licenses. I am informed also that in some cases they have practically undertaken to regulate the fisheries by inserting conditions in their licenses, but as to that I have no formal information.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has the Dominion government the power to enforce a license and to fix a uniform amount as the license fee throughout the whole of the Dominion, or has each province the exclusive right to fix the amount of the fee?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Ontario the local government issue licenses and fix the fees. While we have not formally exercised that power the federal authorities have the same power to issue licenses and to fix the fee for a license issued by the federal authorities.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Will it be possible for each state bordering on the Dominion of Canada to fix the amount of its license and likewise will it be possible for each province in the Dominion to fix the amount of its license?

Mr. BRODEUR. As to the power of the states I am not familiar enough with their laws to say whether they will have a right to levy a fee upon their own fishermen. That is a matter, however, that does not concern us a great deal because each country preserves its absolute right to issue licenses on its own side of the water. If the state legislatures find it advisable to issue licenses and to levy taxes upon their own people that is a matter which does not concern us.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Will the minister advise me on this? Supposing that Professor Prince and the American Commissioner, while they are out in British Columbia, decide themselves upon these regulations, would this parliament then have any control over the matter or is the treaty not practically consummated ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The treaty provides for that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The treaty provides that if they come to an agreement this parliament has nothing to do at all with making the regulations ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am under the impression that there is a clause in the treaty providing that if any regulations are made the congress of the United States and the parliament of Canada will have authority

to take the necessary powers to carry out these regulations.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Then the minister can give us the assurance that we will have an opportunity of discussing these regulations later on ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, because they will have to be submitted to parliament to give the government or the commission the executive power which is required.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood the minister sometime ago to say, that, as he understood the treaty, once these representatives came to an agreement there was nothing for the congress of the United States or the Dominion parliament to do but accept the terms they had agreed to. He did not think we had the right to reject or revise it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose that if parliament should refuse to pass the necessary laws to carry out these regulations it would put an end to them ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I asked my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries some time ago if negotiations were on foot with the provincial governments with the view of adopting a modus vivendi respecting this conflict of jurisdiction but I do not think the minister understood my question. I was under the impression that some commission was appointed by the government to carry on negotiations. I would like to know what is being done.

Mr. BRODEUR. We appointed, last year, a commissioner for the purpose of negotiating with the provincial authorities. Mr. Bastedo was the man who was selected for that purpose. The matter which was the most pressing at the time was the situation which arose in British Columbia and Mr. Bastedo communicated with the provincial authorities, made a visit or two and carried on negotiations with them. I must say that these negotiations were almost fruitless because immediately the provincial authorities decided to issue licenses themselves and in issuing their licenses they took it upon themselves to regulate to a certain extent, even to a very large extent, the fisheries. That, of course, made the question of jurisdiction more acute than it had been before. The matter was submitted to the courts and it was decided that the licenses issued under these conditions by the provincial authorities were null and void. I am informed by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) that the question, though decided against the contention of the British Columbia government, is now being submitted to the Privy Council.

Marine and fisheries investigation—further amount required, $40,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to pay the expenses in connection with the investigation of the Marine and Fisheries Department. On the recommendation of Mr. Justice Cassels, $1,000 is to be paid Dr. Morse for his services in connection with the investigation, and upon the recommendation of counsel $300 is to be paid to Mr. H Thomas.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the total amount?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is estimated at $55,000, but we have not received all the accounts. There was a vote of $15,000 last year.

Mr. LENNOX. Does Dr. Morse only get $1,000?

Mr. BRODEUR. He is an officer of the Exchequer Court and this is additional to his salary?

Mr. CROCKET. Will this vote pay all the expenses?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask the minister if he thinks this investigation was necessary?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no doubt it was.

Mr. LENNOX. What fees were paid counsel?

Mr. BRODEUR. In a letter dated April 18, 1908, from the Minister of Justice to Mr. Watson, it is stated:—

> With regard to your remuneration upon the inquiry before Mr. Justice Cassels, I have to confirm the understanding arrived at yesterday, that you would receive $100 per day and necessary expenses out of pocket, and in addition at the end of the investigation you would receive some further fee to be agreed upon having in view the responsibility involved in the inquiry and the magnitude it may assume.

Mr. CROCKET. Has that further fee been fixed?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Minister of Justice informs me it has not.

To repay Cushing & Company amount deposited as security in connection with the seizure of the schooner 'Evolution' in the year 1893 for alleged violation of shipping laws in Canada, $800.

Mr. BRODEUR. In 1893 the schooner 'Evolution' was seized for alleged violation of the deck-load law and the owners deposited $800 for her release. In 1896 it was decided by the government to withdraw the case which had been three years in court without prosecution, the department having been advised that there was doubt the suit would succeed. Instructions were given to the collector of customs at St. John to reimburse the $800, but he had

deposited it to the credit of the Receiver General and the matter remained in abeyance. It is only fair that these people should be reimbursed the $800.

Mr. LENNOX. They don't ask any interest?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They do, but they don't get it.

Mr. DANIEL. What was the violation of the shipping law?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was alleged that having taken out a clearance for South America the schooner crossed the Atlantic in violation of the law.

Mr. DANIEL. Not South America, but Vineyard Haven, Massachusetts.

Mr. BRODEUR. The defence was that during the voyage the schooner was forced to the other side of the Atlantic and that at most it was only a technical violation. Some years afterwards this law was repealed and the schooner would then not be liable to a penalty. The case was submitted to Mr. Barker, then agent of the Department of Justice at St. John and now Chief Justice of New Brunswick, and he expressed the opinion that it would be difficult to prove an intentional violation of the Act. Later on it was stated that Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was willing to settle the matter and the minister directed the owner should be informed that he merely expressed his willingness to arrange a settlement if the department of Justice so advised. In March, 1896, a return of the money was under consideration but was evidently not approved as a letter was written by Deputy Minister Smith to Mr. Wood, controller of customs, informing him that the matter had been discussed in council and that if he wished to return the $800 the Marine and Fisheries Department would not object. In reply Mr. Wood pointed out that the money had been deposited in January, 1894, to the credit of the Receiver General, and the Department of Customs did not have it to refund. The order in council recommends it therefore as necessary, and a report recommending a refund of the deposit was actually before council when the late government resigned. The report was never approved and the matter has never been settled. At the request of my hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works, I looked through the papers and found that it was simply a matter of justice that this sum should be refunded, and as it was in the hands of the Receiver General in the consolidated fund, a special vote was required.

Mr. DANIEL. When was the minister requested to refund this money?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose a month ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some considerable time ago, Mr. Cushing wrote me and saw me about the matter. His information was that some ten or twelve years ago an order had been made by the department for a return of the money, but for some reason or other the money had not been returned. He also said that he had insisted on the case being disposed of in the courts, and that accounted for its dragging along some few years. Afterwards an order was made to refund the money, but it was found that the money had been handed by the collector of customs to the Receiver General. The matter dragged on a number of years and finally was overlooked in the mass of business in which Mr. Cushing is concerned. He wanted the $800 with interest, but my hon. colleague has not been able to see his way clear to recommend a refund of anything more than the actual amount deposited. Whether Mr. Cushing will be after him later for the interest, I do not know.

Mr. DANIEL. When did Mr. Cushing broach the subject with the hon. minister regarding a return of the money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some time during the Christmas holidays when I was in St. John.

Mr. DANIEL. He did not make any reference to it before the election?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The elections seem to be the one great event in my hon. friend's mind.

Mr. DANIEL. It appears to me that this Mr. George Cushing was a very strong and active supporter of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. True, a most valuable supporter.

Mr. DANIEL. He worked very hard to get the minister returned. Taking that into consideration, coupled with the fact that this fine, which was imposed in 1893——

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was not a fine but simply a deposit.

Mr. DANIEL. I am quite aware that the hon. minister is extremely particular in the use of the English language at times.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is well to be so.

Mr. DANIEL. I quite agree that he should be accurate when he has the opportunity. But it looks rather peculiar that this deposit made in 1893 should be only now returned to a gentleman who took such an active part in promoting the election of the hon. minister. Of course it may be a mere coincidence, and the minister rather intimates it is, and I have no objection to Mr. Cushing getting back his money.

Mr. BRODEUR. There can be no doubt about his being entitled to it, so much so that the late government had decided—on

the eve of the elections, it is true—to give him back the money.

Mr. DANIEL. What is astonishing is that when Mr. Cushing was really entitled to this money, he did not try to get it before. Certainly he was very patient for a man to whom the government owes $800. However, I am quite aware that the Minister of Public Works is good hearted, especially towards his friends, and I have great pleasure in assisting him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not a question of good heartedness but of justice. My hon. friend knows that Mr. Cushing is not the man to ask me or anybody else to get him one cent to which he is not entitled. What I wonder at is that this amount was not paid to him before. It seems to me one of the clearest cases.

Mr. DANIEL. It is just an evidence of how slow justice often travels.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It travelled very slowly from 1893 to 1896.

Mr. DANIEL. And from 1896 to 1908.

Mr. CROCKET. Will it cover the full amount of Mr. Cushing's last campaign contributions?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware that Mr. Cushing made any campaign contributions.

Mr. CROSBY. I did not intend taking any part in this discussion, but when I heard the Minister of Public Works say that this was a mater of justice, and when I heard the Minister of Marine and Fisheries endorse that statement, I want to point out that we have a deck-load law on our statutes for many years. If I understand this transaction, Mr. Cushing's vessel loaded at St. John for Europe, but cleared for a port in the United States in order to avoid the deck-load law. His vessel was seized. The Minister of Public Works said this money deposited was not a fine. But what is a man to do when his ship is seized, but to put up the money to have it released. In order to get his ship released, Mr. Cushing had to deposit $800. Why? Because he had violated the Customs Act by sailing for Europe when he had cleared his ship for an American port. If this committee decides to give that money back we might as well wipe off our statutes that deck-load law, because every ship that desires to evade that law can load and clear for the United States or some South American port, where the deck-load law does not apply, and then sail for Europe. Are you going to attach a vessel which has made false clearance papers and then return the deposit when the demand is made? Is that what you call justice? It is perfectly clear to me that this is a very unfair thing, and that under the law the money should not be returned at all. I do not care whether the man is Cushing or who he is, there could have been no doubt that this ship had loaded for Europe and then had cleared for the United States, thereby committing a breach of the law, that she was seized and had to put up this money in order to be released. Mr. Cushing has been in shipping all his life, and like every man in St. John. he knew the law; yet we are told to-night that as a matter of justice we must hand the money back. There is no justice about it and in handing back his money you break your own law. I do not understand gentlemen saying it is justice, it is an injustice and a serious breach of the law.

Mr. BRODEUR. Who committed the injustice?

Mr. CROSBY. The man who loaded his ship for Europe and cleared for the United States.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He did not happen to do that.

Mr. CROSBY. Then what did he do?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He did not load for Europe at all; he cleared for a certain port in the United States and then by reason of some unforeseen circumstances, perhaps from being carried out of his course in a storm, he was carried towards the old country and went there. At all events, without going into the facts of the case of which I am not fully aware, Mr. Cushing contended that there was no violation of the law and did what every British subject has a right to do, put in his defence and demanded trial. Neither the Minister of Marine nor the Minister of Customs, nor any one else, can take a man's property without giving him an opportunity to state his case. Mr. Cushing did that and demanded trial. It was then that the Marine Department referred the matter to the agent of the Department of Justice at St. John for an opinion and Mr. Barker, now Chief Justice of New Brunswick, than whom there is no more able lawyer in Canada, advised that in his opinion it was not a violation of the law and that the Crown would fail in securing a conviction against Cushing. The department acted upon that advice and abandoned the suit. Surely Cushing was entitled to the return of his deposit if the Crown did not wish to proceed with the suit against him. Therefore I say it was a matter of justice to return the money to Cushing. If the Crown did not intend to return it, they should have gone on with the suit, given him an opportunity to try his case in a court of law, and see what a jury would give him. But as, under the advice of the legal representative of the Department of Justice, the Crown had no case and abandoned the suit, was any other course open than to return to Cushing the money he had deposited as

security that he would make good whatever penalty the Crown might get against him?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How did the Crown abandon the suit?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By not proceeding.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The suit must come to some formal termination in the court.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It just remained in that way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It stands in the court yet, nothing has been done about it? It seems clear that the papers should be brought down. I hope the minister will bring them down and that the Minister of Public Works will place upon the table of the House the application which has been made to him.

I was surprised, after he had stated so strongly the justice of Mr. Cushing's claim that he should have said he did not know much about the facts, because the justice or injustice of the claim seems to depend altogether on the facts. It seems to me to be largely a question of the facts of the case and if we do not know the facts we cannot say whether the claim is just or unjust.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I meant was that all the facts which were material were these: Cushing's vessel was seized. Cushing claimed the seizure was wrong and that he should be allowed to put in his defence pleading a wrongful seizure. The Crown allowed the matter to drag on until 1894 or 1895 and then referred it to its legal representative at St. John for an opinion as to whether the Crown could recover. Mr. Barker advised against proceeding and Cushing was communicated with, was informed of the decision of the department and was advised that the Collector of Customs had been instructed in writing to return him the money. I cannot imagine any clearer abandonment of the suit than that because the defendant was advised that the Crown had decided not to go on with the suit and to return the money. For all these years the matter was not proceeded with, and I say now it is clearly a case of justice to return the money to him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the case is so clear it is peculiar that the money was not returned long ago. If the Crown did not choose to proceed with the case, Mr. Cushing could have brought the case to trial or had it dismissed, one or the other. It does not appear to me that Mr. Cushing availed himself of his privilege in this respect.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because he was informed by the Crown that they had decided to abandon the suit and give him the money.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not propose to argue on facts with which I am not acquainted, but I propose to argue that the papers should be brought down, including those alluded to by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), and the application referred to by the Minister of Public Works. It is an application respecting a public matter which I think should be brought down.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will be glad to bring down the papers in my department referring to this case. I may explain from the memorandum placed in my hand the facts of this case. In 1893 an action was taken against Mr. Cushing. The action dragged for three years, and on the 21st of March, 1896, Mr. Smith, who was then deputy Minister of Marine wrote to Mr. Wood, then Controller of Customs, as follows:

I am to inform you that this matter has been informally discussed in council, and to state that you are at liberty to return the amount referred to to the parties who deposited it, namely $800, and so far as this department is concerned, it will make no objection to your doing so.

This letter was initialed by the then Minister of Marine, Hon. Mr. Costigan, and Mr. Wood replied under date 27th March, 1896:

On inquiry I am advised that this sum of money was not received or dealt with by the customs, and the Department of Customs has no control over the amount in question. The collector at St. John, I find, as in duty bound under the circumstances, acted entirely on instructions from your department. The Department of Customs, therefore, has no interest in the matter nor jurisdiction.

Then a recommendation to council was prepared by the then minister to refund the money and the order in council based on this was one of those numerous orders in council which were not approved by the Governor when the old government ceased to be in power. If the government take the responsibility of asking an appropriation to refund, they can do so. The only thing I ask is that the papers, including the application for the refund, be brought down so that we can discuss it if we think discussion advisable or necessary.

Mr. CROSBY. I am not satisfied with this matter. While I have listened to the very plausible manner in which the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has dealt with this case—as he always can do when he wants things put through this committee—I am more convinced than ever that the money should not be voted at this time. I am not a lawyer or a sailor. The Minister of Public Works pretends to be both. But I want to say that if this ship cleared from St. John for the United States and found herself in Europe, how did she

get there if there was not somebody who had an intention of going there? It would be a difficult thing to do.

Mr. PUGSLEY. She was driven by stress of weather. She did not go to Europe, but to Santa Cruz in the Canary islands.

Mr. CROSBY. Where are they ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In one of the oceans.

Mr. CROSBY. How far was she away from Europe when she was in the Canary islands ? The hon. minister has begun to show how much he knows about law and sailorizing. If she went to Santa Cruz, she was governed by the deck-load law. The hon. minister would not know that, would he ? If the Minister of Customs were here, or if anybody were here who knew about customs, he would know that, going to Santa Cruz, she would deposit $400 or $800, as the case may be, and that money would go into the customs and be handed over to the Receiver General. The government would not worry them about it, because the government would have the money, and if the owner wanted it back, he could make a demand for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He did make his demand; he made it fifteen years ago, and the matter was taken into the court.

Mr. CROSBY. If the hon. minister will wait until I get through, he will understand better——

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will take some time.

Mr. CROSBY. It may take the minister some time, but it will not take other people so long. And perhaps a few people in the country will understand. Any one who knows anything about the customs law knows that there are dozens of cases every year of ships being seized for infractions of the customs law and depositing $400 or $800 as the case may be, which money goes to the Receiver General, and even if they are guilty, the government does not worry themselves, because they have got the money, and, so far as the government is concerned, the question is settled. If the Minister of Customs were here, he could tell the Minister of Public Works that that takes place every month in the year.

Mr. BRODEUR. But the old government decided to give back the money.

Mr. CROSBY. The old government did many things that hon. gentlemen opposite said were wrong. Now, we want this government to do right. I have not had the honour of being here before, but now that I am here I want things to go right. I do not want to go back too far. But the papers in this case have been asked for by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I ask that the log book also shall be brought down which will show what took place every day from the time the ship cleared from St. John until she arrived in Europe. After she arrived in Europe, if she was there as a result of stress of weather, she would have to protest there and show the cause. When Mr. Cushing, or the owners of this vessel, can bring before parliament these papers and show that an injustice was done then, I shall be prepared to vote for this item but not before. I have heard enough to convince me that it is not fair to grant this money. Besides, in voting it, we should establish a precedent for every man who wanted to evade the customs law to clear his ship for a port where the law did not apply and to sail where he pleased. It will be unfair to the House and the country to pass this vote for various reasons which I do not wish to discuss at length. But I ask that the item shall be allowed to stand until we can get the papers before us to convince us that the circumstances were as these parties contend. If that is made clear, there will be nobody more ready than I to give Mr. Cushing all that is due him.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crosby) is asking something that I cannot supply when he asks for the log-book.

Mr. CROSBY. I will put the hon minister in the way of getting that—if he does not know how, I can tell him.

Mr. BRODEUR. These things happened fifteen years ago.

Mr. CROSBY. That does not matter.

Mr. BRODEUR. For my part, I would be willing to receive the opinion of Mr. Justice Parker.

Mr. CROSBY. I do not know Mr. Justice Parker.

Mr. BRODEUR. He was in charge of the case. He had to investigate the facts, and he reported that he was not able to reach a conclusion against the owners of the vessel. And, on the advice of the Department of Justice, and Mr. Justice Parker— Mr. Parker then, a lawyer—it was decided by the old government in 1896 to refund the money.

Mr. CROSBY. We have heard all that.

Mr. BRODEUR. But my hon. friend (Mr. Crosby) is charging me with trying to do something which is unfair, so I desire to state the facts that have come to my knowledge. It was decided by the old government to reimburse these parties. Formal instructions were given by the Department of Marine to the Department of Customs to give back the money. The Department of Customs said that the money was not in their hands, and so it was found that an order in council was required. A recommendation to council, was prepared, but the elections came on and the orders in council were not

passed. After the case had been withdrawn, and after the formal undertaking of the government of Canada, I think we are bound to carry out the obligations of the former government, whether we disagree with them or not. I have been through these papers, and I shall be glad to bring them down, and the hon. member can satisfy himself that the case that was proceeded with for three years by the former government, when they decided to repay the money, was gone on with in good faith, except that the formalities were not completed. It seems to me that it is only rendering justice to pay the claim under the circumstances. Whether the old government was right or wrong in prosecuting or not prosecuting that case is not the question. They decided not to prosecute but to abandon the case and pay the money. But the money was not paid, for the reasons I have given. To pay it under the circumstances would only be in accordance with justice.

Mr. CROSBY. The only argument the Minister of Marine and Fisheries puts up is that the old government recommended a lot of appointments when they went out of power. If he was going to do all that the old government did when they went out of power, I could understand his argument. But I say that the log-book is available in every British ship, it is returned to the Trade Association in Great Britain, and the minister, or his department, is the collecting agency in Canada for that association. He can see the log-book or can if he wants to. He acts as the collection agency for the Board of Trade in London, and he can write and get that log-book any time he wants to. When he brings these papers here and shows what the Minister of Public Works indicates, then I will be satisfied. But we have no proof. It is no use for the Minister of Public Works to tell me that because this deposit was made, and because the government did not bring an action, this man had a right to go and ask for his deposit. There never was a case of that kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a regular proceeding for bringing the matter to court, and that was done in this case.

Mr. CROSBY. I beg the minister's pardon. I venture the assertion that when the Minister of Customs is here I will prove by him that that is not the case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have had dozens of cases in that way.

Mr. CROSBY. You may have had dozens of cases trying to get the money back for the man who put it in; but there has never been any case where the customs brought suit against a man after he had deposited his money; there was never a case where, after the money was deposited, the Minister of Customs or his officers brought suit against the man.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The proceeding is this: The notice is given by the Minister of Customs before the seizure. The owner is notified within so many days to put in a claim. He puts in a claim, and then the matter goes regularly to the Exchequer Court. The Crown is the plaintiff and the claimant is the defendant.

Mr. CROSBY. When the ship is seized and the sum is stated, it cannot be less than $400, the owner of the ship deposits his money. But there is no case on record, where after the money was deposited, the customs brought action against the man who deposited the money.

Mr. BRODEUR. In this case, action had been taken by the government because it was for the payment of the penalty under the deck-load law.

Mr. CROSBY. What action did the government take?

Mr. BRODEUR. An action for the penalty.

Mr. CROSBY. Did they take any action after they got the $800?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, they took action for the recovery of the penalty provided under the deck-load law.

Mr. CROSBY. Didn't they have the penalty already?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. CROSBY. Then what are you going to get back if you have not got the penalty?

Mr. BRODEUR. When there is a violation of a provision of the Shipping Act, and action has to be taken for the penalty provided by law, they immediately seize the vessel. Of course the vessel can be released, and it is done very often, on the deposit of a certain amount of money. That was done in this case, and then the action instituted by the Crown goes on, and has to be adjudicated. We often take action in my department against infractions of some of the provisions of the Shipping Act. In this case the government, after the case had been standing on the docket for three years, decided to withdraw the case and refund the money.

Mr. CROSBY. The minister says that he brought a case. Of course he did, he seized the ship. His case was good and he got the money. Now what more do you want? The other poor fellow is the one who has got a case. He had a hard case, and he couldn't get his money back for twelve years, and no wonder he is willing to get it back without interest.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I am acquainted with several cases of infractions of the customs law where a ship is seized; the own-

ers want to obtain a release and put up a bond or a sum of money in order to obtain the release of the ship. Subsequently an action is taken, probably in the magistrate's court, to fix the penalty.

Mr. CROSBY. I would ask any man in this parliament if he ever knew a case in connection with the customs where an amount of money was deposited and action was brought, and the customs have got more than was deposited.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not a question of the violation of the customs laws, it is a question of the violation of the Shipping Act. The boat is seized, an action is taken by the Crown for the recovery of the penalty provided by the law, then the action goes on. In this case the action was withdrawn.

Mr. CROSBY. Who withdrew the action?

Mr. BRODEUR. The government decided not to proceed with this case, and the Department of Marine and Fisheries gave instructions to the collector of customs to reimburse the money.

Mr. CROSBY. Bring these papers down and if they prove that the case is as the hon. minister has described it we will give the money, but until then I will vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Sinclair). Carried.

Mr. CROSBY. The item is not carried. You cannot carry an item without taking a vote.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Sinclair). The hon. gentleman must have heard me declare the item carried.

Mr. CROSBY. You cannot carry it without taking a vote. I demand that you take a vote.

Indians — Quebec — to provide a further amount for relief, medical attendance and medicines, $6,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is that necessary?

Mr. OLIVER. A very large and unexpected expenditure has been necessary in connection with epidemics of typhoid fever at Oka and Escoumaine, and scarlet fever and measles at Caughnawaga and at the present time some twenty-five cases of small-pox amongst the Indians of Restigouche. In order to stamp out the epidemics at Oka and Caughnawaga it became necessary to establish tent hospitals and to place doctors in charge. Dr. Ouimet at Oka and Dr. Patton at Caughnawaga. The unavoidable expenditure in connection with the epidemics at Oka and Caughnawaga amounted to $2,874.58. At Restigouche there is a quarantine of 25 patients ill with small-pox, who have to be fed and in every way supplied with the necessaries of life, and reclothed after the epidemic has ceased. No accounts have yet come forward from this locality. The expense of the typhoid fever outbreak at Escoumaine is as yet unknown, but it will amount to a considerable sum. In addition to these causes for the usual estimate for this service being insufficient there remains the fact that unusual applications for relief have been received during the present winter, and there yet remains to be paid accounts for the three most severe months, January, February, and March.

Indians—Nova Scotia—to provide a further amount for relief, medical attendance and medicines, $6,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that for any special reason?

Mr. OLIVER. The appropriations for medical attendance and relief have been altogether inadequate, chiefly due to the outbreaks of small-pox at Bedford, Halifax county, at Indian Book Reserve, Hants county, and at Pictou Landing, Pictou county. At the latter place some thirty Indians are reported as having the disease. In Hants county five families are affected. In all cases provisions have not only to be supplied to the sick but to all the other Indians in quarantine. The necessary expenditure to combat these epidemics will be between $4,000 and $5,000. Unusual applications for relief of distress have also been received during the present winter, and there yet remains to be paid accounts for the three most severe months, January, February and March. The accounts received and unpaid amount to about $3,500. The probable expenditure for the last three months, including medical attendance and provisions for Indians for small-pox, and in quarantine in Hants and Pictou counties will be $2,500.

Indians—New Brunswick—to provide a further amount for relief, medical attendance and medicines, $1,200.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there a superintendent of schools appointed for the Indians of New Brunswick as proposed last session?

Mr. OLIVER. There was a superintendent of schools appointed—Rev. Father Ryan.

Indians—Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Northwest Territories—to provide for removal of St. Peter's Indians to Fisher river, $8,975.

Mr. LENNOX. How many Indians were removed?

Mr. OLIVER. The total number of Indians on the reserve is about 1,100, and it is expected that all or almost all will remove

to Fisher river. The work has been going on during the past summer, but the accounts are not in and we cannot say how many have actually gone. Thirty houses have been erected and there has been a great deal of material freighted over and preparation made for the accommodation of the Indians.

Mr. PERLEY. Why were these Indians removed?

Mr. OLIVER. It was part of the agreement necessary to secure the surrender of St. Peter's Reserve, a large reserve on the Red river quite close to the town of Selkirk, and in such a position as to be a considerable detriment to that part of the country. Under the arrangement it was necessary to get another reserve and make provision for removing the Indians to it.

Mr. LENNOX. I see that the next item is:

To provide further amount for surveys, $6,561.

Is that in connection with the same matter?

Mr. OLIVER. It was in connection with the adjustment of the right to the land in the reserve. In the reserve there were claims held by others than Indians, and it was necessary to have a survey to decide these claims, and also to dispose of the Indian lands. The Indian lands were to be sold when the surrender was secured.

Dominion lands—chargeable to capital—further amount required for surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, &c., $93,256.06.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would like to ask the minister is the expense of surveying these lands paid out of the proceeds of their sale? Do you charge the account for surveying the land to capital account and use the proceeds of the sale for current expenditure?

Mr. OLIVER. The cost of surveying Dominion lands is charged to capital account and the revenue from the lands is credited to current revenue.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would like to know upon what principle the minister considers the survey of land which is sold as a capital charge against the country and when the land has been disposed of why it should be considered as an asset of the country.

Mr. OLIVER. The land is given away. It is not treated as a source of revenue.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. We have received some $18,000,000 from Dominion lands and the surveys have been charged to capital. Would it not be better to charge to the proceeds of the land the cost of surveying?

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. FIELDING. There is something in that criticism, but the practice was established years ago, and it is convenient to follow it for the purpose of comparison.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Are these abuses to continue for ever?

Mr. FIELDING. It does not hurt any one.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. It gives a wrong impression as to our assets.

Mr. FIELDING. The cost of surveying is not treated as an asset.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. It gives an erroneous impression as showing a surplus which the country has not got.

Mr. FIELDING. I don't think it conveys any erroneous impression.

Mr. OLIVER. For instance, it would not be fair to charge the surveys of lands given to railways, and free homesteads, to the revenue from lands.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Every time you charge to capital account the country is supposed to have a corresponding asset.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, no. A railway subsidy is charged to capital, but there is no asset to represent it. If we were starting out afresh it might be well to charge the surveys to the revenue account, but there is convenience in following established methods.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If the expenses were paid out of current expenditure, would not your alleged surplus be so much less?

Mr. FIELDING. No, because the surplus is not established by reference to assets. We have lots of valuable property in Canada which we do not set down in our assets.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister is correct in what he says about assets, but my hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro) is perfectly right in his contention that if you charge this to capital account, which does not enter into your consideration of your surplus under your present method of bookkeeping it is obvious it would increase your surplus by that amount.

Mr. FIELDING. I admit that.

Seed grain, $40,000.

Mr. OLIVER. While the crop generally speaking was a very good one last year, the House will be sorry to hear that in the prairie area westward from Moosejaw and running along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to west of Medicine Hat, there was a dry season and the crops were very light. In other localities there was a loss of crop by frost and it is desirable that the homesteaders should not be short of seed this year. The cases in which there was a light crop last year were not

the cases of individual settlers, but applied to a section of country.

Mr. ROCHE. How will this be distributed?

Mr. OLIVER. By the immigration branch.

Mr. ROCHE. Not through the provincial governments?

Mr. OLIVER. No, this deals with homesteaders, and last year it included those who held patents. These the provincial governments are looking after this year.

Mr. ROCHE. What is the security ?

Mr. OLIVER. We take liens on their homesteads, being the only people who can take liens on their lands. The money is being expended now and it is particularly necessary to get the grain out in time.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is the grain for use this year ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is being distributed now.

Mr. ROCHE. Has the government any of last year's grain on hand ?

Mr. OLIVER. No. It was all disposed of last year.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. When did the government decide on this extra appropriation ?

Mr. OLIVER. About three weeks ago I received word from our immigration commissioner at Winnipeg that this amount would be required.

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL. How much of this will be spent on salaries and how much on grain ?

Mr. OLIVER. None will be spent on salaries, as this work will be handled by the immigration staff. Last year the work was so very extensive, we had to employ additional assistance, but that is not the case this year.

Mr. ROCHE. How did the government decide what parties should receive this ?

Mr. OLIVER. When we have information as to the requirements in any particular locality, an officer of the Immigration Department is sent there to investigate, and we act on his report.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Did the suggestion originate with the commissioner ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, during the latter part of the winter we were receiving communications at the head office here from different parts of the west, stating there was need for some assistance, and at the same time the commissioner was receiving applications in Winnipeg.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the district extend to both provinces ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but more largely in Saskatchewan than in Alberta.

Further amount required for engraving, lithographing and printing maps of the Dominion and Northwest Territories, $9,600.

Mr. BLAIN. Are those maps still purchased in the United States ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, they are the homestead maps which are drafted in the offices here and printed in Toronto.

Legal and other expenses incurred in connection with the arrest of certain Chinese in Sydney, Nova Scotia, $880.62.

Mr. FIELDING. This is for the payment of legal and other expenses connected with the arrest of 17 Chinamen alleged to have been smuggled into Canada from Newfoundland. They were fined $100 each, but through a flaw in the Act which has since been corrected, they could not be deported.

To cover unprovided items, 1907-8, as per Auditor General's Report, page C—4, $238,876.

Mr. PERLEY. I want to protest against an item of this kind. It is very strange that we should have an item now with regard to the year ending March 31, 1908. The government brings down its estimates and then its supplementaries for the same year before the session is closed, and then further supplementary estimates in the the following session at the end of the year. The supplementary estimates to March 31, 1908, were not passed until long after that date, because business did not proceed with as much expedition then as this year. It is very extraordinary that the government should expend over $300,000 for the year ending March 31, 1908, in certain items in excess of the amount provided for in the previous estimates they brought down. The various departments ought to be able to get more closely to what they require.

Mr. FIELDING. For very many years an item of this character has been brought forward. It is a bookkeeping entry which the Auditor General desires for the closing up of his accounts. In some branches of the departments, it will be found that the grants have been greater than the expenditure, but in some other branches the expenditure is somewhat greater than the grant. In most instances the items are quite small, but occasionally they are quite considerable. The Auditor General desires to have this as bookkeeping entry. When we consider the vast current expenditure of the Dominion, this over expenditure of $200,000 or $300,000, scattered over all the departments, cannot be considered very large. With the best we can do, there will be occasionally some over expenditure.

When an expenditure is current, you cannot always tell what it will amount to. If the excess is large, the Auditor General will refuse to pass it, but if small he lets it pass and asks that an indemnity be given in this way. $300,000 may seem very large, but distributed over the total business of Canada in a year, it is not excessive.

Mr. PERLEY. I understand very well that it is impossible for the government to get the amounts exactly right at first. As I remember, the supplementary estimates for the year ending March 31, 1908, were not passed until last May or June. How can there be any possible reason why these items, at least for last year, should not have been passed in the supplementaries for last year?

Mr. FIELDING. Of course the government are responsible for everything, but as a matter of fact this is a book-keeping matter which the Auditor General sends in. The Auditor General asks for this whenever his accounts are finally adjusted. The current year is practically at an end and yet you cannot adjust these accounts for some weeks. Before they are adjusted it will be discovered that here and there are some large over-expenditures, but the amount in this case is not unusually large.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I see $162,000 in one department.

Mr. FIELDING. There is difficulty there; in the working of the Intercolonial Railway there may be quite large over-expenditures, but when you take a large service like the Intercolonial Railway the amount is not excessive.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This must have been known last year.

Mr. FIELDING. It is the Auditor General who makes it known when he balances his accounts. It is his item particularly.

Mr. PERLEY. The first item is $29,000 for charges of management.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a large item, I have not the details here. My officials are not present.

Mr. PERLEY. That item was brought to the attention of the Auditor General later on when the accounts were being closed, but when the supplementaries were up the officers of the department must have known that this amount was going to be required to pay the Civil Service up to the 31st of March, last; but the estimates were not passed until May or June. Does the minister not think they should have had this in the supplementaries for last year?

Mr. FIELDING. That is that the departmental estimates should have been made more closely ?

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. PERLEY. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. In the Finance Department this is not an over-expenditure, the law has provided for it by a permanent statute.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me the whole proceeding is illegal.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I suppose so.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding House adjourned at 1 o'clock a.m. Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 29, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL.

Mr. LEWIS. With the permission of the House and the consent of the government I move that Bill (No. 108) of the Public Bills and Orders be now called.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LEWIS moved the second reading of Bill (No. 108) respecting the Saving of Daylight.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LEWIS moved that Bill (No. 108) be referred to a select committee of three members to consider and report upon the same, the said committee to consist of Mr. McLean (Sunbury and Queens), Mr. Monk (Jacques Cartier), and Mr. McLean (South Huron), with power to send for persons, papers and records, and report from time to time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am happy to agree with the motion, but I would amend it by adding the names of Mr. Lewis and Mr. Talbot to the committee.

Motion as amended agreed to.

ELECTION ACT AMENDMENT—RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. J. CONMEE (Thunder Bay) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 112) to amend the Election Act. He said: I may say in respect to this Bill that it is not my intention to press it with a view of its becoming law during the present session. The object of the Bill is to afford an opportunity to a class of citizens to exercise their franchise who could not otherwise exercise it because of the nature of their employment; I refer to railway employees. I am told that there are about 15,000 disfranchised because the duties of their service require them to be absent from the riding in which they reside, and in which they are on the list and entitled to vote;

the object of the Bill is to provide machinery by which this class of men can poll their votes. I am aware that it may be said this opens a wide door, that if this privilege be extended to this particular class of citizens it should be extended to others. I do not hold that view; I do not know of any other class of citizens in a similar position, at least if there are any their number is very small. These gentlemen are fulfilling what is really a public service. The mails must be carried, passenger traffic must be conducted, the train service on the great railways must go on, notwithstanding that it is election day, and these gentlemen are called upon in the performance of their duties to be absent from the riding in which they are entitled to vote, and in which they are on the list. The object of the Bill therefore is to provide machinery to give them the right to vote wherever they may be on election day. These gentlemen are entitled to vote, they have all the qualifications of voters, they are residents of the country, they have homes and interests in this country as well as any other class of citizens, and I think that parliament should provide the machinery by which they may cast their vote, notwithstanding that their calling requires them to be absent from the riding in which they could cast their votes under the Election Act as it stands.

The Bill provides that, at the request of any candidate, elector or electors, the returning officer shall provide such number of polls as are necessary to poll the vote of that class of electors in any riding in which they may be during election day, either in the province in which they are resident or in an adjoining province. It provides that such deputy returning officers shall be appointed by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, as may be necessary, and as polls will be held throughout the country on that day. There will be in the majority of cases polls held in sufficient proximity to railway points to enable the train service men to cast their vote in the ordinary polling booths which the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery may select for that particular day, but the deputy returning officer would require additional authority to that which he now possesses, namely, the authority to receive the votes of this class of electors and deposit them in a separate ballot box. It will be an easy matter for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to keep in touch with the election in such a way as to be able to nominate a very large number of deputy returning officers without incurring any additional cost, or at all events, very trifling additional cost. It may be that at some divisional points in some of the ridings a special officer would have to be appointed, but even so, the expense would not be very great. The Bill provides that the Governor in Council shall fix the polling places at divisional or other suitable points along the line of any railway; it provides that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall instruct the returning officer for the particular riding in respect of which a request is made for the holding of such poll, to forward to the deputy returning officers appointed for the purpose, all the necessary ballots, papers, stamps and forms to enable him to hold the poll, and to forward to him a ballot box which shall be labelled in these words: 'Ballot box in which the ballots of voters being railway employees for the riding of shall be deposited.' Provision is also made as to the procedure under which the elector is to be entitled to vote. He may obtain a certificate from the returning officer which will entitle him to vote at the polling booth named in the certificate. Upon presenting that certificate he may be required by the deputy returning officer holding the poll to sign a declaration to the effect that he is the person named in the certificate. The object of these provisions is to prevent manipulation and fraud at elections. The Act provides for the counting of the votes by the deputy returning officer, and the sending of the ballot box, locked and sealed, the same as in all other cases, to the returning officer of the riding affected, who is, under the machinery of this Bill, required to include the votes cast in the respective polling divisions in which the electors are resident and entitled to vote. The effect of this would be that the vote would be counted just in the same manner as if the elector were able to cast his vote in his own riding upon the day of the election. I noticed that when I mentioned that some of the provisions of this Bill were intended to prevent fraud at elections it caused a smile to appear upon the countenances of some of my hon. friends opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CONMEE. I am rather inclined to think that, notwithstanding that, they do understand what the word means. There is, I believe, in every election, and hon. gentlemen, I am quite sure, are aware of it, a considerable amount of manipulation. You can call it intimidation, you can call it fraud, or you can call it what you please, it is manipulation by which the voter is either compelled to lose his franchise or to vote perhaps in a different manner from that in which he would desire to vote. It is within the power of a railway company. I do not wish to convey the idea that any railway company in this country would so manipulate those in its service as to deprive them of their franchise, but I do wish to say that officials and subordinates of

these companies do act in that manner, and that men are sent out who, they know, will vote for a certain candidate or a certain party purposely to deprive them of the opportunity, while others are brought to the polling booth where it is possible for them to vote simply because there is a knowledge of their political leanings or of the candidate for which they may vote. This, I think, will do away with that class of manipulation. I do not believe there will be very much room for that if this Bill is worked out properly. I do not say it is a perfect measure. It is a tentative measure, and I propose to ask the House to refer it to the privileges and elections committee. I do not think that committee is very much overworked. I think it might very well take up this subject and that after the Bill has been dealt with a certain number of copies of it might be printed and distributed so that at the next session of parliament we would have a better idea than we have now as to the wisdom of passing such a law. They have adopted a similar law in some other countries. In western Australia they have a law which goes a little farther than this one. It gives to all absentee voters the right to vote by mail. The machinery provides for the voter obtaining a certificate, according to the form laid down in the Elections Act, and presenting that to an officer or magistrate during the seven days preceding the day of polling. He is allowed to vote according to the regulations laid down in the Act, have his vote mailed to the returning officer of the riding to which he belongs and have it counted in the same manner as other votes. The returning officer, under a clause of the law, opens these envelopes and counts the votes in the same manner as the ordinary votes placed in the ballot boxes are counted. I am not able to speak with any degree of knowledge or from experience as to the working of the law but it seems to me that it opens a very wide door for manipulation. It seems to me that the plan proposed by the Bill which I have introduced would be a safer measure and would leave less room for manipulation in the casting of the vote. Then, as to extending the vote to other classes of absentee voters; I know of no other class in the same position unless it be the mail clerks. There is quite a number of them. Their duties and service require them, in many instances, to be absent from the polling booth at which they are entitled to vote. If it is thought well to include that class of voters I see no objection. So far I have confined the Bill merely to railway employees. The absentee voter, if the measure were wider, would have less incentive to exercise his franchise in accordance with the interest of the country, or in accordance with the interest of the riding in which he might cast that vote. In this case the voter is a resident of the riding to which his vote is to apply, his family lives there, he has all the interest that any other voter would have in the election, and it seems to me that under these circumstances there is not much room for doubt that this class of voters, who are a very intelligent class of our citizens, would cast their votes with due regard to the best interests of the country. I would ask that the Bill be referred to the committee on privileges and elections.

Mr. STAPLES. I followed the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) very closely all through his remarks. He covered all the ground as far as I can see with the exception of one point and that is that I do not think he made any provision for special trains.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CEDARS RAPIDS MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 94) respecting the Cedars Rapids Manufacturing Company.—Mr. Boyer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When this Bill was last before the committee I suggested that the extension of time should be reduced from 1914 to 1912. That seemed to meet the views of the committee. A short time ago, however, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries spoke to me, and he would like the Bill to stand over for a short time, if the promoter of it is willing, as he wishes to make some inquiry with regard to it.

Mr. PERLEY. I wish to call the minister's attention to the fact that on Friday evening it was suggested that the date be changed from 1914 to 1911, and thereupon the minister gave notice that he would move that amendment to-day.

Progress reported.

KOOTENAY AND ARROWHEAD RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 80), respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—Mr. Geo. Taylor (Leeds).

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to say something in reference to this Bill, but as the promoter is absent, I move that we report progress on the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

QUESTIONS.

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE asked:

1. Have the following persons had contracts for supplies, &c., with the Department of Marine and Fisheries since the date

of Hon. Judge Cassels' report, viz.: James Murphy, W. R. Blakiston, James Holliday, Allison Davie, J. B. Coté, Jos. Samson, Terreau & Racine, Jean Drolet, E. Amyot, Charles A. Parent, A. N. Melvin, Howell & Co.?

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

No contracts have been entered into with the following persons by the Department of Marine and Fisheries since the date of Hon. Judge Cassels' report: James Murphy, W. R. Blackiston, James Holliday, Allison Davie, J. B. Cote, Jean Drolet, Elie Amyot, A. N. Melvin, Howell and Company, Jos. Samson.

Orders have been given to the following persons by the Department of Marine and Fisheries since the date of Hon. Judge Cassels' report:

Terreau and Racine, $164.04. This purchase consisted of grate bars, patterns for which are the property of the above-mentioned firm.

Chas. A. Parent, $22.00.

BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Who are the present stockholders of the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway, and what are their post office addresses?
2. What are the present ordinary passenger rates to intermediate stations between Brockville and Westport?
3. What are the present freight rates per cwt. in small lots to intermediate stations between Brockville and Westport?
4. What are the present freight rates per cwt. on carloads to different intermediate stations between Lyn Junction and Westport, and to Westport?
5. What are the rates during the season of navigation in competition with the Rideau canal to the various stations west of Delta?

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

1. The department has no information as to stockholders; but the following is a list of directors:

Name of Director and Post Office Address.
Edward R. Thomas, New York City.
John Gerkin "
Orlando F. Thomas "
Carster Heilshorn "
F. T. Lewis "
W. S. Buell, Brockville, Ont.
W. G. Curle "
Robert Bawk "
Wm. H. Comstock "
Jas. Cumming, Lyn, Ont.
W. C. Fredenburg, Westport, Ont.

2. The present ordinary passenger fares from Brockville to points on the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway are as follows:

Lyn	$0 15
Seeleys	0 25
Forthton	0 40
Elbe	0 45
Athens	0 60
Soperton	0 80
Lyndhurst	0 85
Delta	0 90
Elgin	1 10
Forfar	1 15
Crosby	1 20
Newboro'	1 35
Westport	1 50

3. The present freight rates are covered by the company's standard mileage tariff, governed by Canadian classification, and are as follows:

FROM BROCKVILLE.

Classes in cents per 100 lbs..

To	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Seeleys	10	8	7	6	5	5	4	4	4	4
Forthton & Elbe	12	11	9	8	6	6	5	5	5	4
Athens	14	12	11	9	7	6	6	6	6	4
Soperton	16	14	12	10	8	7	6	7	7	5
Lyndhurst & Delta	18	16	14	11	9	8	7	8	7	6
Elgin and Forfar	20	18	15	13	10	8	7	8	8	6
Crosby and Newboro	22	19	17	14	11	10	8	9	8	7
Westport	24	21	18	15	12	11	8	9	8	7

Less than carload shipments are covered by classes 1 to 4 inclusive, minimum charge for one consignment 35 cents.

The company have a special tariff on oil in barrels, L.C.L., as follows:

Brockville to Lyn	5 cts.	per 100 lbs.
" Seeleys	6	"
" Forthton and Elbe	7	"
" Athens	9	"
" Lyndhurst & Delta	10	"
" Elgin and Forfar	11	"
" Crosby and Newboro	12	"
" Westport	13	"

4. Carload rates are generally covered by classes 5 to 10 inclusive, although 4th class applies on carloads of high grade goods. In addition to the class tariff, the company have filed special carload commodity tariffs as follows:

Coke and coal, minimum 30,000 lbs.—Brockville to Athens, Delta and Elgin, 80 cents per net ton; Brockville to Newboro and Westport, 85 cents per net ton.

Brick, minimum 40,000 lbs.—Brockville to Westport, 4 cents per 100 lbs.

Under freight classification above referred to, 10th class would apply on heavy commodities, such as lumber and forest products, sand, stone, lime, cement, &c.; 9th class rates apply on live stock; 8th class on grain and grain products; 7th class on pitch, grindstones, mica, and certain ores; 6th class on machinery, agricultural implements, cream separators, &c; 5th class on

sugars and heavy groceries, also the majority of manufactured goods; 4th class on cotton goods, carpets, furniture, tea, spices, and other high class groceries.

5. During the season of navigation the following class rates governed by Canadian freight classification are in effect from Brockville to points west of Delta:

Classes in cents per 100 pounds.

To	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Elgin and Forfar	15	13	11	10	8	7	6	5	..	4
Crosby and Newboro	16	14	12	10	8	7	6	5	..	4
Westport	17	15	13	11	9	8	7	5	..	4

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—THE WALLBERG CONTRACT.

Mr. CROCKET—by Mr. Daniel—asked:

1. Has Mr. E. A. Wallberg completed his contract for the construction of the new Intercolonial Railway passenger car repair shop, passenger car paint shop, stores and office building, freight car repair and machine shops, at Moncton, New Brunswick?

2. What was the contract price under each contract?

3. What has been the total cost under each contract?

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

1. Yes. The works in question are completed; but final payments have not been made.

2. The passenger car repair and paint shops and the stores and office building was, lump sum, $146,445, with a schedule for additions or deductions. The freight car repair shop was, bulk sum, $56,630, with a similar schedule. Locomotive shops, bulk sum, was $430,000, with a similar schedule.

3. The amount paid to date for passenger car and paint repair shop and stores and office buildings, was $147,736.08. Voucher has been prepared for final estimate; but not paid, amounting to $72,304.75. Freight car shop, amount paid final estimate, $75,213.32. Locomotive shops, amount paid to date, $403,171.29. Voucher has been prepared for final estimate, but not paid, amounting to $81,740.

RAILWAYS IN SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. LAKE asked:

How many miles of railway were under operation in the territory now comprised within the boundaries of the province of Saskatchewan on December 31, 1896, and December 31, 1908, respectively?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Number of miles of railway in territory now comprised within the boundaries of the province of Saskatchewan on June 30, 1896, 1,185·96; and on June 30. 1908, 2,081·30.

Mr. GRAHAM.

RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS.

Mr. PORTER asked:

How many railway mail clerks have been killed or injured while on duty in Canada during the past two years?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Postmaster General). One killed, and thirty-six injured.

PILOTAGE RATES.

Mr. BARNARD asked:

1. Has any new scale of charges for pilotage services levied against vessels entering the port of Victoria, British Columbia, been made since the 26th February, 1908?

2. If so, what is the new tariff and what was the tariff prior to 26th February, 1908?

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

1. Yes.

2. The orders in council are published on page 557 of the 'Canada Gazette' of August 29, 1908. If the information contained therein is not sufficient for the hon. member's purpose, will he be good enough to move for a return, as the details of the pilotage rates in the district of Victoria and Esquimalt are too lengthy to be satisfactorily given in a reply to a request in this form?

PROPRIETARY MEDICINES ACT.

Mr. SEGUIN—by Mr. Lavergne—asked:

1. Has the government appointed officers or analysts to carry out the provisions of the law respecting proprietary or patent medicines, passed at the last session?

2. If so, what are the names of the officers or analysts appointed and the amount of their remuneration?

3. If not yet appointed is it the intention of the government to make these appointments soon?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. No appointments have been made.

2. No appointments have been made.

3. It is not the intention to make any appointments for the purpose mentioned.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ST. IGNACE WORKS.

Mr. C. ROY asked:

1. Were some works done at the St. Ignace station, on the Intercolonial Railway during the autum of 1908? If so, by whom were they ordered, and on whose recommendation?

2. If the said works were done, was it not at the request of other persons than those interested, the inhabitants of the said parish of St. Ignace, who requested the construction of a new station, or the enlargement of the present one for the convenience of the public?

3. If the said works are done, what kind are they, and what was the cost?

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

1. Yes. On the authority of the Department.

2. See number one.

3. For the erection and completion of an addition to the old station at Cap St. Ignace, for which tenders were invited by poster advertisement, and the tender of Messrs. Cloutier & Gaudreau, for $750, being the only one, was accepted, by order in council, and a contract awarded them at their tender price. The work has been satisfactorily completed, and the amount of their contract, viz., $750, paid them.

EAST HURON PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron) asked:

How much public money has the Dominion government expended on the construction of public works in the constituency of East Huron during the last 20 years?

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

$31,910.09.

FRUIT MARKS ACT.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

How many inspectors are employed under the Fruit Marks Act in each province, and the district each covers?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

Nine permanent and twelve temporary inspectors were employed under the Inspection and Sale Act for the season of 1908-9. The Dominion fruit inspectors are not as a rule assigned to any particular district or province, but are sent from place to place according to the movement of apples or other fruit. They have been distributed during the past season as follows:—In British Columbia, 1 permanent inspector; in Alberta and Saskatchewan, 1 permanent inspector; in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1 permanent inspector: at Port Arthur and Fort William, 1 temporary inspector; in Western Ontario, 1 permanent and 3 temporary inspectors: in Eastern Ontario and Quebec (including the ports of Montreal and Quebec), 4 permanent and 3 temporary inspectors; in New Brunswick, 1 temporary inspector assisted by a permanent inspector from Montreal; in Nova Scotia, 1 permanent and 3 temporary inspectors; in Prince Edward Island, 1 temporary inspector.

ANNUITIES ACT.

Mr. J. HAGGART asked:

1. What is the number and amount of life and yearly annuities respectively applied and paid for up to March 1, 1909?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The number and amount of life or yearly annuities applied and paid for (or which have been applied for and are being paid for on various plans, immediate last survivor; immediate, single; immediate, guaranteed for a number of years certain; deferred, single payment; deferred, lump sum and annual payments; deferred, by periodical payments), and the amount of purchase money received up to and inclusive of the 28th February, 1909, are and is as follow :

Number of Annuitants.	Amount of annuities applied for.	Amount of purchase money received.
42	$7,047 78	$35,859 56

Since that date up to and including March 27, 1909, the additional figures are as follows:

Number of Annuitants.	Amount of annuities applied for.	Amount of purchase money received.
39	$6,109 54	$14,503 10

Making a total of:

Number of Annuitants.	Amount of annuities applied for.	Amount of purchase money received.
81	$13,157 32	$50,362 66

FENIAN RAID VETERANS.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO asked:

Does the government intend during the present session to introduce any legislation granting any bounty or assistance to the veterans of 1866 and 1867? If not, why not?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It is not the intention to introduce this session such legislation for the reason that after consideration it is not found advisable to disturb the decision arrived at many years ago.

SHERBROOKE DRILL HALL.

Mr. EDWARDS asked:

1. When and to whom was the contract given for the Sherbrooke drill hall?

2. From whom were tenders received, and what was the amount of each?

3. What part of the work was covered by the original contract?

4. Has any of the work been let without tender? If so, what, to whom and the amount in each case?

5. What is the total estimated cost of the said drill hall complete and ready for use?

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

1. (a) Date of contract, November 7, 1907.
(b) Simoneau & Dion.

2.

Simoneau & Dion, Sherbrooke.. ..$ 82,000
Paquet & Godbout, St. Hyacinthe. 86,000
A. Joncas, Sherbrooke.. 117,000

3. Excavation, mason work, brickwork and tiling, carpenter work, plastering, iron and steel, felt and gravel roofing, sheet metal work, plumbing, painting and glazing.

4.

Subsequent tender asked for name stone in French from Simoneau & Dion	$ 98 50
Subsequent tender for heating from Simoneau & Dion	3,550 00
Boilers, Star Iron Co	617 24
Printing, advertising and translating	640 72
Travelling expenses	44 15
Supervising architect, J. W. Gregoire	931 40
Professional services, E. B. Worthington	43 95
Survey, J. Tremblay	70 00
Survey, J. Migneault	150 00
Work on grounds, test pits, &c. (pay-list)	195 05
Lumber, Fortier	5 21
Hardware, Bourque	25 41

5. $107,000, exclusive of site.

FISH HATCHERIES.

Mr. EDWARDS asked:

1. How many fish hatcheries are there in Canada?

2. Where are those in Ontario situated, what was the cost of constructing and maintaining each last year, respectively, including salaries?

3. How many applications for fry were received at the Ontario hatcheries last year, and how many were granted?

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

1. Thirty-five.

2. Sandwich, Newcastle, Ottawa, Wiarton and Sarnia. Sandwich, $14,354.55 maintenance; Newcastle, $3,934.30 maintenance; Ottawa, $2,825.59 maintenance; Wiarton, construction, $4,660; maintenance, $5,031.63; Sarnia, construction, $4,136.

3. Seventy-seven received; sixty-four granted.

CAMPBELLTON AND BRIGHTON MAIL

Mr. OWEN asked:

1. When was the contract for carrying the mails between Campbellford and Brighton relet for the year 1909, to whom was it given, and at what amount for the year?

2. What was the contract price last year?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for the Postmaster General):

1. Lowest tender that of E. R. Cryderman at $600 per annum accepted on the 17th March, 1909.

2. $365.

BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

Mr. ROCHE asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government, in view of the conference held with the provincial ministers of Manitoba, to introduce a Bill at this session of parliament to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba?

2. If not, what is the intention of the government in reference to this question?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have to remind my hon. friend that by a resolution adopted last session, this House authorized the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba, out of the Northwest Territories, to an extent therein specified.

Until the legislature of Manitoba has signified its acceptance of these boundaries, and until the Dominion government and the provincial government have come to an understanding as to the financial conditions consequent thereon, the government has no authority to introduce any legislation on this matter.

RURAL MAIL EAST NORTHUMBERLAND.

Mr. OWEN asked:

To what extent has a rural mail delivery been established in the county of East Northumberland?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for the Postmaster General):

A contract has been awarded providing for rural mail delivery between Brighton and Campbellford.

An application is now in the hands of the post office inspector for a rural mail delivery service on the route between Brighton and Lovett.

MAIL AT ST. JUSTINE STATION.

Mr. BOYER asked:

1. Has the Post Office Department already received complaints about the postal delivery service at the St. Justine station by the Grand Trunk Company?

2. On what dates and by whom were these complaints brought to the knowledge of the department?

3. Has the department made an inquiry into these complaints and adopted any preventive measures?

4. Has the government been informed by another person than the member asking this question that another accident of the same kind as those referred to happened on Friday, March 19, at St. Justine station, that is to say, that a mail bag fell under the wheels of the train and would have been damaged and its contents spilled on the track?

5. Does the department intend to compel the Grand Trunk Company to make a better delivery and by what means?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for the Postmaster General):

1. Yes.

2. 16th February, 1908; 19th March, 1908; 7th November, 1908. By the postmaster, Gustave Boyer, M.P., and J. A. Lortie, M.P.

3. Yes, and measures taken, which it was thought would prevent future accidents.

4. It is understood that on 19th March when the mail bag was thrown off at St. Justine station it was through suction drawn under the wheels of the train and the con-

tents of the bag containing unregistered mail matter badly mutilated.

5. The Post Office Department has no power to compel railway companies to stop trains for the exchange of mails. If the people of the locality consider that trains should stop, the matter should be brought to the attention of the Railway Commission.

FORT CUMBERLAND.

Mr. RHODES asked:

1. How much land, if any, is owned by the government embracing the site of Fort Cumberland, Westmoreland county, N.B.?

2. If owned by the government, is it under lease? If so, to whom and on what terms?

3. If not owned by the government, when was it sold, to whom was it sold and for what price?

4. When was the armament of this fort sold, to whom, and on what terms?

5. Has the government in contemplation any arrangement for preservation of this or any other ancient fortification?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The Department of the Interior has given the answers to questions 1, 2 and 3.

1, 2 and 3. This property was transferred to the Department of the Interior by order in council dated October 20, 1879.

4. Nothing is known in this department of the sale of any of the armament of the fort.

5. The only ancient fort which the government is at present engaged in preserving is Annapolis Royal in Nova Scotia.

1. Seventy-two (72) acres.

2. Yes. James Lowerison from year to year at an annual rental of $64, payable half yearly. Mr. William Miner, agent for Lowerison, is the present occupant.

3. Answered by Nos. 1 and 2.

PORT OF VANCOUVER—SHANGHAIING.

Mr. COWAN asked:

1. Did the commissioners appointed about two years ago to inquire into 'shanghaiing' at the port of Vancouver make a report?

2. If so, when and what action was taken by the government thereon?

3. Is the government aware that captains of vessels leaving British Columbia ports are still obliged when getting their crews to pay $35 per man to Sims, Levi & Evans, who in return guarantee that the seaman's wages shall not exceed $20 per month?

4. Is the government aware that there are about 70 sailing ships leaving British Columbia ports annually whose owners are still obliged to pay to this firm about $45,000 per year for crews, and that these crews are obliged to advance to the above firm about $32,000 annually, being at the rate of $25 per man?

5. What action, if any, does the government propose to take to abate this evil?

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

1. Yes.

2. No action was taken as the commissioner gathered from the evidence adduced that the conditions at the port of Vancouver do not differ materially from those obtaining in other seaport towns throughout the empire.

3. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has only recently been informed that this firm is operating in Victoria, and the matter is receiving attention. Some of the contracts to supply men are made with this firm by the owners of the ships in Great Britain before the ships leave there.

4. No.

5. The facts will be ascertained, and whatever action is possible to meet the difficulty will be taken.

SAULT STE. MARIE CHANNELS.

Mr. BOYCE asked:

1. Who were the contractors for placing buoys in the old channel from Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., to the head of St. Joseph's island, and from Point aux Pins to Batchewana, during the season of 1908?

2. Was the work let by contract? If not, who had charge of it, upon what terms, and why were tenders not invited?

3. What was the amount paid for the placing of buoys in these waters, during the preceding five years, and to whom were such moneys paid respectively?

4. If the work was let by contract, was it open to public competition?

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

1. Roderick A. McLean, of Sault Ste. Marie.

2. Work was let by contract to Roderick A. McLean, of Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.; the service from Sault Ste. Marie to the head of St. Joseph's island at $215 per annum, and the service from Point anx Pins to Batchewana at $400 per annum. Tenders were invited for the service between Sault Ste. Marie and the head of St. Joseph's island in 1899, and the contract was awarded to Mr. McLean, who has performed the service under contract since that date. Tenders were invited for the service between Point aux Pins and Batchewana in 1904, and the contract was awarded to Mr. McLean, who has performed the service under contract since that date.

3. The price paid for maintaining the service from Sault Ste. Marie to the head of St. Joseph's island, was $215 per annum, and for the service from Point aux Pins to Batchewana $400 per annum. The contract prices were paid each year to Mr. Roderick A. McLean.

4. Yes.

PACIFIC COAST FISHING LICENSES.

Mr. COWAN asked:

1. How many seining licenses for fishing on Pacific coast waters are now current?

2. To whom have they been granted?

3. What is the area covered by each license?
4. How many of these licenses are being operated by the original licensees, and how many by aliens?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The answers to questions 2 and 3 are so voluminous that I would ask the hon. gentleman to let them stand as notice of motion. I will procure the information immediately.

Stands as notice of motion.

DREDGING AT STE. ANNE DE BELLEVUE LOCKS.

Mr. BOYER asked:

1. Has the government received a petition signed by several navigation companies on the Ottawa river, asking for certain dredging works in the river of that name below the locks of Ste. Anne de Bellevue, which would have the effect of shortening the course of the canal?
2. If so, what are the names of these companies?
3. Has an engineer been sent to this place to ascertain the possibility and utility, of these works?
4. Does the report admit the justification for these works?
5. What does the government intend to do in the exigency?

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

1. Yes.
2. The Sincennes-McNaughton line, the Montreal Sand and Gravel Company, Quinlan and Robertson, the Ottawa Forwarding Company, and the Ottawa Transportation Company.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. Matter under consideration.

MR. BREWSTER.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. Is Mr. Brewster still in the employ of the government as immigration agent for the eastern townships?
2. If not, when were his services dispensed with, for what purpose and on what date?
3. Has any one assumed the duties of immigration agent for the eastern townships since the date of Mr. Brewster's retirement?
4. Is it the intention of the government to appoint an immigration agent for the eastern townships? If so, will the appointment be of a temporary or permanent nature?
5. Is the government aware that there is a great dearth of farm labour in the various counties of the eastern townships, and that an active immigration agent is urgently needed in that locality?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of Interior):

1. No.
2. First of November, 1908, on termination of engagement.
3. No.

Mr. COWAN.

4. An appointment will be made for the season.
5. The government is aware that there is a need of farm labour in the eastern townships.

DEFENCE FOR OUR SEA COAST.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved:

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

He said: I desire to state in the first place, that this resolution, which I have the honour of introducing, was handed in to the clerk by me before the session opened, and appeared on the first Order Paper. It is therefore not one which has arisen out of the later events and circumstances which are in the minds of all present. I also wish to state that it was not conceived, and is not introduced to-day, in any party spirit. In making that statement, I am absolutely candid and open. Party spirit in Great Britain, has not generally intruded itself upon great questions of international interest, and in our country, though we have many subjects which produce keen contests between the parties, I may be permitted to express the wish that those questions that concern national defence and Imperial obligations may be kept as far outside of party politics and party contention as they are in Great Britain. It is in that spirit and with that intent that I move this motion. For a good many years I have been more and more impressed with the necessity of our facing the question involved in this resolution. Nothing particular has been done with it so far in parliament. I do not think that we mitigate any difficulties by avoiding them, or get rid of any of our responsibilities by evading them, and it seemed to me that the time had now come when the parliament and people of Canada should sit down together and take stock of the position and come to some conclusion as to whether they have duties, and what thes duties are, regarding the great question of the defence of our common heritage.

Now we have, I myself have, all sympathy with that class of good and estimable men who declare that war is horrible, that its burdens are almost intolerable, and that its effects are wide reaching and in the main injurious, and who, in our country as in others, declare that we want no armaments no militarism, no defences, that ours is an

era of peace, and that we should strive, as best we can, to make good this in principle and in action, without arbitrament of war. But whilst I have sympathy with this view, I have taken into account the history of the world and the lesson it teaches. And whether I be right or wrong, I draw from the history and experience of the world this one great fact that force, absolute physical force, lies at the foundation of all our progress and civilization. In the primeval times, physical force expressed itself and exposed itself in bare and brutal form. To-day it is surrounded with, and disguised by the trappings and refinements of civilization; but in the last resort, it is there. Just as underneath the varied soils, beautiful in varied growth, there yet lies the solid granite-base, the foundation and guarantee of permanence, so under all the civilization and refinement of to-day, there is to be found, in the last analysis, the appeal to physical force. A man meets his neighbour, as individual against individual. If he can persuade him by argument, if he can prevent and restrain him by quoting the law and the conventions of society, well and good; but if none of these prevail, it is his right and duty to defend himself by sheer physical force. In the family, the school, the city, the province, the country, the situation, in the last analysis, is similar. If there are mischevious members of society, who are not amenable to christian teachings or to moral ethics, then the force of the law has to deal with them, and the constable, the policeman, the militia and the standing army, if need be, are resorted to as the personification of a physical force that is conclusive. If this is true of society and the individual, it is equally true with reference to nations. From the earliest times to the present, there have been mischievous, unscrupulous and ambitious peoples, which has compelled resort in the end to physical force. We deduce therefore this fact that to defend and to preserve is the right and the duty of the individual of society, and of the nation, and that if it is necessary to do this by force, then force must be invoked. The right and duty of the individual is the right and the duty of the aggregation of individuals, that is of the nation itself. As we find the selfish and the unscrupulous and the strong preying upon society, so among nations it has always been, so it is now and so, as far as I can see, it will be for our own lives and very probably for many generations thereafter. In fact the more inviting the situation that a country possesses, if it is combined with weakness and lack of preparation, the more that country becomes the prey and the mark of the ambitious, of the unscrupulous, of the strong. There are considerations which act as restraints, the jealousies of surrounding nations, the ententes cordiales, the pacts, the agreements, the commercial ties, the world's conscience—all these restrain and retard and moderate. But some day all these become storm swept and the naked sword flashes out in defence of altar and hearth-fires. All history teaches the lesson of this insecurity and that the nation which is forewarned and forearmed, which makes its preparation with proper care, is the only nation that has reasonable security and guarantee of existence.

Take, if you will, the last 50 years of the greatest and most civilized century of the world. Take the last 50 years, and what are the examples! The fire that was kindled on the Crimea, the blood-red streams that ran in India, the long struggle in the United States between the South and North, the Anglo-Italian war, the Franco-Prussian campaign, the Spanish-American battles, the British-Boer war, and the Japan-Russian war,—all these are outstanding, large examples of the fact that all the restraints of Christian morals and of ethics are impotent to curb the ambitions and the passions of nations, examples of the sad disappointments of those who have believed that the era of peace, and enduring peace, had been at last ushered into existence. To-day we must come to the conclusion that neither Christian teaching nor peace conventions, nor strong commercial liens, nor Hague conferences nor Triple alliances, nor Berlin Treaties, can guarantee peace. In a single night, within the last few weeks, a great nationality tore in tatters the Treaty of Berlin, and the lurid war cloud hovered over the Balkans and shot its lightnings into every chancellory in Europe and even to-day the unrest is not stilled.

Sir, into this world of trouble, of uncertainty, amongst this world of nations, Canada has pushed forward to her place. She has taken a position which is important now, which will become more and more important as the years advance. Her ship of state is launched on the world's waters, it is open to every storm, it is exposed to every danger. She cannot escape the common burden, she cannot neglect the common duty, she cannot ignore the common responsibility. I do not believe that she wishes to. Having entered the game, I believe that it is the disposition of the Canadian people to play it valiantly, to play it honourably, and to play it successfully. If her sons have the pride of manhood, as I believe they have, if they know what the stern joy of contest means, if they have proper faith in their high destiny, if they visualize any adequate picture of the future, it seems to me it is up to the people of Canada and to the manhood of Canada to

prove their faith and their worth by their works, to grasp the full meaning of their heritage and its responsibilities and to prepare to defend it as well as to develop it. And what has Canada to defend? Her vast national resources, ever unfolding, inestimable in quantity and of excellent quality, but more significant in one sense, in the particular time at which in God's good providence she has commenced to enter into their development, the time in the history of the world's advancement in which she has commenced to exploit, in this last great west, what is to be of such worth, of such value and of such resource to the whole world. Her extended coast line, her ports, her harbours, with coal supplies at the pit's mouth almost open to the bunkers of the vessels, with immense resources of food supply, with her rivers and her lakes stretching through the centre of her vast country, face to face, east and west, with two vast oceans just across which two immense masses of human activity—on one side, in the Orient, 350,000,000 people waking up into a new life, an activity the outcome of which no man at present living can define; on the other side, face to face with the activities of the old and well-known nations of Europe; on the south, face to face with the most compact and powerful people on the globe, and in the background, the wide cool reaches of the north, silent and mysterious. Was there ever a national stage set and equipped as this one? The actor has taken her place on that stage; the play must proceed. How shall she interpret her parts to this, the greatest auditory of the greatest century the world has seen.

Then observe her lines of communication and transport, built by her own people, aided with money from foreign countries and mainly from Britain. Look at the development of her transportation system—whether directed by policy, whether it was providence, whether it was what we may call the compulsion of circumstances, there it lies. All the great lines of railway transport east and west, moving from the central zones towards the ocean on the west, or to the ocean on the east; watch her rivers flowing east and west and the great lakes which empty therein, river and lake passing close to the homes of the farmer and the marts of our people, stopping by the side of her wharfs and her docks, and saying: Here I am ready to work, load me up with your treasures, and I will bear them to the sea. And so along the lines of railway transport and the great lines of natural transport by lake or river, we are everywhere seeking the seaport for embarkation, everywhere bound outward on the pathway of the sea to foreign ports and foreign markets; and the one absolute condition of prosperity and permanency is

that the ports of embarkation and the sea path to the ports of ultimate destination, must be secure. That is the essential thing.

Well Sir, suppose that to-day whilst we are living in fancied peace and security—which is not real peace and security—suppose that to-day a third-class cruiser should show her face in Victoria and Vancouver, or in Halifax and Sydney, or in St. John, or Quebec or Montreal, would not a great deal of this fancied peace and security into which we have lulled ourselves, in which we expect an abiding and never to be interrupted repose, quickly pass away, to be succeeded by deep anxiety? Sir, the question forces itself on us. Six and a half millions of people with their mighty heritage, and yet to-day no adequate defence in her great seaports from a third-class cruiser which might suddenly appear within her gates! It makes us think. We can excuse it, we can palliate it, we can laugh it off, we can say it is fanciful to put the question to ourselves just that way; but it ought to make us think, and ought to make this parliament think, and every good citizen of his country think. But, says some one, oh, that is fanciful. We have safe embarkation, and we have a safe convoy across the ocean east and west and south. Yes, Mr. Speaker, but by whom is this safe embarkation and the safe convoy provided? Negatively it is not provided by Canada. Hitherto we have been busy in Canada in fighting the wilderness, in subduing the soil, in spending our labour and our money in developing the vast resources of a virgin half continent. We have not done it badly; in my opinion we have done it well, on the whole. We have laid at least the firm foundations of a nation in the present and the future prosperity of which we ourselves feel confident.

But, Mr. Speaker, development is not defence. Sometimes we hear it argued that it is a contribution to Imperial defence. We have developed our country for whom. For ourselves, for the settlement of our immense lands. We have opened them for ourselves, and for the strangers whom we welcome and make part of our own people. We have built great lines of railway, we have built them for the transport of our own commodities, the opening up of our own country, and for the development of our own wealth and our own resources. True, a great transcontinental railway affords a line of transport for Britain's troops, the empire's troops, from ocean to ocean. But every soldier that traverses it pays his passage money, and the British government finds the money with which to pay that passage. It is true that we have developed, and it is true that we have made this country great, and it is true that by

doing so we have materially enhanced the might and power of the empire in that sense; but in the sense that we have made any contribution to the burden of the defence of the empire, or of ourselves, I do not think it can be contended. It is a fact, is it not, Mr. Speaker, that this development may be even a source of weakness, external and internal! If we develop our great resources and make no provision for their defence, two effects follow. It weakens us in the outside world, because it displays our riches and shows them weakly held; and it weakens us with ourselves, because in the peace, and enjoyments, and business of development we grow careless, and less inclined to make proper provision for reasonable defence.

It is true that we have developed a militia system, and a militia force. It is not all it ought to be, it is not all we hope to make it. It has progressed, but it has a great deal of room in which still to progress and become better fitted to fulfil its work in the future. But we have developed a militia system, which personifies the physical force of the Dominion of Canada. That militia force has done excellent service for our country on several critical acsasions, and some units of that militia have gained imperishable glory on a foreign field, and though we doubt not it will do what it can, and do its duty bravely, yet if the great peril of war descended upon us, whilst our militia would stand to their colours, and march to their orders, the eyes of all Canada would be turned in wistful longing for the regular troops of the British army to come and help their children and their brethren. Our ultimate dependence would be in British power.

But as to naval defence, what have we done? I think we might just as well be frank with ourselves and say we have done nothing. From the earliest dawn of history, commerce and the protection of commerce have gone hand in hand. They have sailed the seas together, and worked out their beneficent purpose of development and protection side by side. You cannot point in history to a single commercial people that neglected to provide a protection more or less adequate for their commerce. We are a people nearly a century old with the mighty heritage of which I have spoken, a heritage which is not simply for our own enjoyment but which is to be transmitted to the generations—the far distant generations—that succeed us. We to-day sit in this parliament and live in this country and we have to acknowledge to each other, if we will be frank, that we have done no single effective thing in the way of naval defence. Ah, but one says: we have taken over Esquimalt and Halifax. Yes, we have, and we have undertaken to relieve the British government of a certain amount of expense. We have taken them over and we foot the bills for them, whatever they are, but we might as well be frank here and say that as to their effective force right here and now they do not bulk largely. You have to judge these things by the test of actual war and if actual war broke out and a cruiser appeared at Esquimalt or at Halifax of what avail would these be? Have we the guns, have we the torpedoes, have we the mines, have we the machinery, have we the trained men even if we had the machinery? Such statements serve to salve our conscience when it pricks us, they are nice to round out a sentence in a speech upon the hustings, but we must come down from all this, if we are frank with each other, and say that they cut a very pitiful figure in the line of actual, efficient naval defence. They are the bases around and upon which we may build but, it seems to me, that is about the best that can be said of them. Oh, but says another: we have bought and built fishery protection vesels. Yes we have, and what are the fishery protection vessels?—constables of the coast sent out to guide harmless fishing smacks in the line of duty, to keep them from coming within the magic boundary line and to control them in various and sundry ways according to national and international regulations. That is what they are, but as an offset against an attacking fleet, an attacking cruiser, or an attacking vessel of any kind, what are they? They are simply children's toys, only that and nothing more. A third-class cruiser showing her nose to any one of these fishery protection cruisers would cause her to get within a harbour as quickly as her heels could carry her there, or, if she refused to go into harbour, would quickly put her under water. We cannot bank much on the fishery protection vessels as a naval defence against imminent or future danger. Whilst this is the case and whilst we take off our hats and cheer as the magnificent first line of defence in Great Britain makes its procession before royalty in the North Sea we have to admit that in comparison with other dependencies and overseas possessions Canada stands silent and shamed. In the meantime, whilst we have been doing nothing, Cape Colony, a comparatively poor colony and sparsely populated, has made a contribution of £50,000 annually; Natal, a small and comparatively poor colony and of sparse population, has made its contribution of £35,000 annually; New Zealand has given £40,000 annually, now increased to £100,000, and Australia, £200,000, altogether a contribution of a million and three-quarters of dollars per year, whilst the British taxpayer goes down in his pocket for £34,000,000—

$3.60 per unit—to maintain the naval defence of the empire. But when we read these names, Natal, Cape Colony, New Zealand and Australia, the name of Canada does not appear, and as we look at that procession in the first line of defence we come to the conclusion, and it is not an exhilarating one, that not only have we not put a dollar into the naval defence of Canada for her own coasts, but that not a ship in the procession bears the name of Canada and that not a stiver or a sixpence of the mighty expense of that great battle line has been contributed out of the money of Canada. Well, I say that this grips attention. It gives us, at least, to press it no further, reason for thought. To some, and I confess to myself, it appears necessary for very shame's sake, that we did something and did something adequate. But says some objector, Great Britain is bound to protect the empire, her prestige demands it, her necessities demand it. Well, all I have to say of that argument at the present time is, that it is not the argument of the brave, or of the generous-hearted, or of the self-respecting, or of the properly independent man, and it is not the argument for a young and growing people which is a candidate for admission amongst the nations of the earth. The most sublime figure in all history, the one that grows upon one as he views it in the light of the history of 500 years, to go back no farther, is the figure of the old mother empire, the great-hearted mother who has given birth to the young nations that circle the globe, the great-hearted mother that has gone outside of her own kith and kin and has mothered nation after nation, people after people, continent after continent, brought them out of darkness and slavery and set them upon the path of a better civilization. That grand old mother nation, endued with great heart and more than Titanic force to sustain world burdens—behold her course. Watch her in India and see what she has done for its three hundred million people, follow her in Egypt and see what she has done for the physical, the moral and the national betterment of that country, everywhere we know that she has done more in beneficient, scientific, humanitarian, uplifting action than any country in any age of history. What has she done in Africa, what has she done in America, from those early times when her armaments, her soldiers and her navy began to carve out of this North American continent the great heritage which she once enjoyed upon this continent a large portion of which she has given over to us. To-day, Great Britain has her armed guards on the Pamirs, and in the passes of the Himalayas, her sentinels on every frontier line, her sailors and flag in every sea, her bodies of living scarlet and khaki here and there dispersed throughout the world and though she has done all that and bears the immense burden to-day, she has yet to exact the first penny of tribute from any country that she has liberated or any people that she has made free. Every dollar of the money, every drop of the blood worth more than money poured out so lavishly and so long in those great world efforts has been contributed by the people of the British Isles. For five centuries the patient, toiling British taxpayer has paid the bill and paid it with a cheerful countenance, and so far without grumbling. Can you find in the history of the world any more sublime figure and any more benificient instrumentality for good worked in so unselfish a way and borne so cheerfully and unstintingly by the few millions of people that live in the islands in the North Sea? What rank ingratitude in us, of all people, to shield our selfish indifference to the sacrifices of such a mother behind such an argument. Well, but, says some one: 'We are safe in Canada, the Monroe doctrine will be all that we need, the United States will not allow any foreign country to plant its flag on the soil of the North American continent, we are immune, because of the Monroe doctrine.' Mr. Speaker, the Monroe doctrine and the United States of America might guarantee our safety from foreign invasion but what would be the price that Canada would have to pay? The humiliation of it would be like the Cain's mark on the brow of every Canadian; the degredation of it would eat into the heart of every man until he grew servile and cringing. The price we would have to pay would be continual demand, continual concession, until at last absorption finished the craven course, covered up our name and blotted out our hope of a national future. Bad enough for us to hang on to the apron strings of a loving opulent mother, but when we have grown to manhood it is the negation of every principle of manhood and independence that we should live in our national home by the grace of the stranger, however well intentioned and kind he might be. I put away the Munroe doctrine as absolutely unthinkable for us as a shelter under which to grow up to national manhood. I come then to the conclusion, imperfectly argued out I know, first: That protection is necessary, absolutely necessary; that we cannot as a people owe our protection to the United States of America, or to any other foreign power; that that protection must either be borne by ourselves or by ourselves in conjunction with Great Britain and in co-operation with the mother country.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments then to take up the question of how this protection is to be given. In the first

place I recall the circumstances under which my motion was introduced and what has taken place in the way of more or less important events since. Recollect that my motion deals simply with a stated, regular, uniform, normal line of proceeding and policy. Let us argue that out first. It seems to me that when you boil down all the propositions that are made you get down to two propositions, one or the other of which must in the end be adopted, and I desire for a very few moments to canvass these two propositions not as an advocate who has dogmatically made up his mind and who admits of no reason on the part of one who takes the oposite thought and might wish the opposite course. But let us as far as we can, think around them and see what the two mean.

The first is the policy of a fixed annual contribution in money to the British government or the British admiralty. Now, that divides itself apparently into two branches but it is really the same thing. One man says: Send one million dollars or two million dollars a year; another man says: Send a Dreadnaught or two Dreadnaughts, and so far as Canada is concerned these two are absolutely one. We are not in a position to build and equip and send over Dreadnaughts. When we translate our contribution into Dreadnaughts it comes down in the end to money which would be sufficient to build and equip a Dreadnaught and therefore I say there are both parts of the one proposition, an annual fixed contribution of money to the British government for the purpose of national and imperial defence; or if you would rather have it, for the purpose of Canada's defence through imperial co-operation and imperial supreme command in war times. The first difficulty in that is as to fixing the amount of the contribution. The very moment that you sit down in council and say: Let us talk the matter over and fix the proportion that Canada ought to give, you come upon a pretty difficult question. The British taxpayer pays $3.60 per head and that translated in equal proportions to the Canadian taxpayer would mean an amount of money which would be something appalling. Then again; how long shall the sum which you fixed to-day remain the proper sum, and will it be subject to constant revision, constant negotiation, and may be occasional disagreement and consequent troubles. That is one difficulty that arises when you discuss a proposition of a fixed annual money contribution. Another objection raised is that it smacks too much of tribute, that we are a free people, and we do not want to be paying a contribution to the old country for this or for any other purpose. I do not take much stock in that objection. Not one atom of our autonomy, not one atom of our independence, not one atom of our power as a parliament is taken away from us because we decide and by vote do place a certain sum of money into the hands of the British government or the British admiralty to be applied to the purpose of our and the Empire's defence. It is not demanded of us; there is no tribute unless there is force, and unless there is a specific demand which brings the tribute. A fixed sum may be a most willing gift of the most liberty enjoying legislature in the world.

But one says: We pay, but we do not control. That is true; but what are we paying for? We are paying for a portion of the defence of the empire, including ourselves. If we believe that the British government and the British Admiralty have the widest experience, the greatest knowledge, the plans of war more thorough, the expert skill, every appliance and every accompaniment of the effective use of the money which we give, does it matter after all so very much whether we follow the course of the expenditure of that money or not? So that I do not take too great stock in that objection.

Another objection put forth is that it impinges on our autonomy. I have dealt with that in a few brief sentences. To me it does not seem that a free contribution interferes in the least with our autonomy, with our own full and free legislative liberty or in fact with any other kind of liberty which we possess.

Another objection that is made is that Britain may use our contribution in unjustifiable wars, and that we should guard ourselves carefully lest we make a contribution for the equipment and strengthening of a fleet which may be used in wars that we do not approve of. That might be with some countries an objection; but if you take the history of Great Britain for the last fifty years or more, you may pretty fairly come to the conclusion that, as she has not and is not now, so in the future Great Britain will not be liable to carry on unjustifiable wars of conquest. She has more territory than she needs. Her trouble now is to administer the wide territory which she has. Her business now is to defend the borders, already if anything too far enlarged, of her territory. The whole spirit of the old country and its history for the last half century, may make us pretty sure that wars of conquest, undertaken for aggressive purposes and for mere lust of battle, are not likely to take place so far as Great Britain is concerned.

While these objections have some force, though as I think not a force that is irresistible, there are some reasons which appear to me to have deeper force with reference to that method of taking our part in defence. I do not know whether I can make myself understood to the members of this House on this point, but I shall briefly try to do so.

The first and greatest objection which I have to a fixed money contribution is that it bears the aspect of hiring somebody else to do what we ourselves ought to do; as though a man, the father of a family, in lusty health and strength, should pay his neighbour something per month for looking after the welfare and safety of his home instead of doing that duty himself. That seems to me, when you work it out, to be a basic objection to this form of aid. It goes still further than that. Suppose you contribute this year your sum, and next year your equal sum, and thereafter year after year. After ten or twelve, or twenty, or thirty years, you will have paid out an immense amount of money. You will have been protected in the meantime ; but in Canada itself there will be no roots struck, there will be no residue left, there will be no preparation of the soil, or beginning of the growth of the product of defence. Yet some time or other, no one can doubt that with resources and with a population constantly increasing, we must and will have in this country a naval force of our own for our coast and home defence.

The interest that we take in a contribution spent by another is not the interest that I desire for Canada. I want to see something grafted on the soil of Canada's nationhood, which takes root and grows and develops until it incites the spirit of defence in this country, leads to a participation in the defence, leads to that quick interest in it, its glories, its duties and its accomplished work, which is after all the one great thing that compensates a people for great expenditures either on land or on sea in the way of defence and of the maintainance of the rights of the country.

Again, it disjoins what has been joined together from the earliest days of the world's existence—commerce and the protection of commerce. After all, the basic idea of a naval force is the protection of the commerce of a country. A commerce side by side with its protector, and its protector side by side with the growing commerce of a country, flourish best together, and are the surest helpers to each other. That is the idea which is in my mind—that when we make our contributions in the way of a fixed sum and it goes from us, and we are not responsible for it, we have none of the inspiration arising from the growth and development of a system of future defence in our own country. We are deprived of the larger benefit ourselves, and in the future we do no greater service to the empire of which we form a part, in this matter of defence.

Then, again, I think this method ignores the necessities and the aspirations and the prospects of a great people such as the Canadian people are destined to become. We must have beginnings; these must at first be small; but some time, or other, as I have said, our country will have its naval force for the defence of this country if for nothing else. The point with me is as to whether it is not the greater wisdom to sow the seed at once and cultivate its growth, as best we may, in our circumstances and with our resources, until at last we arrive at that stage of expansion which we have reached in other great lines of our country's progress. You will notice that while I have tried to discuss the pros and cons in connection with this method, while I have stated reasons in favour of and others against it, my own mind tends rather towards the employment of another form than that of an out and out money contribution.

The second policy to which I would refer is the assuming by ourselves of the defence of our own ports and coasts, in constant and free co-operation with the imperial forces of the mother country. Let us see what are the objections to and what may be urged in support of that second policy. It has its advocates and its opponents. In the first place we begin with no plant, no expert skill, no trained cadets, no trained sailors. In those respects, Canada is a blank sheet. Whatever may be necessary has to be collected and assembled and developed with such expedition and in such abundance as circumstances will allow. Under that system our first vessels would be British built, British equipped, British manned, British officered from stoker to captain. There is no other way in which we could proceed. We are absolutely bare of the skill, the experience, the training and the machinery necessary to put one single war vessel on a proper footing; but—and it is but the beginning of a circle—the first Canadian owned vessel, built and eqipped in Britain, and sent out to defend our coasts would become the nucleus and the training ground of Canadian stokers, Canadian sailors, and Canadian officers, and by and by perhaps, of a Canadian admiral on the Canadian coast. How much time would be taken in completing that circle none of us can say, but if we begin the tracing of it and follow it fairly and faithfully, the time must come when we get a complete circle and have an imperial adjunct to the British navy for the defence of Canada and the defence of the empire, in which Canada has some of her body, her bones, her blood, and her mental power, her national pride. Then would come the dockyard, which would be of sufficient size to enable us to repair the smaller vessels and in time build the smaller class of vessels that we need at first, to be implemented by co-operation between Canada and Great Britain in the shape of a dockyard sufficient to dock any lame vessel of the Bitish navy that might happen to limp to our coast

and require refitting and repairs. And so, in that progressive, gradual way working up to the fullfilment of this idea, a defensive force in Canada which would be an auxiliary in the case of an outbreak of actual hostilities, which would be sufficient for the ordinary surveillance of our coasts and which would be, in time of war, sufficient to work in conjunction with the main portion of the fleet that would be sent to the part of our country that was menaced.

I have spoken of commerce and the protection of commerce as falling side by side. I believe that Canada has, on the line of water development, as great a future as on the line of land development. We have fallen victims to our imaginations. Struck at once and forcibly by our vast landed estate, we suffer ourselves to think that the land is the sole theatre of the triumphs and the development of Canada. But look at what nature has given us. View the immense oceans on our east and west and the waters that lie between. Note the conjunc- of coal and iron and of lime stone and all building material. Look at our ports and harbours, dotting every portion of our coast, the most of them yet unused and a large number of them serviceable to a degree. Look at the 40,000 or 60,000 fishermen and boatmen on our coasts, our rivers and great lakes, born and bred within the sight of, and largely upon, the water, making themselves fit candidates for the career of commerce and all that pertains to it in the development and progress of this country. It seems to me that with the immense grain producing and meat producting resources of Canada, with our immense productive power in other respects, with our sea and water privileges, the imagination can scarcely grasp the commerce that waits for Canadian vessels, manned by Canadien crews, and a mighty instrument of expansion and wealth to be held almost completely in our own hands. But to accomplish that purpose we must build steel vessels. Take Great Britain and go around its coasts where shipbuilding is carried on from Newcastle to the Clyde, what are the great forces at work? The building of warships is the strong encouragement of the steel and iron commercial shipbuilding in Great Britain to-day. The two are joined. The one works into and out from the other. I say that steel shipbuilding inaugurated in this country developed tc the capacity of turning out war vessels would not only benefit Canada, but Great Britain as well. For the old empire has not passed it zenith.

Though it has had its course of so many hundred years, there is no reason to believe that a still longer course is not before it. I do believe that irrevocable fate decrees the death of nations. I believe that, comparatively, they may have eternal life if they will seek for it in the right direction; and the old blood that some sneer at in the effete veins of the old country may easily be reinvigorated in the overseas possessions by the young flood of life and development and enterprise flowing back into the heart at home rejuvenating and revivifying the race. It is no stretch of the imagination to believe that the empire, with its component parts in full accord may have at some time immense dockyards in the Dominion of Canada, on the Pacific coast and on the Atlantic coast in which will be built not only our own vessels, distinctively Canadian, but a part of the navy of Great Britain itself. In Australia the foundations of such a course are laid. That country to-day has taken this line of policy: within seven years her programme calls for an expenditure of $11,000,000 on torpedo vessels and that kind of coast defence, and $2,000,000 annually thereafter to keep up and forward in an equal line of progression. After having tried the contributory method, Australia has adopted this policy with the best of concert between the mother country and herself, the coast defence in times of peace, the auxiliary body to the fleet in times of war, both carried on with the cooperation and good will, which perfect trust in each other engenders and keeps strong. Cannot we trust the mother country? She has done enough for us in the past and showed her good will. Are we afraid of losing our autonomy? Every move of Great Britain has been to shift responsibility upon us rather than to take it from us. What has she denied to us? If she has erred in any way it has been in the sentiment now wholly extinct that the colonies had better go and fend for themselves; but to-day no man can point a finger to a policy or a solid weighty utterance of Great Britain in which there is the least shadow of a menace that she evens harbours the faintest idea of depriving one of the overseas dominions of her perfect autonomy.

An objection to this method is found in its greater cost. I doubt if the cost would be greater. As I said, our first vessels would actually have to be built, equipped and manned in Great Britain. The cost of these is no greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If all the battleships of the empire were swept from the sea, the torpedoes and coast defence that any of the colonies might have would make no headway against the combined fleets of the conquerors. But we do not believe that that disaster will occur, and we do not believe it because we have faith that prevision and provision will be made sufficient to obviate any such calamity, the prevision and the provision made by the mutual component parts of the empire, trusting each other with a generous trust, believing that in every time of stress

and difficulty the best councils will prevail and the best course will be taken.

It is said also that there are physical and mechanical difficulties to be overcome. I have mentioned these—they can be overcome. Time and the application of a reasonable amount of resource will overcome those difficulties and place us where we have had to place ourselves with reference to every other great line of development; we must begin at the beginning and work up gradually until we gain the skill, the plant, the machinery and the power to make for ourselves what at first it was physically impossible for us to make. I do not know which of these forms our aid will take after due care and consideration but whichever form is chosen, one thing is certain, that something ought to be done—and done now. Our circumstances, our manhood, our sense of gratitude and our sense of right all demand that something should be done, something adequate and something now. What boots it to drift from year to year? Are we proper stewards of this heritage if we allow it to go one moment longer without some proper care and provision for its defence? Are we doing our duty as men unless we put our own hand in our own pocket and share the burden of the defence of the heritage which is ours?

For what have we had from Great Britain? Our heritage, we are proud of it and we boast of it, has been conquered and held against all comers by Great Britain. Go back over a few centuries, watch the wars with European nations, the wars with the Indians, the first possessors of this continent, the struggles in 1776 and 1812, with the American Republic, Take your pencil and add up the treasure that Great Britain has expended during all that long series of years in order that this heritage might be free to those who now possess it—and the wonderful thing about it, which stirs our hearts and which calls for our concurrent action of gratitude, is that after all that expenditure of treasure and of blood, she handed it over to the Canadian people without encumbrance of any kind—no mortgage upon it, no balance to be paid, the patient British tax-payer footed all expenses and gave it to the colony that he loved and to the people for whom he had prepared it. Thereafter she has guaranteed by her army and navy our security. Our eastern gateway stands open ,our western gateways are unblocked, the ocean path is as secure as the streets of a city. Why? Because of the guarantee of Britain's navy and of Britain's prestige. For all of that she has not asked one penny of tribute from these people, she has placed no contribution upon them. Our borders have been preserved. When the Fenian Raids of 1866 took place, what was the power that stood upon our frontier? The British regulars joined with our own volunteers stood as the defence of Canada. The British government paid all the bills; and the British government afterwards paid the indemnity for the damages which were caused by the invaders. When the Red River rebellion took place, and our western heritage was in doubt, it was Wolsley with the British regulars that, joined with our own volunteers, made the long and tedious journey to that far distant section, and stood for the protection of our nascent nationality. Great Britain paid all the bills. In the Riel rebellion our volunteers and our resources were sufficient to quell the rising; but just outside the ring stood the might and power of Britain, ready to interfere if any one had lifted hand against the nationality and the integrity of this country. Our rights have been upheld, our rights of fishery and navigation in the Atlantic and on the Pacific. When the threat was made that if Canadian vessels were found within the prescribed sealing area they would be confiscated, and our men imprisoned, it was the might of Britain which intervened and saved Canadians arrest and indignity. When Cleveland's message went out in 1888, it was Britain's prestige and power which robbed it of its sting, and which made us rest in peace because that power and that prestige were behind us. Our liberties have been guarded. What have we asked that has not been given to us? Much that we have not asked has been freely bestowed. The rivals in long years of war, when once the war was ended, became equals in peace, guaranteed in their language, their creed, their rights and their privileges; and from that day to this we have lived together in more or less perfect peace, joined as Canadian citizens in common love for our common country, and a desire to develop it and to make it, if we can, the greatest in the world.

Our commerce has been protected. Wherever a Canadian vessel goes, wherever a Canadian trader travels there he finds in every city, in every port, the ubiquitous protection of the fleet, and he finds there a representative of the best consular and diplomatic service in the world. All of these things cost money, all these are maintained there by Britain. The expense of every diplomatic establishment and of every consular agency is paid for by the British government and is at our free service. When we go to Madrid to negotiate a treaty, or to Paris to negotiate a treaty, or to Tokio to have some difficulties arranged, what do we find? The prestige and good will of Britain, and the embassy, the diplomatic service, all at the free use and for the free advantage of the

people of Canada, all without money and without price to ourselves. All these we have accepted, on all these we have relied, by all these we have profited, and the only thing we have given in return is now and then some cheap criticism, and more or less scant gratitude—not a very worthy return for the services that have been given to us. If we had been dependent on ourselves, what harassing, overshadowing fears would have been ours? What perils would we have incurred by sea and by land? What tremendous expenses would we have incurred with insufficient national insurance? What probable fire disaster extending even to loss of home, of name, of distinctive national existnce. That for a century our farmers have tilled their acres in perfect peace, that in peace our fishermen have gathered their waterbred harvests, the merchant handled his wares, the doors of external commerce been kept continually open and the ocean passageways secured from molestation is due to the fact we have been safely insured in the greatest guarantee company of the ages, John Bull & Company, who has charged us no annual premiums, who has given us an incontestible policy, an unquestionable security, as much as anything can be unquestioned in this variable world of ours. But she has also been our banker. Her money has built or partly built, our great railways, our canals, many even of our public buildings. Her money has furnished the life blood for our municipalities, for our great corporations, for great industrial concerns and development companies. To what nation amongst all the nations could we have gone with such assets, and assurances of good will, of ready resources and low rates of interest? If we were to wake up to-morrow and read that the British fleet had been swept from the ocean, that an irretrievable disaster had come upon her, what a feeling of insecurity, of absolute and utter loss, what a deprivation of power would take place in this country? Is there any doubt? I do not believe it will take place, because as I said before, my faith is strong that the good sense and cooperation of the various component parts of the British empire will make such reasonable provision that such a disaster will not come within the category of possibilities. But if it were to happen, can we picture to ourselves what would be the result?

Well, in the end some one will snarl and grow cross at this long harangue, and say, 'Oh well, let Great Britain fight her own battles, she is able to do it.' Yes she is. But suppose her battles are our battles, how then would we look at it? Her battles have been our battles, her battles of the future will be battles for her defence, and the defence of those that belong to her as dependent and oversea dominions. I cannot conceive, as I said before, of Britain fighting an aggressive war. To-day she is not an aggressor, she has not been for half a century. Her wars are our wars, her battles are our battles. One sees plainly, if a fleet were to invade this country and the British fleet were to range itself against our enemies, off our own coasts that it would be our battle waged in our defence. But suppose the battle is fought off the coasts of the threatening enemy; suppose, better yet, it is fought in the emergent pass ways when the vessels of the enemy are issuing from their ports one by one in straggling order before their full fighting power is possible and their full deployments made? Is not that our battle just the same as it would be if it were fought within sight of our own coasts? It seems to me that the best place to fight a battle for the defence of Canada, for the defence of Australia, is to fight it in the very ports and passageways of the enemy. That is the first, the primal, the effective line of defence. We must not think that because we are not in sound of the artillery or in sight of the vessels that are engaged therein, it is therefore not our battle.

Now, all this refers particularly to my resolution. Let me say two things; first, that my resolution explains itself. My suggestions, or thoughts, are the crude thoughts of a man who has no expert knowledge but who reads, observes and forms an opinion. They are worth what they are worth and no more. Their inadequacy does not militate against the spirit and principle of the resolution. They are the contributions, for what they are worth, of my own thought and my own ideas towards the discussion of this question. Let not opposition that may frame itself against my particular details consider that it is necessary to frame itself as against the resolution which is broad, comprehensive and gives complete freedom of detail even to the slightest and most distinct particular. So far I have been dealing with what may be called the stated, normal policy that I think Canada ought to adopt; home defence, by a coast line and harbour protection of torpedo vessels at first which would make the attack of the rambling, raiding cruiser a doubtful and a dangerous one, which would ward off the first attack until more sufficient aid could be brought if the invading force were superior to the defence. But when once we settle upon this policy —and I hope we will soon settle upon it— there is another feature of the case, and it is this. Outside of any settled action, outside of the normal condition of things in society, in the world, in nationhood, occurrences arise, special emergencies, that are unexpected, suddenly loom in view, a great crisis, a great danger. That is absolutely outside of the normal policy

to be carried on year after year with settled purpose and upon a settled plan. Every one of these emergencies must be met as it comes and met according to the gravity and importance of the occurrence. Since my resolution was introduced into this House occurrences have taken place. I am not so sure of my knowledge as to dogmatically declare that this is all an overnight panic and that there is nothing in it. When weighty men, the foremost statesmen in the British world and, may I say, in the world itself to-day, on both sides of party politics, utter their weighty warnings, which to me, are a sign of graver thoughts yet unexpressed that peril stands at the gateway, that an emergency of great gravity has arisen, then we are face to face with a condition which is to be met outside of the normal rule. When, in 1899, Kruger attempted to drive the British into the sea and take away the great outposts of South Africa from the British dominion, that was an emergency. That emergency impressed itself upon the people of Canada and aroused to white heat the loyalty and devotion, to Canada first, because an attack upon that outpost was an atack on Canada, and to Great Britain in the second place, because of her sacrifices in behalf of Canada for centuries, which would not be denied, which sought for immediate action and followed it up heroically on the plains of southern Africa, with glory to every participant, with honour to Canada and with a great addition of prestige and power to the old land herself. For every threatening rival nation, which, up to that time, had not been sure and was querying thus: 'Will the colonies stand by the mother country?'—queried no longer and knew that if they unjustifiedly made war against Great Britain they must count on the opposition of every colony and overseas possession that Great Britain cradled with her empire. Was that of no force, no weight, with the councils of Europe and of the world ? I believe it was. To-day, peril stands at the gateway. It is not for me to say how great it is, but I cannot brush it aside. To-day it impresses itself upon the gravest statesmen of the old country; to-day it appeals to Australia until public subscriptions are taken and the government is being importuned to do even more than its settled policy to meet the emergency; to-day little New Zealand gives one Dreadnaught and offers a second and to-dav Canada faces that position of peril, that imperial emergency. Let me say to my right hon. friend that if, after careful consideration, he proposes to this parliament a means for meeting that emergency adequately, by the gift of Dreadnaughts or the gift of money, this side of the House will stand beside him in thus vindicating Canada's honour and strengthening the empire's defence.

Mr. FOSTER.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, to the eloquent and able observations with which the House has just been favoured by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) very little exception, if any, can be taken by any one and certainly not by myself. If my hon. friend will permit me, and if he will accept it from me, I will offer him, in all sincerity, my hearty congratulation, for the temperate and moderate manner in which he has approached a difficult and very important subject. Let me say at once to my hon. friend that the only exception which I have to take to the observations that he has offered to the House and to the policy that he has, to some extent, outlined for us, is simply that his conclusions have been too indefinite and that they should have been presented in a more concrete form. I was anxious to hear from my hon. friend what would be the argument which he intended to apply in support of the resolution which he has placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, and which has been upon the Order Paper for the last two months. I am sure I will not offend my hon. friend when I tell him that in my estimation his resolution was not perhaps as clear as the crystal water of the mountain brook. My hon. friend did not define what was the policy that he would like us to adopt as explicitly as I would have desired. The gist of his proposition is to be found in these words :

> Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibility and financial burden incident to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great seaports.

The only interpretation I could give these words was that in the opinion of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) Canada had been remiss in the duty she owes to herself of providing for her own defence. This seemed to me somewhat surprising in view of the fact that Canada has no quarrel with any one, that she does not desire any territorial aggrandizement, that she occupies geographically an issolated position, and that she has only one neighbour, with whom she has been at peace for nearly 100 years. But, now that we have had the pleasure and the advantage of listening to my hon. friend, we have learned that his opinion is not that Canada has been remiss in the duty she owes to herself, but that in his estimation Canada has been remiss in the duty which she owes to the empire. Well, let me say to my hon. friend, and I say it in all sincerity, because I hope that if we differ in details we shall be able to agree on the main issue, let me say that in my estimation, if Canada has been remiss to the duty she owes to the empire we are not conscious of it.

Sir, we will not for a moment admit that impeachment. We are British subjects; Canada is one of the daughter nations of the empire and we realize to the full the rights and obligations which are involved in that proud title. It has been, it is, it shall be our unalterable determination to meet and to carry out every duty which is implied by the title of 'British subject.' Nay, more—not only will Canada fulfil every obligation which is implied by that title, but I think I make bold to say that we will rise to every sacrifice that may be needed in order to maintain unimpaired the rank and status which is occupied by Canada in the British empire and the rank and status which is occupied by the British empire throughout the world. But, Sir, I may say—and I do not say it in reference to the speech which we have just listened to —I may say that we are not to be carried away, we are not to be stampeded from what has been the settled policy and deliberate course which we have laid down, by any hasty, feverish action, however spectacular such action may be. It behooves us as freemen to look at our position calmly and deliberately, to review the situation as it is, to ascertain where we are, and to determine whether we should alter or whether we should persist in the course we have adopted long ago. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has told us, and I agree with him, that this question should be approached not only from the point of view of Canada, but from the point of view of the British empire at large. I agree with everything my hon. friend has said, and eloquently said, with regard to the admiration and devotion which every British subject, every Canadian, should have in his heart for the British empire. I agree with my hon. friend that the greatest phenomenon recorded in the pages of history is the existence of the British empire as it is at this moment. In its origin perhaps it may not have differed widely from the origin of other empires, but in its continuance and permanency is the phenomenon. The empire of Rome, the empire of Alexander, the empire of Charlemagne, the empire of Napoleon, were all built up and maintained by force and the moment force gave way these empires crumbled. The empire of Britain has been founded less on war than on discovery and colonization, and wherever founded in any part of the world, whether by war or colonization or discovery, it has been maintained only by the free will and consent of the peoples who now acknowledge British supremacy. To-day the British empire is composed of a galaxy of young nations proud of their allegiance to the British Crown and proud also of their own local independence. And though they may have a common aim, each has reserved to itself the duty and the right to develop its own resources and to attain its aim according to its own views, and by its own methods as may be best suited to the peculiar cimcumstances of each.

Now, it may be said that defence which is the duty of all nations is a matter as to which there should be a common aspiration. Yes, I agree in that, but at the same time the young daughter nations of England have insisted that even in the matter of defence they should preserve in its entirety local autonomy, and that each should approach this subject according to its own lights. Let us not disguise the fact from ourselves that at present there is a passing wave in which we can trace anger, enthusiasm and fear, and which directed and pushed us to depart from our policy and to contribute at once to the British navy. Well, Sir, let us view this question as it is, let us not blink at it, let us realize that it is not the way in which in the past we have understood our duty. This question is not new; we are familiar with it, it is not of to-day or of yesterday. I will not say it is as old as the hills, but it is as old as confederation itself and it comes to the front periodically. It presented itself in a concrete form in the Imperial Conference of 1902 to those who were there assembled from all parts of the British empire conferring with the government of the mother country. The proposition was placed before us that all the self-governing dominions of the British Empire should contribue to the army and to the navy. The Canadian ministers who were present attending that conference did not view that project with any favour. They received it with respect but they declined to accept it and thev presented their views in a state paper wherein they stated what they were prepared to do so far as Canada is concerned. Their views thus stated have often been quoted in this House, but I think it is opportune that I should quote them again. This is the statement:

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

enced imperial officers, so far as this is consistent with the principle of local self-government, which has proved so great a factor in the promotion of imperial unity.

Now, Sir, this paper has been sometimes criticised, but it has never been seriously challenged so far as I know. At all events it has never yet been challenged on the floor of this House, and if I understood the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) aright, he does not now dissent from the proposition which is therein made.

Nay, more, the policy which we there laid down has been adopted by some of the dominions which had not accepted it before. The Commonwealth of Australia had for many years made a contribution of $1,000,000 a year out of its treasury to the imperial exchequer for the purposes of the navy. This policy has been reversed by the Australian government, and Mr. Deakin, the late Premier of Australia, one of the ablest men of the British empire, a man of lofty ideals, has himself introduced a resolution on the line of the Canadian policy, if I may so call it, providing for the local defence of Australia. Under the old arrangement Australia contributed £200,000 to the British squadron. Under the new arrangement, that of a flotilla, there will be no money contribution. Instead, it is proposed to build and equip six destroyers, nine submarine, and two depot or parent ships, which the Admiralty estimates will cost £1,277,500. In making his proposition, Mr. Deakin spoke as follows:

> The real question is one of control. The problem before us is the association of our small naval strength with the great organization of fleets of the mother country, so as to secure the highest efficiency and unity without sacrificing our right to the constitutional control of our own funds, and of any flotilla built and maintained at our own cost.

Yet there is more than this. If there is a man in the British empire who has given his thought, his heart and his soul to the great problem of the defence of the British empire, a man who has made it the study of his life, I think I am justified in saying that that man is Lord Milner. He was in this country a few months ago, and discussed this question at various places, and everywhere he took the position we are now taking. At Toronto, where he discussed the question perhaps more fully than anywhere else, he spoke thus:

> I have never been a great advocate of contributions from the self-governing states to the army and of the United Kingdom. I am sure that the form which imperial co-operation in this field will ultimately take, and ought to take, the form at once most consistent with the dignity of the individual states and most conducive to their collective strength and organic union is the development of their several defensive resources in material and manhood.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Therefore, I think I am justified in saying that our policy is the one which commends itself to all the thinkers who have given any attention to this subject. I might also quote the opinion of a veteran Canadian statesman, Sir Charles Tupper, who, in a famous article which I am sure no one has forgotten, wrote these very pregnant words:

> The policy of levying a large tax was a policy unheard of, mistaken and fraught with danger.

Well, Sir, this is the position we have taken; this is the position we maintain to-day, and, as I understood my hon. friend from North Toronto, while he was not very emphatic for it, he was not against it either. If I understood him aright, he insisted that something should be done; but in what particular form it should be done, whether by a contribution to the imperial treasury or by the development of our own naval resources, he left an open question. Well, to us it is an open question, and we see no reason in anything that has taken place recently, to depart from the policy that we laid down in 1902.

It may be said—and my hon. friend approached this subject, I must say, in a very moderate and fair way—that though this was our policy, we have not lived up to it. I deny the impeachment. We have done a great deal for defence, though not perhaps as much as we might have done. At the conference in London in 1902 we stated that we undertook to develop our own defences by land and by sea. With respect to our defences by land, we have done more than our duty; we have done what I think we have reason to be proud of. In 1902 we spent in round numbers two and a half millions on our militia, and last year we spent more than six and a half millions. So that in five or six years we have just trebled our expenditure on the militia. What have we done for that increased expenditure? We have taken over the garrisons of Esquimalt and Halifax; we have relieved the British treasury to that extent. We have organized a small permanent force. We have established instruction camps. We have provided arms and ammunition, and have drilled more than 50,000 men; and, Sir, those who were at Quebec at the time of the Tercentenary celebration and saw the review of the Canadian forces to the number of some 12,000 men by the Prince of Wales, could not but feel a sense of pride in their hearts at the appearance of those men, looking as they did like veterans, and receiving the praise of that veteran of many battlefields, Lord Roberts. In the development of naval defences, I admit we are altogether behind the times. Engaged as we have been in works of peace, we have delayed and put

off the development of our navy. But, Sir, I agree with my hon. friend that we shall undertake this work also, and undertake it immediately; but upon what lines should we do it? Upon the lines, I repeat, of our own action—of undertaking to do with respect to a navy what we have done with respect to the militia. I think we should commence to establish the nucleus of a navy. But I call the attention of my hon. friend to this, and I am sure he will agree with me. Is he sure where we should begin and end in naval matters? In this age of invention naval construction has varied almost from year to year. Is it not a fact that the armaments of to-morrow may be so improved as to render the armaments of to-day obsolete? When we were in London in 1902, what we had in our minds was training ships; they were of great importance. When we were again in London at the conference of 1907, training ships were altogether forgotten; then it was the defence of our seaports that was the important question before us. Lord Tweedmouth, of the Admiralty, speaking on the question of what should be done by the self-governing dominions, ignored the question of training ships altogether, and insisted that we should at once make provision for the defence of our sea harbours. This is the language he made use of on that occasion:

I understand that, in Australia particularly, and in South Africa, it is desired to start some naval service of your own. Perhaps I might suggest that if the provision of the smaller craft which are necessarily incident to the work of a great fleet of modern battleships could be made locally, it would be a very great help to the general work of the navy. You cannot take the small craft such as torpedo boats and submarine across the ocean, and for warships to arrive in South Africa or in Australia or in New Zealand or in Canada, and find ready to their hand well-trained men in good vessels of this kind, would be an enormous advantage to them. It would be an enormous advantage to find ready to their hand men well trained, ready to take a part in the work of the fleet. There is, I think, the further advantage in these small flotillas, that they will be an admirable means of coast defence; that you will be able by the use of them to avoid practically all danger from any sudden raid which might be made by a cruising squadron. What I should like to point out is that, above all things in this work, the submarine is probably the most important and the most effective weapon. It is the weapon with which you can meet a fleet attacking during the day, or individual ships attacking by day. I am assured by my advisers at the Admiralty that it is a most important weapon, that it has already reached very considerable development, and it is one on which we may rely with great confidence.

In another part of his observations he spoke as follows:

Then I should like to say a single word on the further point of the provision of docks and coaling facilities in the colonies. The enormous development of the modern warship entails important consequences. These great modern warships require large docks to contain them. I think we are getting on well with the provision of docks. At this moment in our own country and abroad we have, I think, 13 government docks which will take in our largest ship, the 'Dreadnaught.' I think in the course of the next two years we shall have four more, which will make about 17 altogether. But it is very desirable that we should have in all parts of the world docks which could take such great ships, supposing they were to meet with an accident or were to receive damage in war.

This was only two years ago, and the chief Lord of the Admiralty then accepted in the fullest sense the policy of the Canadian government that we should ourselves maintain our own navy and not contribute to the Imperial Exchequer. He accepted to the fullest extent the proposition that we should invest in and build submarine torpedo boats and tugs. Two years have elapsed and to-day, if we were to listen to a certain press and give attention to the wave which is passing, we would send a Dreadnaught to Great Britain. But all these spasmodic efforts would not, to my mind, furnish a proper defence of the British empire. How should that be done? We should proceed as we have done with our militia. We should consult with the naval authorities of the British government, as my hon. colleague the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) has done with the council of defence in London; and after having organized a plan, we should carry it out in Canada with our own resources and out of our own money. This is the policy which commends itself to the government.

My hon. friend concluded his remarks by saying that if it were decided to offer a Dreadnought to Great Britain, that decision would be acceptable to the opposition. This brings us to something which is in the air at present and which no British subject can ignore. For a hundred years and more the naval supremacy of Great Britain has been unquestioned—nay more, British supremacy on the seas has been so absolute that no one supposed it could ever be disputed. But this is an age when events happen very fast. We have learned lately that the foremost military power of the world at present is contemplating perhaps to cope with Great Britain on the high seas. We have, perhaps, reason to believe, as we have just been told that Germany is building more ships than Great Britain and building them more rapidly. Possibly there is a conclusion to be drawn from this, and the only conclusion is that Germany intends sometime to do with Great Britain on the high seas what she has done with France on land. Everybody knows, it is a matter of

history that Prussia had for years been silently preparing to cope with France which, up to that time, had been the greatest military nation in the world, that Prussia waited its opportunity, and when that opportunity came, delivered a mortal blow. If it be true then that Germany is organizing on the seas, no British subject can afford to be indifferent to the prospect. For my part I do not think that the danger is imminent. Germany is a great nation, she has made greater progress in peace and war during the last 60 years than any other nation; she has increased her population from 40,000,000 to 62,000,000; she has developed her industries and commerce in a marvellous manner; she has increased her wealth prodigiously. But to bring the German navy up to the standard of the British, to accomplish in a few years what has been the result of centuries, may be a task which is even beyond the ability of Germany, with all her great ability and resources. At all events, we know that the British nation is not unduly alarmed. We have the testimony of the great organs of English public opinion that Britain can cope with Germany alone, without the assistance of the British colonies. We know that the British government has, in response to the generous offer made by New Zealand of a Dreadnaught, postponed its acceptance. There is something else not to be lost sight of. I appeal to every student of history whether it be not the case that although England has been of all nations of Europe the one which has given more attention to trade than to war, she has generally come out victoriously in all the wars in which she has been engaged. This, she owes, in the first place, to the courage, the endurance, and dogged pertinacity of her sailors and soldiers, but surely in no smaller degree also to the fact that while other nations were wasting their energies in war, she was attending to the arts of peace and amassing wealth, and consequently had an abundance at her hand to make use of when other nations were deficient in that greatest essential to success. But although I do not believe that the danger is imminent, I have no hesitation in saying it would be folly to sleep in a sense of the fullest security. Vigilance, and eternal vigilance, must be the watchword to-day, not only in England but in Canada and every other part of the British empire. On more than one occasion I have said that I would deprecate Canada being drawn into the vortex of militarism existing in Europe. The situation of Europe to-day is one which cannot be characterized as other than madness. Europe is an armed camp. Every nation there is living in a condition of armed peace almost as intolerable as war itself.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

England is the one nation which has not lost her head, which has resisted militarism as much as she could, which has refused to adopt the conscription and sacrifice her children on the altar of this insatiable moloch. I hope the day shall never come when we will be drawn into the conflicts of Europe. But I have no hesitation in saying that the supremacy of the British empire is absolutely essential, not only to the maintenance of that empire but to the civilization of the world. I have no hesitation in saying that the supremacy of the British empire on the seas must be maintained in the highest degree of efficiency it has occupied the last hundred years. I have no hesitation in saying also that if the day should come when the supremacy of Britain on the high seas will be challenged, it will be the duty of all the daughters of the nation to close around the old mother land and make a rampart about her to ward off any attack. I hope that day will never come, but should it come, I would deem it my duty to devote what might be left of my life and energy to stump the country and endeavour to impress upon my fellow-countrymen, especially my compatriots in the province of Quebec, the conviction that the salvation of England is the salvation of our own country that therein lies the guaranty of our civil and religious freedom and everything we value in this life. These are the sentiments which animate the government on this occasion. As I said a moment ago to my hon. friend, the resolution he has offered is not sufficiently explicit in my estimation, and if he will permit, I will substitute for it —and hope with his concurrence—the following resolution:

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

The House reaffirms the opinion, repeatedly expressed by representatives of Canada, that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions the payment of any stated contribution to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is conecrned, be a satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

The House has observed with satisfaction the relief afforded in recent years to the taxpayers of the United Kingdom through the assumption by the Canadian people of considerable military expenditure formerly charged upon the imperial treasury.

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

is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.

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

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House listened with a great deal of pleasure to the very eloquent speech of the Prime Minister, and I was glad to learn that he did not take any exception to the remarks of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) except perhaps in one unimportant particular; I was pleased also to observe that he did not find any fault with the resolution proposed by my hon. friend except that it was not sufficiently definite. I was rather led to believe from that remark that the resolution which the Prime Minister himself would propose would be of a definite character, but I am bound to say that I found his resolution even less definite than that which was proposed by my hon. friend. Now the right hon. gentleman has spoken of the relations of Canada to the empire, and I for one am prepared to go as far as he, as far as any hon. gentleman in this House, in absolutely maintaining in this country of ours the full control of our own affairs, which we have enjoyed for many years in the past. I do not think there is any difference of opinion between the two political parties in Canada in that respect. It might be wise to refer for a moment to the circumstance that Great Britain, by giving to Canada and the other great dependencies of the empire, absolutely full control of their own affairs, an absolutely autonomy in respect of self-government, has, I believe, increased and strengthened the ties which bind these great dependencies to the empire as a whole, in a measure which would not have been practicable by any other policy. I believe also that the ties which bind Canada to the empire to-day are firmer and surer and more enduring than they have been at any time in the past.

It might be well to refer for a moment to the curious evolution by which this has been brought about, and to point out to the House that it has been accomplished by exactly the same means as the system of parliamentary government, both in Great Britain and in Canada, has been evolved. It has been accomplished by the circumstance that the constitutional law of Great Britain is to-day for the most part an unwritten law, and that which determines the relations between the great dependencies of the empire and the empire as a whole, is to a great extent a matter of unwritten law. I am not unmindful that we have a written constitution, I am not unmindful of the fact that there is, both in Great Britain and Canada, a great body of written law setting forth constitutional provisions; but the British system of parliamentary government chiefly depends upon that which a great French writer, M. E. Boutmy, in his work upon the constitutions of Great Britain, the United States and France, has called the customary law of the constitution; and the development of this customary law has had more influence in bringing about the evolution of parliamentary government, both in Great Britain and in Canada, than any other means of which I am aware. It seems to me that the relations between Great Britain and her dependencies are being moulded and developed to-day, as they have been during the past 50 years, by the same influence of unwritten law and custom; and that makes it all the more important to us to-day to understand clearly what we propose to do, to see clearly the path on which we are entering, and to understand thoroughly what the consequences will be to Canada and to the empire as a whole of the action which we propose in this regard. I understand that we have a witten constitution in Canada, a constitution which is a statute of the imperial parliament. I understand also that in Great Britain the King has, as a matter of formal law, of strict legal, but not of constitutional right, the power to impose his veto upon any statute enacted by the parliament of the United Kingdom. But I also understand that by reason of that which Mr. Lowell, the new president of Harvard, has called custom superimposed upon law, and which Mr. Anson another great constitutional writer, has called law overgrown by custom, the parliament of Great Britain to-day, although it has the legal power, has not the constitutional right to alter the British North America Act without the consent of the people of Canada. So we understand that we have in this country full powers of self government, and that those powers of self-government depend, not only upon the written but upon the unwritten law, which has so largely moulded British institutions and the relations of the great dependencies to the empire in the past.

Coming now to the consideration of the matter which is immediately at our hand,

it has been said, we are all in the habit of saying it, my right hon. friend has uttered the boast, if it be a boast, some eight or ten years ago, that Canada to-day is a nation, and we are all proud to recognize and to hail Canada as one of the great nations in the greatest empire that the earth beholds. But Mr. Speaker, let us not forget also that a national status implies national responsibility. It is of no use for us in Canada to speak of this country as a nation, and to shrink in any manner from the discharge of our national responsibilities. What are those responsibilities? Acknowledged in every civilized community, recognized among all the great nations of the earth, a primal responsibility is the defence of their territories and the protection of their commerce. I do not gather, Mr. Speaker, that my right hon. friend dissents in any way whatever from the enunciation of that principle which was laid down this afternoon in such eloquent terms by my hon. friend the member for North Toronto.

Now I am prepared to recognize also, as the Prime Minister has very properly observed, that the people of this country, so far as military defence is concerned, have done a great deal, and have done a great deal more in recent years than they ever did before. As a matter of fact, if we look at the expenditure for military and naval defence of the whole empire and of the great dominions of the empire, we find that in 1905-6 Great Britain and her colonies paid respectively the following sums per head of the population:

	£	s.	d.	f.
United Kingdom	1	9	3	..
Canada		4	6	1
Newfoundand		..	3	1
Australia		5	..	2
New Zealand		5	2	1
Cape of Good Hope		5	1	..
Natal		2	11	2
Transvaal		2	..	1

So that if you look at the amount expended on both military and naval defence, you find Canada pretty well up to the standard of all the great self-governing dominions of the empire. But, I would venture to submit that our expenditure has, to some extent, been appropriated to the wrong purpose. What is the object of our military expenditure? I know that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) has stated in the House that the military expenditure of this country is not larger than is necessary for the aid of the civil power. I would hardly think that an expenditure of $6,000,000 annually would be necessary for that purpose, and, while I am not prepared at the present moment to lay down any figure which would be a proper amount for the people of Canada to set apart for the purpose of defence, I do most unhesitatingly say that of the portion which the people of Canada should set aside for that purpose out of their public revenues, a very substantial portion, and, in my opinion, not less than one half of the amount appropriated for defence should be devoted for naval instead of to military defence. I would like to point out to the country and to the House some considerations which lead me to that conclusion. Where is the great market of the people of Canada to-day? We know that it is across the Atlantic ocean, and we believe that in years to come it will also be across the Pacific ocean. The great market of Canada to-day is not the market which would be especially safeguarded and preserved to us by the expenditure of a large amount of money for military purposes, but it is a market which may be preserved to us by expenditure for naval purposes. Let me point that out to you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentlemen of this House by this illustration. Take the total agricultural exports in the last year for which we have any statistics, and you will find the following:

	Value of exports.
Cereals	$62,548,153
Live animals	10,897,232
Dead meats	11,494,665
Dairy products	22,995,860
Total	$107,935,910

You will also find, and this I desire to emphasize, that the ocean-borne exports amount to no less a sum than $104,740,000 and land-borne exports to $2,198,000. Therefore, as far as our commerce is concerned, I venture to submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this House, that the expenditure in defence of our seaports, in defence of our coasts and in defence of the waters of the ocean, which are immediately adjacent to our coasts, is of immensely greater advantage and of immensely greater importance than the expenditure which, year after year, we are disbursing in connection with the military forces of this country. Against whom could the military forces of this country protect us? Under the law of the land they cannot be taken out of the Dominion of Canada without the consent of parliament. I do not desire in the least to minimize the importance of some expenditure for military purposes, and I am prepared to acknowledge the very great advance that this country has made in that regard in many respects. I am aware that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence has been invited to a seat upon the Imperial Defence Committee. I am aware that there has been some movement made within the

past three or four weeks for the co-ordination of the general staff of Canada with the imperial staff of Britain. I am not prepared to minimize these things. I do not desire to minimize them but I do desire to emphasize, as far as may be in my power, the importance to Canada of some attempt at naval defence, of the defence of our seaports and the protection of our commerce.

Let us look at the question from another aspect. How many cities and towns are there in Canada which would be open to the raids of a second or third-class cruiser, as pointed out by my hon. friend from North Toronto? I suppose there are not less than forty or fifty cities and towns in Canada of 2,000 population or upwards which would be open to the raid of an enemy coming against our coast. Let us not forget that the danger pointed out to the Commonwealth of Australia by the admiralty itself was the imminence of a movement of that kind in Australian waters and against the Australian coasts in case the empire should unfortunately become involved in any great naval war. We are all aware to-day that the policy of the British Admiralty is a policy of concentration, and we are all aware that the Australian naval programme which has recently been entered into with the full approval and consent of the mother country, is altogether designed to guard the coasts of Australia against a danger of that kind.

In so far as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to-day outlined the lines of naval defence of this country I am entirely at one with him. I am entirely of opinion, in the first place, that the proper line upon which we should proceed in that regard is the line of having a Canadian naval force of our own. I entirely believe in that. The other experiment has been tried as between Australia and the mother country and it has not worked satisfactorily in any respect. In Great Britain the contribution has perhaps been regarded as rather unsatisfactory. In Australia it failed, in the end, to meet with the approval of the people for the reason that Great Britain felt constrained to ask Australia that the field of operations of the squadron should be extended to the China and Indian seas; and when the operation of that squadron was so extended, the Australians felt that the contribution which they had been making for some years past was not really being used to give that protection to Australia which her interests demanded. So that, the policy of Australia at the present time is to build up a flotilla of submarines and torpedo boats which, in case of war, would co-operate with the armed cruisers and battleships of the British navy. It was pointed out in discussing this question that Australia in providing a force of that kind would provide a force which it would be very difficult if not impossible for Great Britain to send across the seas, and that in thus protecting themselves they were providing the best possible force for the protection of the empire. So, I am at one with the Prime Minister as far as this is concerned. I am at one with him in this respect also that I think that an expenditure of money designed for that purpose ought, in the main at least, to be under the control of our own parliament and that by making an appropriation of that kind and attending to the defence of our own coasts, by co-operation and co-ordination with the imperial naval forces, we would be rendering a real service in the defence of the empire and we would be doing our duty not only to Canada but to the empire as a whole.

My right hon. friend has spoken in very eloquent terms of the necessity of maintaining the integrity of the empire. We are all at one with him there, and there are just one or two observations that I desire to make in that regard. The first is that the loss of the control of the seas by the British fleet means the dismemberment of this great empire. Great Britain having once lost control of the seas it is impossible to conceive that this empire would longer survive. A world-wide empire such as ours; an empire which reaches out on every continent and spreads over every ocean can only be maintained by absolute naval supremacy. The moment a naval power arises which can effectively challenge the supremacy of Britain's navy that moment may the British empire be dismembered and that moment Canada may cease to be among the nations of that great empire. I am not one of those who look to see the integrity of the British empire menaced by the future independence of Canada. Like Sir John Macdonald, I was born a British subject, I shall remain a British subject, I hope to die a British subject. I trust the day will never come when the British flag will cease to float over this Canada of ours. But as has been eloquently said, Britain staggers under the too vast orb of her fate, and so it behooves us her children to decide how we can best assist the motherland to maintain control of the seas. It is not for us to-night to lay down the details of a scheme by which we can best co-operate towards that end, and I agree with the Prime Minister that we should act in conjunction with and by the advice of the British Admiralty. They have experts at their command, they have the experience of the past to direct them, and these we have not. While I venture to think that a system of torpedo boats and submarines such as has been adopted by the Commonwealth of Australia would be perhaps the most effective way in which we could assist Great Britain in a stated policy of naval defence, yet I agree that the Canadian government ought to have the advice of the British Admiralty and lend it-

self to such co-operation and co-ordination as will be best for the whole empire. We are either of the British empire or not of it; we are either in the empire for weal or woe or we are out of it. The unanimous voice of the people of Canada demands that we shall be in the empire and of the empire, and being in the empire and of the empire we must take our fair share of the burden of the naval defence of that empire and particularly of our sea coasts.

I come now to a consideration of the resolution which has been moved by the right hon. the Prime Minister, and I will say that with many portions of it I am in entire sympathy. But, I would like to make one or two suggestions to the right hon. gentleman, and I do not make them in any party spirit or in any carping spirit, because if there is one thing more than another that I would desire it is that the policy of Canada on this great question, and the resolution announcing it should meet with the absolute and unanimous approval of this parliament and of the country. What suggestions I have to make, I make with the sincere desire that we may shape a resolution of which we can all approve and which shall go forth to the world as a ringing declaration that if the mother of nations has to fight the battle of her life, the people of Canada without distinction of party or of creed will stand by her side in that fight. This is too great a question for the introduction of party strategy; it is a question in respect to which we should all rise superior to all party motives, and so I purpose making to my right hon. friend one or two suggestions which I know he will receive in the spirit in which I make them. I do not find any fault at all with the first paragraph which reads:

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

The next paragraph of the resolution reads:

> The House re-affirms the opinion repeatedly expressed by representatives of Canada that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions the payment of any stated contributions to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not so far as Canada is concerned be a satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

I would respectfully and very sincerely suggest to my right hon. friend that perhaps that paragraph had better be omitted, and I will tell him why. In the first place because it tells Great Britain and the world what we are not prepared to do when it seems to me that this is an occasion when we should declare to all men what we are prepared to do. My right hon. friend will not misunderstand me; I am as strong as he is in the assertion of the rights of self-government which Canada enjoys. I believe that we enjoy our privileges not by grace but of right, and we enjoy them in the carrying out of the wisest statesmanship on the part of the mother country. But, it does not seem to me that there is any need of asserting now a mere negative proposition such as is embodied in this paragraph. Again, it seems to me that this is a little inconsistent with the last paragraph of the resolution. The day might come—I do not know that it will come—the day might come; it might come to-morrow, it might come next week, it might come next month, when the only thing we could do in the absence of preparation in this country would be to make some kind of contribution. I do not know, and the right hon. the Prime Minister does not know what events may point to. Probably he knows more than I do, and I am not asking him to disclose anything to this House which ought not to be disclosed, but would it not be wise to omit that paragraph altogether? I tell him that I and every man on this side of the House stand firmly for the principle that the rights of self-government which we now hold shall not in any way be detracted from in the slightest degree. But is there any need of inserting this somewhat negative proposition in a resolution which ought to go forth as a message not only to the people of the empire but to the people of the world?

There is another paragraph in the resolution which—and I say it with all deference to my right hon. friend and to any hon. gentlemen whose opinion may not coicide with mine—there is another paragraph in the resolution which does not commend itself to my judgment. It is this:

> The House has observed with satisfaction the relief afforded in recent years to the taxpayers of the United Kingdom through the assumption by the Canadian people of considerable military expenditure formerly charged upon the imperial treasury.

It does seem to me that the occasion is not very opportune for impressing that fact upon the mind of the British tax-payer. It no doubt seems a considerable sum to the people of Canada; I am not disposed to minimize it in any way; but after all, when you compare it with the enormous contributions which have been made for the defence of the whole empire by the British taxpayers for many years past, is it desirable at the present moment that we should put it forward in a resolution of this kind, designed to go out not only to the people of the British empire, but to the people of the whole world? It seems to me, if I may use the word, as I do without offence, to be too trivial a matter to introduce into a resolution of this kind. Therefore I would most earnestly suggest to the right hon. gentleman that it would

be better, in the interest of this country, and undoubtedly in the interest of the empire, that it should be omitted. To omit it would be to emulate something of that generous spirit, that remarkably generous spirit, which is to be found in the utterance of a British naval authority—the First Lord of the Admiralty, I think it was—in 1907. I do not suppose that a more magnanimous utterance ever fell from the mouth of an imperial statesman. He said: 'We are prepared to defend this empire through its entire length, and we do not ask you to contribute one dollar to it; but we shall be glad, so far as your good will and your loyalty will impel you to do it, that you should come to our aid if it pleases you to do so.' But mark, he said: 'We do not even ask it; we will do it ourselves whether you do it or not; but if it pleases you to come to our aid, then the British nation will recognize with appreciation and with gratitude your action in that regard.' Well, Sir, when we are face to face with utterances of imperial statesmanship of that greatness and magnanimity, is it worth while, in a resolution framed for so great a purpose, to refer to that expenditure by Canada, which after all, in comparison with the enormous expenditures of the mother country, must seem extremely trivial, and is indeed trivial compared with what the resources even of this country might accomplish?

Just one word as to a further amendment which I would like to suggest to my right hon. friend. In paragraph 4, he proceeds:

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

I would be glad if my right hon. friend could accept the suggestion of inserting in that paragraph some word which would indicate an intention to act promptly. If my right hon. friend would insert before the word 'organization' some such word as 'immediate' or even 'early,' I think it would greatly improve the paragraph, it would meet with my approval, and I do not think it would be disapproved of by any hon. member of this House.

Now, I understand what the right hon. gentlemen contemplated in 1902. At that time he looked to the establishment of a Canadian naval force. At page 18 of the proceedings of the Imperial Conference of 1902 the First Lord of the Admiralty announced this:

> Sir Wilfrid Laurier informed me that His Majesty's government of the Dominion of Canada are contemplating the establishment of a local naval force in the waters of Canada, but that they were not able to make any offer of assistance analogous to those enumerated above.

Then, further on, in a written statement from which the right hon. gentleman has quoted, the following statement of policy is to be found:

> At present Canadian expenditures for defence services are confined to the military side. The Canadian government are prepared to consider the naval side of defence as well. On the sea coasts of Canada there is a large number of men admirably qualified to form a naval reserve, and it is hoped that at an early day a system may be devised which will lead to the training of these men and to the making of their services available for defence in time of need.

That was the statement, but up to the present time, as my right hon. friend is well aware, that has not materialized in anything of value. I know that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in a speech at the Colonial Conference, dwelt somewhat on the expenditure of this country on the fisheries protection service; but after all it does not seem to me that that should be taken greatly into account. If you leave that out of the account, you find the record of naval expenditure for 1905-6 to be as follows:

United Kingdom..	£33,389,500
Canada..	Nil.
Newfoundland..	3,000
Commonwealth of Australia.	255,651
New Zealand.. .. ..,	40,592
Cape of Good Hope..	50,000
Natal..	35,000
Transvaal..	Nil.

I do not think that I am making any statement in breach of confidence when I say that I am thoroughly aware that the late Raymond Prefontaine thoroughly intended to establish a Canadian naval militia or naval force of some kind. He told me so about a year before his death. Mr. Prefontaine was a man of large views and of great courage, and it may be—I am not intending to cast any reflection upon my hon. friend the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries—that a policy which would have been carried out otherwise has not been carried out owing to the present head of that department finding it necessary to devote his attention to other matters. I suggest to my right hon. friend that we should put something in this resolution which would point to prompt action. In 1902 we told the imperial government that we intended to do something; but up to the present time, seven years afterwards, we have done nothing. If the resolution of my right hon. friend were so amended, I think it would commend itself to the unanimous approval of the members of this House.

I do not desire to say anything more on this subject. I believe that the defence of our own shores and the protection of our own commerce is due to the self-respect which should fill the heart of every man in this country. You say that we may rest contented to depend for our naval defence on Great Britain. Well, if we have assumed the status of a nation in one respect, shall we adhere to the status of a Crown colony in other and still more important respects? You speak of a Monroe doctrine, but that doctrine would not defend our coasts, our cities and our commerce from the attacks of any foe; and it is idle to suggest that we could, in the case of a great naval war, obtain any measure of comfort from the Monroe doctrine. But if we should depend on the Monroe doctrine, would it not, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) well said this afternoon, reduce us to a position of vassalage as regards the great republic. That is not a condition or a policy in harmony with our self respect or with our ideals and status as a nation. We desire that this resolution should go out as the unanimous resolution of the parliament of Canada to the whole world, and I believe it may go out as a message which will do much to keep the peace of the world in these days of uncertainty. It should go in such terms as would entitle the Canadian people to the gratitude of the empire and do much to restore to the people of this country that self respect in which, it seems to me, we have been somewhat lacking in these days when others have done so much, and we so little, for naval defence so absolutely essential to the integrity and the maintenance of our great empire.

Mr. F. T. CONGDON (Yukon). I am sure, Mr. Speaker, there will be no word of complaint from any portion of the British empire at the tone in which this discussion has been carried out. It is recognized on both sides that the question is too important, not only to Canada but to the British empire, to be discussed in any party spirit. It certainly is one which must be discussed from the broadest national point of view and a solution of which must be sought, not merely acceptable to the government of the day, but to future governments, as governments change from time to time. There is very little difference in the opinions expressed regarding general conditions. There can be no doubt that great dangers always have, and always must, attend great empires; some of these dangers come from without, but the majority from within; and it is one of the pleasing features in the history of the British empire in modern times, that whenever her foreign relations have been covered with gloom, that gloom has been dispelled by the brightness of the loyalty of her daughters. That loyalty has burst forth amid the deepest gloom as when a sable cloud turns forth her silver lining on the night. There can be no doubt as to the loyalty of Canada and of every other dominion of Great Britain to the empire, and the question resolves itself into this: What shall the various portions of the empire do in order to put themselves in such a position as to be able, at the critical moment and at the proper time, to render the greatest assistance to the mother country. In Canada it is generally recognized that there is no military spirit dominant in the country and very little in favour of military establishments, unless such military and naval establishments as are absolutely essential for our welfare and the defence of the empire. There are better investments we can make in behalf of the empire and of Canada than expenditure upon navies or greater military organizations in the immediate present. If Canada desires to become a great nation, a nation that shall be a tower of strength to the mother country, as well as a sure bulwark of defence to herself, I do not see what better policy she can pursue than that of husbanding her strength and resources and thus enabling herself to become a powerful factor in the British empire. Were we at present to engage in a naval programme what would we require to do? It would be necessary to take the money of our people and go outside the boundaries of the Dominion to spend it. It seems to me that it would be better for the government and parliament of the Dominion to sanction such aid to our steel and iron industries in the east and west as will make it possible to us in a few years to build our own navy. You can never induce the people of Canada to make contributions for expenditure of that kind outside her own limits. I venture to say that no greater danger could arise to the empire than would follow if we agreed annually to contribute to the British authorities either a battleship or sufficient money to build one. That would create friction and controversy between the mother country and Canada; and any arrangement whereby the control of the money contributed by us would be under the authority of British statesmen, and not shared in any way by Canada, would lead to such conflicts and difficulties between the mother country and the Dominion as would be a source of danger to the empire. I believe that the best policy for us to pursue is the one we are now following and from which I see no reason for departing. That is the policy of being ready, as the people of Canada are always ready, to furnish whatever they have that may be necessary for the defence

of the empire in times of need. But if we start at present into any vast naval or military outlay we shall so impede our growth that in the course of a very short time we will be of much less assistance to the empire than if we permitted our country to advance and prosper as she is doing now. I do not think that there is at present anything so critical in British relations as to cause us to get excited. One of our greatest publicists has said that of all the nations in the world, there is none so governed by their humour as the English. He said that two hundred years ago, and it is not less true to-day, and it is pleasant and consoling to find that the Scotchmen who are to-day in the cabinet of Great Britain do not share the excitement of some of the music halls of London regarding the danger hovering over the empire at present. I listened with some regret to the exordium of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Foster), I could not but think that if some heathen had been listening to that address he would have thought that the hon. gentleman was a great high priest of pessimism performing the funeral rites of Christianity. It may be that wars will come, it may be that we cannot prevent the recurrence of warfare, but the people of Canada are inclined to peace, and the efforts of our public men should be directed not to inflaming passions among nations, not to arousing hostility but to endeavour to bring about that time when war will cease and be looked upon as a vanity out of date and battleships as a superannuated piece of folly.

To-day there is talk of danger of war between the two great nations of Germany and Great Britain—Great Britain, the greatest contributor to the liberty of mankind in a political sense; Germany, the greatest contributor to the liberty of mankind in an intellectual and philosophical sense. These are the two most advanced nations of the world and why to-day is there any danger of hostilities between these nations? Is the fault entirely on the part of Germany? Is it not due to a large extent to the fact that each of these two nations is abusing the other, that their papers are full of abuse and ridicule, the English making fun of German awkwardness and the German of English awkwardness, saying all sorts of witty and offensive things, instead of treating each other with courtesy and attempting to conduct themselves in such a way as to render impossible a war between the two nations. Richter said that Providence had given to the French the empire of the land, to the English the empire of the seas and to the Germans the empire—of the air. I do not think any one could expect that Germany would be satisfied with the empire of the air. It must be remembered that Germany is a vast and important and a great people, one of the greatest peoples of the world to-day and there is no instance in the history of the world of a great nation such as the German nation tying itself up within the narrow confines of an empire like Germany of to-day and not seeking and succeeding in obtaining some outlet for its population. Great Britain to-day has an outlet in all its vast empire for its surplus population, and I do not believe that anything could be better than that Germany should obtain some such outlet for hers. I believe the object in the creation of the German navy is to obtain an outlet of that kind, but I am satisfied that that aim could be best obtained by negotiations with other nations. It is customary to condemn the Emperor of Germany. We all remember when he ascended the throne 21 years ago the prognostications of what was to occur; he was to be the troubler of Europe, he was to create war here, there and everywhere, and we all know that the very contrary has been the case. He has undoubtedly made, as he doubtless would admit, a few mistakes. I do not know if he had the chance again, whether he would write the Kruger telegram, but that has long passed by and surely there should be a statutory limitation in regard to faults of that kind. No one can view his career without recognizing that he is one of the greatest rulers of modern times. Naturally enough he seeks to build up and to advance the interests of his own empire. It is only a few weeks since the King of England visited Germany and was received with great enthusiasm not only by the Emperor but by the people of Germany. The English were so delighted to find the people of Berlin naming streets after His Majesty that they almost became German in their sentiments. Yet to-day the Emperor of Germany is going to conquer the British empire !

I do not think the people of Canada will cease to be patriotic, but I am sure they will never become hysterical in their patriotism. I hope they will continue to keep erected above them in regard to this, as in regard to other matters, the banner of sound common sense, and in the discussion of this and every other question they will not overlook homely self-interest, coupled with a due regard to and a due sense of what is reasonable and what is right. It seems to me you might as well have asked the old settler cutting down hardwood trees in Ontario in the days of tomahawk and scalping knife, to buy a uniform and enroll himself in a regiment of soldiers to protect those hardwood trees as to expect Canada to give up the development of this country, its settlement and the working of its vast resources and to turn her energies to developping a great military and naval strength. If that is ever done, if that is immediately

done in Canada, you will divert from Canada her greatest attraction for increased population.

I venture to assert that if Great Britain would adopt the policy of the old tribes, when migrations of natives began, of dividing up the population, and placing in each portion a number of the noble and ignoble, the rich and the poor and then drawing lots as to which should get out of the country, we would gladly take one of those portions, help to bring them to Canada and help to build up here a further bulwark of strength for the British empire. I believe that some such sane, sensible scheme as that would be a thousand times better for the British empire, would make Canada a stronger support of the British empire than spending money on Dreadnoughts and on the military fuss and feathers some people would like to see in this country. The people of Canada will not submit to the drums and tramplings of militarism. They are going to defend themselves, but they are prepared to take some risk. Every man has to take the risk of loss of life or property; any one of us may be assassinated, but still the authorities will not allow us to carry guns for our own protection, and why cannot a large nation like the British or the Canadian take a certain risk? I would sooner be conquered by any people than go along as some people in London would have us, frightened to death that some foreign nation will conquer us. Even if Great Britain should lose her navy, and be in such a position that the New Zealander could stand on London bridge and view the remains of this old Dreadnought grounded on the Thames, I do not believe that Canada would be in the slightest danger from any foreign aggression.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CONGDON. I hope that hon. gentlemen do not think I am prophesying any such disaster as that. If the hon. gentlemen in dissenting from my views thought that I was speaking of such a calamity as likely to occur to Great Britain, they misunderstood me. I was merely quoting Lord Macaulay's expression regarding the New Zealander standing upon the ruins of London bridge. Any reader of history knows that such disasters have occurred to the greatest empires. There are elements of strength and greatness in the British empire, but they do not relieve it from the possibility of the fate that has pursued all great nations of the world from the Hittites down to the present day. But even if that disaster should occur, there is no danger to Canada if the proper policy is pursued in Canada, the policy of training every young man in the country in physical exercise, the training to which Lord Strathcona has devoted his magnificent gift. If every young man is taught to use the rifle, if every young man is taught discipline, you can in this way build up a population of free men, ready to lay down their lives in defence of their country, and we need not fear the Dutchmen or any one endeavouring to invade or conquer our country. You might as well talk about raising fortifications as a protection against the great republic to the south. We all know there is no danger of invasion from the southern republic. The spirit of that people is too far advanced; the danger of collision between them and us has, I believe, absolutely passed away, and when you begin to talk about military matters at our present stage of a material development, it is exactly as though a young boy, a recruit, should shove into a lot of gladiators showing his biceps and declaring that they could not get on without fighting. It is not necessary for Canada to talk about fighting, it is necessary for her to pursue a policy that will avoid difficulties and entanglements for the British empire and relieve her from the horrors and dangers of warfare. The ideal I have of Canada is not a country with fortifications here and there, and people listening to the drums and trampling of soldiers, with horrid, hideous battleships around our coasts. The ideal I have of Canada is a Canada that, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, shall contain no city in which there is a single slum, no city in which there are any of those abominations which to-day exist in other countries, and I say that to-day Canada would be pursuing a noble aim and a noble object and an object which would make her a great country, if she pursued the policy of endeavouring in every city to create a civic spirit, determined to see that the labouring class in that city should not be in want, that there should be in it none of those disreputable quarters which seem to be an inseparable auxiliary of the cities of the old world. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that there is the slightest danger of Canada going crazy over this question. I am quite convinced that we shall not build any Dreadnoughts in the near future, and send them over the water; but if we do I hope we will give her the usual bill of lading, 'God send the good ship safe to harbour,' and that no disasters will occur to Canada, in consequence, to force us hereafter to declare 'It was that fatal and perfidious bark built in the eclipse and rigged with curses dark that sunk so low that sacred head of thine.'

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey). I have listened with a great deal of pleasure, as I usually do, to the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster); I have also listened with a great deal of pleasure to the eloquent speech delivered

by the right hon. the Prime Minister, and to the very able speech delivered by the leader of the opposition, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). I may also say that I have listened to the speech of the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Congdon) but I cannot say that I have listened to it with much pleasure. Judging from the hon. member's speech, we have a right to conclude that he is going to vote both against the resolution of the hon. member for North Toronto and against the amendment of the Prime Minister. He has totally ignored the conditions that exist in the empire to-day. He has totally disregarded the fact that the statesmen of Great Britain, in the speeches they have delivered in the British House of Parliament, have declared that the time has arrived when the supremacy of the British navy is being menaced, that Germany has shown by her haste in the construction of battleships that she intends to challenge the supremacy of the British navy. The hon. gentleman has totally ignored these facts, and has shown by his speech that he is not in favour of any immediate action by Canada to give assistance to the motherland.

A great deal has been said for and against any concrete action being taken to render assistance to the mother land. Let me say a few words on that question. We are here to-day to protect the Dominion of Canada a country that has a population of nearly seven millions, a country that is thirty-three times as large as Italy, eighteen times as large as Germany, eighteen times as large as France, nearly as large as the whole of Europe, and slightly larger than the United States. We are here to protect the commerce and the productiveness of the Dominion of Canada. We are here to protect 7,000 miles of coast line on the Pacific coast. We are here to protect the great industries of British Columbia with her total yearly production of $88,000,000 worth, her fisheries worth between six and seven millions, her mineral production amounting to twenty-three million dollars, her 13,000 men engaged in the fishing industry, and her 9,000 men engaged on the shore fisheries of that province. Then I pass over the Rocky mountains and come to the province of Alberta. We are here to protect the nineteen million bushels of grain that are raised in that province, valued at ten and a half million dollars, and her three million dollars' worth of cattle exported from that province last year. Then I pass on into the province of Saskatchewan. We are here to protect the 105 million bushels of grain raised in that province during the last year, and valued at sixty million dollars. I pass onward into the province of Manitoba, and we are here to protect the 113 million bushels of grain raised there, of a value of something like fifty million dollars. I come down into the old province of Ontario with its many agricultural products. We are here to protect the 185 million bushels of field crops grown in that province, to protect its butter, its cheese, its fruit, its cattle that are being exported to Great Britain. Then I come on to the province of Quebec, and we are here to protect its eighty-five million bushels of field crops, to protect its large exports of butter and cheese, to protect its 260 million dollars worth of foreign trade. I pass on to the maritime provinces, and we are here to protect the products of their farms, of their mines and of their fisheries. I pass on to the coast of Nova Scotia, with her unprotected sea coast of 5,600 miles, extending from the Bay of Fundy to the Straits of Belle Isle. It is said that the farmers of this country will not sanction any contribution towards the maintenance of a naval force, or in keeping up a navy. I come back again, and I collect the surplus agricultural products of these various provinces, and I carry them down to the sea, and what do I find? I find that out of the 120 million dollars worth of agricultural products exported from the Dominion of Canada, no less than 101 million dollars worth go to that grand old country beyond the seas. In other words, of our total agricultural production exported from the whole Dominion, five-sixths pass down through the great lakes and along the various lines of railways, and are transported across the sea. It follows as a consequence that unless we can protect these lines of communication by which our exports proceed, we are absolutely at the mercy of some foreign power.

Then I will touch upon another aspect of the question. Our total trade last year was $650,000,000, an enormous amount. It is true a great portion of that is trade with the United States, but the balance is trade which has to seek an outlet across the seas, and which must be protected by Britain's navy. Then I come to the question of our fisheries. I find that in the Dominion of Canada our total fishery output is valued at 25 million dollars, of which we export 14 millions. We employ 84,000 men, and the capital invested in that industry is 15 million dollars. Is there an hon. gentleman in this House who would say that it is not of some importance to us to protect these fisheries, a large proportion of which is carried on upon the sea coast of our country? Then I come to the matter of tonnage owned by the various countries, as shown below:

British	12,000,000
German	2,744,000
American	2,734,000
Norwegian	1,491,000
French	1,284,000
Russian	1,076,000
Italian	996,000
Japanese	847,000
Swedish	720,000
Canada	700,000

That is to say, Great Britain owns to-day a tonnage equal to that of all the other nations I have mentioned. To be linked to a country of wealth and commerce so enormous, must be an inestimable boon to the Dominion of Canada.

Then I come to the question of finances, and let us see how this country is bound up with the finances of the United Kingdom. It has been estimated by a great authority that the total British capital invested in the Dominion of Canada to-day is between $1,100,000,000 and $1,200,000,000. We know that in the last year we have borrowed from Great Britain $200,000,000. We know that the whole of our borrowings from that country amount to 85 per cent of our total loans, and that of all that has been borrowed 3 per cent comes from the United States and the balance from individual interests. Therefore, do we not see that with regard to the question of finance, our welfare is inseparably bound up with the mother land?

Let us see the position in which we stand with reference to the other colonies of the empire. What have the other colonies done as compared with what we have done? We will take the case of New Zealand. New Zealand has a population of less than a million souls. New Zealand gave a subsidy, first of all, of £40,000—$200,000 a year —and she is now giving a subsidy of $500,000, or half a million. She has come to the conclusion within the last two or three weeks that not only is $500,000 not sufficient as her share of the up-keep of the British navy, but she sent an offer of a Dreadnought which will cost $8,000,000 or $9,000,000. Surely if the loyalty of the little island of New Zealand with less than a million people, is such that she can contribute not only an annual subsidy of $500,000 but a Dreadnought as well, Canada can show her appreciation in some more tangible form than she has done in the past. Next, let us take Cape Colony with a population of 2,300,000, one-quarter only of which is white, makes contribution of $250,000 per annum, and surely if Cape Colony can do that the Dominion of Canada, with 7,000,000 of a population and with her vast natural resources, can do something more substantial than she has been doing in the past. Then take the little colony of Natal with a population of 1,200,000, only one-tenth of which is white, and we find that Natal gives $175,000 a year as her contribution to the national exchequer. Then we come to the Commonwealth of Australia with a population of 4,200,000, with a total vessel tonnage of 400,000, as compared with our vessel tonnage of 700,000, and with a total trade of $600,000,000, as compared with our total trade of $650,000,000, and we find that Australia has given $1,000,000 a year since 1902-3 or 1903 and has continued to give that contribution, but has now decided to change the form of it as pointed out by the right hon. First Minister.

Then I come to the question of the British navy. The British navy is composed to-day, as I understand, of about 485 ships, and the number of officers and men is 128,000. The capital invested in the British navy is almost incalculable. The estimates for the year 1908-9 for the British navy were $163,500,000. During the last ten years Great Britain has expended on her navy $1,600,000,000. One can scarcely conecive what an expenditure of $163,500,000 annually means. It means $448,000 per day, $18,666 per hour, or $311 every minute of every hour of every day of the 365 days of the year.

Then, I come to the question of the British army, and I refer to the British army for the reason that if we were threatened with an invasion of any kind Great Britain would send to our assistance her army; so that, for all practical purposes Great Britain is maintaining that army for herself but she is also maintaining it for the benefit of her colonies. We would get the benefit of the army just as fully and just as completely as would the people residing in Great Britain. The British army costs $154,185,000 every year, $422,422 every day, $17,600 every hour and $293 every minute. I will put the two together to show the House what Great Britain is paying for the army and navy, and as we get as much benefit as great Britain we will realize the debt of gratitude which we owe to the mother country for what she does in this respect. The total combined cost of the British army and navy is $317,695,120 every year, $870,422 every day, $36,266 every hour, and $604 every minute of every day in the year. You may say: Is it possible that we are getting our full pro rata share of the benefit of the army and navy of Great Britain? I want to point out to you that when the rights and privileges of a small portion of the British subjects in a distant part of the empire were attacked 350,000 men left the shores of Great Britain and her colonies, they were transported with the assistance and protection of the British navy three or four thousand miles across the sea and they went into the heart of British South Africa for the purpose of enforcing the rights of those few citizens. That is the best guarantee we have that if trouble arose in Canada today, if any unfriendly power dared to put her foot on our possessions, Great Britain would do in Canada just as she did in South Africa a a few years ago and there would be an army of 100,000 of her best soldiers transported across the Atlantic and landed in Canada to perform the very same service that they

performed in South Africa. What do you think that cost the mother country? It cost the mother country 18,000 souls who went to South Africa and never returned and it cost $1,030,000,000. That was the amount that was expended to enforce the rights of British subjects in South Africa and that is exactly what Great Britain would do to-day if our rights in this country were assailed. It costs Great Britain $30,000,000 to pay the interest at 3 per cent on the debt which she contracted to uphold the rights of the British subjects in South Africa. Then, I say what could Great Britain have done in South Africa if she had not had a sufficiently strong navy for the transportation of her army three or four thousand miles across the sea? I would like to point out also that in my humble opinion the best form of protection for the country is that which is provided by a navy. You may build a strong fort upon one portion of the sea coast and you may, to a certain extent, effectively protect the section of coast in which it is situated, but an adverse navy will come along and attack your coast a few miles away and you cannot move that fortification. Every Dreadnought of the British navy is a movable fortification. Every Dreadnought can transfer its power from one portion of the British empire to another. Every war vessel is nothing more or less than a species of fortification that can be transferred to any part of the empire in which it is required. That is the strongest kind of portable fortification that any country can have. It therefore behooves us to strengthen the hands of the British government and to give our contribution towards upholding the British navy.

The question is asked: Is the resolution before us specific enough? Does it go far enough? I am not going to discuss that question further than to say that personally I think the time has arrived for Canada to take a decided stand. It will not do for us simply to put resolutions at conferences; it will not do for us simply to say by resolution that we are willing to do so and so. That resolution has been practically before the country since 1902 or 1903 and nothing has been done in reference to the navy. It is true that something has been done in reference to taking over the two fortifications of Halifax and Esquimalt, but absolutely nothing has been done in reference to a contribution to the assistance of the navy as far as the Dominion of Canada is concerned. It is not enough to say to-day that we will stand absolutely in the position we took in 1902 at the Colonial conference; it is our duty to assert that while that is our principle yet the time has come to show the motherland that we are prepared to back up our sympathy by some actual effort.

Mr. ALEXANDER B. WARBURTON (Queens, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, the speeches delivered in the House to-day lead to the conclusion that the views held by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House on this question are not so divergent as on the surface they would appear to be. It may be assumed as an axiom that every member in this House and probably every citizen of Canada is loyal and true to the empire and prepared to support it in case of need. The time has gone by when the charge can be laid against any section of our people that they have not the interests of the British empire deeply at heart. I listened with pleasure and profit to the patriotic speeches delivered by the right hon. the Prime Minister and by the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). In this my first session in the Dominion parliament it was an inspiration to me to find that a debate of this importance could be raised to such a lofty plane and be so worthy of the Canadian nation. But, if we were to accept the words of the hon. member (Mr. Middlebro) in their literal sense we might well wince at the contract which he offers to us. He told us that we had the wheat fields of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, as well as the commerce of the other provinces of the Dominion to afford ample protection to. I would like to ask him how in the name of common sense there would be any chance of a hostile force reaching the interior of our country?

Mr. BEATTIE. He said we had to protect the products of these provinces in transit.

Mr. WARBURTON. Of course, when these products are in transit on the sea they might require protection, but so far as hostile invasion is concerned, with the exception of a narrow fringe on our Pacific and Atlantic coasts our country is impregnable. Even as to our coast line, it would seem to me that if we can protect our coal supplies a hostile fleet would be rendered powerless. It could not keep the sea. It has been asked during the debate what we are doing for the empire in comparison, for example, with New Zealand. I have seen it stated that New Zealand has given way to the panic which for a brief space spread over the empire and has offered one Dreadnought and expressed her readiness to supply another in case of need. Well, I have conversed with a good many persons from New Zealand in the last few years and the thought occurred to me that a country which has to borrow so largely might perhaps be accused of

being generous when she ought to be just. But let us see if we are not doing something for the mother land. Is it nothing that we are providing at great expense to ourselves homes for the people of Great Britain, and thus relieving the congestion of population there? Is it not a fact that every workingman who finds a home in Canada ceases to be an expense to the mother country and becomes a source of strength to her in this part of the empire? What happened during the Boer war? In some respects that war was a blessing in that it demonstrated that England was not alone, but that her kindred beyond the seas were enthusiastic to rush to her aid and defend her interests. It was an object lesson never to be forgotten that Canada and the other parts of the British empire sent their sons to the veldts of South Africa to fight for the common welfare of the British empire. The resolution of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has been on the Order Paper since the first day of the session and hence the recent panic had nothing to do with its origin, but I think the House will agree with me that the existence of that panic had much to do with the interest taken in this discussion. The English are supposed to be the staidest people on earth, and yet it would almost seem that once in a decade or so they must get into some state of excitement, probably as a safety valve to keep them in their usually even frame of mind during the interval. There was a panic in England aroused by what was called the Battle of Dorking pamphlet, there was the Fashoda panic when some young French officer committed an indiscretion and the hot headed people and the excitable press of both nations were ready to fly at each other, but time has healed all that and to-day France and England live on terms of perfect amity. The present panic will, history repeating itself, be followed by others and so long as the instincts of the British people are as they are we may expect periods of excitement. To say anything detrimental of the British navy is a sore spot with every Englishman, and so whenever its supremacy is questioned there is likely to be excitement. Reading the history of the past we find there have been many scares of invasion in England. There was first the Armada, which miserably failed; then there was the Dutch invasion, but the Dutch navy, after a slight success and the British people found themselves, ceased to be a menace. Napoleon in the zenith of his power threatened to invade England, but it was but a threat, and so the present day scare of invasion will pass away and the British empire rise stronger and more glorious than ever. There is a matter which perhaps I am not competent to express an opinion on and it is this:

We have heard much of Dreadnoughts and of the offers of some of the Australian colonies to contribute Dreadnoughts to the British empire. In the light of recent inventions and discoveries, it is just possible that the Dreadnought type of ship may not continue to be favoured very long. In our own recollection—and none of us are very old men—we can remember more than one change in the type of ships of war. In the early sixties, at the time of the civil war in the United States, the 'Merrimac' attacked an American fleet, which was supposed to be very powerful, and sank one or two ships, thus rendering obsolete all the fleets of the world at that time. During the Russo-Japanese war a few years ago, the Russian Admiral Marakoff placed his faith in the type of large cruisers which failed him, and now we have the very heavy type such as the Dreadnought. But many of the members of this House had the pleasure on Saturday last of listening to one of the greatest inventors of the day describing his recent discoveries, and speaking particularly of the airship. In view of the discoveries and inventions of the last twenty or thirty years, we cannot scoff at or belittle any invention. A few years ago any man who talked about transmitting messages by means of wireless telegraphy would have been looked on as a lunatic; and no one to-day can say that the warships of the future will not be airships. We know that the German government is experimenting along this line. In Cape Breton Dr. Bell and his associates are conducting similar experiments. It would not be at all beyond comprehension to suppose that one of these little airships might destroy a great ship of the Dreadnought type. So that we do not really know whether or not the vessels of this type are going to be permanent or not. It has seemed to me, ever since I devoted any thought to this question, that while we should take measures to protect our harbours on the sea coast, the real arm that we ought to strengthen is the military arm. I remember reading, in one of the speeches of Lord Roberts in Quebec last summer—and other men whose opinions are entitled to respect have said the same thing—that the great need of Great Britain to-day is not so much contributions of ships as contributions of soldiers to help her to fight her battles on land. She is very well able to take care of herself on the sea. The military arm of Canada has been greatly improved of late years until now we seem to have a real force. Possibly it may be necessary to spend more money on that force and on the protection of our seaports, and when we do that we do about all that it is possible for us to do. The British navy has held command of the seas for a century, and British statesmen say that there is no immediate probability

of her losing that command. So long as she can command the seas, the best assistance the outlying parts of the empire can render her is in strengthening the military arm and in protecting their own coasts.

Mr. GEORGE H. BARNARD (Victoria, B.C.) Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I can add very little to the merits of this discussion, after the very eloquent speeches which have been made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and other gentlemen. At the same time, I feel that I would be derelict in my duty to my constituents if I did not endeavour to place before this House what I believe to be the views of the people of the city of Victoria and of the province of British Columbit upon this question. When the Pacific squadron was in existence, it had its headquarters at the town of Esquimalt, at a short distance from the city of Victoria, and practically a suburb of that city; so that the people of Victoria were brought into daily contact with the officers and men, and had ample opportunity to judge of the ability and efficiency of the men composing His Majesty's navy. It was a sore blow to the people of British Columbia when the imperial authorities decided to withdraw the Pacific squadron from that port; but if that withdrawal should result in the Dominion of Canada using that point as a naval base for a navy of its own, it may prove to have been a blessing in disguise. Hitherto, the Dominion of Canada in this respect has occupied a humiliating position, because we find that practically every other self-governing colony of the empire contributes its proportion to the naval expenditure, while Canada contributes nothing. At the Colonial Conference of 1902 the Colonial Secretary declared that he had had an opportunity to communicate with the representatives of the different colonies, and that all had agreed to make certain contributions except the Dominion of Canada, which he was assured was going to establish a naval force of its own. Yet at the Imperial Conference of 1907 the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that Canada's contribution was the taking over of the Halifax dockyard, the negotiation for the taking over of the Esquimalt dockyard, and the maintenance of a fisheries protection service. With regard to the Halifax dockyard, we find by a statement of the ministers' own officials, that although it has been taken over, it is now being used only as a kind of glorified junk shop. I quote from the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for 1908 page 31, a statement regarding the dockyard and grounds at Halifax:

Dockyards and Grounds at Halifax.

The appearance of the naval dockyard and grounds was improved during the season. The dockyard is now used for departmental purposes in storing lighthouse material, buoy anchors, chain and lighthouse repairs and equipment.

That is one sample of Canada's contribution to naval defence. Taking up the other branch of the question, the fishery cruiser protection, what do we find? I cannot speak of those cruisers on the Atlantic, but we were assured to-day — and there was no contradiction of the statement—by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), that if any kind of a second or third-class cruiser of a foreign power should come to Canada with hostile intent our Canadian cruiser would show her heels and get into dock as fast as she could. As regards fishery protection on the Pacific coast, I shall not give you any words of mine, but quote again from the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for 1907-8, page 302. We have one boat out there, but I never heard her called a cruiser until I came down here. Regarding the steamer I find this stated in the report:

On the 28th, we visited Rock Fish bay. At 0.17 p.m., of this date we sighted a steamer fishing well inshore at the mouth of the Cumshewa inlet. I immediately gave chase, but as they saw us at the same time as we sighted them, she at once ran in and picked up her dories and escaped before we could reach her; thus another valuable prize of $75,000 was lost for the want of a fast cruiser. This steamer proved to be the 'Manhattan,' owned by the New England Fish Company.

Again, in that same report, I find this statement:

I have the honour to submit the following prepared statement of the number of pounds of halibut caught in the waters of the coast of British Columbia by Canadian and United States fishing vessels, from January 1, 1907, up to and including the month of October, with comparative statement for the months of November and December, thus giving a statement of the total halibut catch in the above stated waters for the year 1907.

	Total catch for year.	Value.
Canadian	4,730,000 lbs.	$ 236,500
United States.	30,854,164 "	1,542,820
Total	35,584,164 "	1,779,320

The fish above referred to were all practically caught in Canadian waters, or in other words, if there were cruisers enough to protect and keep foreign fishing vessels out of our harbours, and outside the 3-mile limit, said foreign vessels could not possibly have caught in the same time more than one-third of the above stated catch.

So that when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) or any other representative of the Canadian government says to the Colonial conference that Canada is doing her share of naval defence, by the maintenance of fisheries

cruiser protection and taking over dock yards, he puts the people of Canada in a most humiliating position. With regard to the dock yard at Esquimalt, that is not yet taken over. We were told on the first of February of this year by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that negotiations were still pending. They were pending in 1907 and are still in the same condition, and that is another sample of Canada's contribution towards naval defence. So that we have, as an offset against the amount voted by New Zealand and other colonies, this condition in Canada which I have just pointed out. The statement has been made that the contribution of New Zealand was only £40,000, but after the Colonial conference of 1907, New Zealand voluntarily increased her contribution to £100,000, and gave that contribution without any condition. New Zealand waived the condition of the previous grant and left the matter altogether in the hands of the imperial government.

So far as the people of British Columbia are concerned, I can assure the right hon the Prime Minister that they are practically unanimous in the desire that some suitable contribution, in some shape or other, should be raised towards imperial defence. I am satisfied that what would be best for the country would be some such system as the Australian Commonwealth has outlined. Personally I would be prepared to go further. I do not see why the Dominion government should not if necessary build Dreadnoughts, put two on the Atlantic and two on the Pacific coast. They could be manned by men from the imperial service and be available at any time for that service, and I am satisfied that we would then not be in the humiliating position we now occupy.

Another question raised at the colonial conference, was that of dry-docks On this Lord Tweedmouth laid great stress. He said it was of the utmost importance to the imperial authorities that they should have dry-docks in every portion of the world capable of taking in a Dreadnought. Such a vessel would be 490 feet long and 75 feet beam. I do not know the conditions on the Atlantic coast, but on the Pacific there is no dry-dock capable of taking in a ship of anything like that size. I should suggest that if any such policy be adopted, one of the first things to be done would be to construct a dry-dock which would be under the guns of the fortifications at Esquimalt and thus protected from the inroads of an enemy. A suggestion which was met with a good deal of approval from the English press is one that was made by a gentleman residing in Victoria, Mr. C. A. Gregg. He wrote the London 'Times' suggesting that Great Britain should dispose of some of her cruisers, which are not sufficiently up-to-date to be in the front firing line, to the Dominion. That suggestion has been favourably commented on by some of the English press, and I would like to cite a few words from the London 'Times':

> Our correspondent makes the sensible suggestion that, as the Admiralty is constantly discarding vessels which would admirably discharge the duties contemplated, these vessels should be assigned to Canadian marine police work. Canada would thus save the expense of constructing new ships which could never form part of a fighting fleet, and would be encouraged to invest money to much better purpose in ships fit to take their place in the imperial navy. It is important that there should be as little overlapping and waste as possible, and for the avoiding of these there ought to be the most complete and intelligent utilization of resources from an imperial standpoint. The idea we are discussing appears to further that aim. No doubt there will be technical and official objections, but if the idea were developed on broad lines and with a due sense of the solidarity of the empire, the results might be found both morally and financially satisfactory.

I do not know that I have anything much further to say except that I am satisfied it is high time the people of Canada woke up to a sense of their responsibility in connection with this matter. I believe that if a firm and able stand were taken it would be found that there are very few dissenting voices in the Dominion and that the people of this country would be prepared to make sacrifices, if sacrifices were necessary, in order to carry into effect the resolution which has been proposed this afternoon.

Mr. G. A. TURCOTTE (Nicolet). Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few remarks on this resolution and to give my views on its intrinsic value and importance. The resolution brought before the House by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is drawn in a very able and insidious manner. It appeals to our national pride and sets forth the fact that our resources are diversified and abundant. This is a broad admission that the country is in a far better financial situation than it was when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had the management of the Finance Department, and I am led to presume that this is the reason why such a resolution as the present one was never brought to the attention of parliament during the Conservative regime.

I am thankful to the sub-leader of the opposition for this disinterested and sincere acknowledgement, which bears testimony to the prosperity of Canada under Liberal administration.

I fully recognize the immense progress which has been achieved in all branches of public service, under the wise and able rule of our Liberal administration. I realize with pride and admiration the great success with which the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has administered the public money of this country, and I glory in the fact that with judicious economy he has had a considerable surplus over expenditure. I have no hesitation in saying that Canada has made a great step towards manhood and that the relations between our motherland and her greatest colony, are such as to let us anticipate, sooner or later, some change in the alliance between the two countries. I sincerely hope that a broad discussion of the most needed political changes will attract public attention to them and lend strength and importance to the movement in their favour because the political as well as the economical future of Canada must occupy a foremost place in the thoughts of those who have at heart the prosperity and greatness of our country.

What is the aim of the resolution now under consideration? Does it imply solely and directly the best interests of Canada or does it seek to afford military and naval help to England without any compensation? We have worked out, up to the present time, our own destiny and have enjoyed for many years past the utmost liberty, protected as we are by the British flag, I am happy to say. We have built up a great country and the energy and intelligence of the Canadian people have brought to completion gigantic enterprises which have evoked universal admiration. Our constitution, which derives its vitality from the fact that it is a shoot of British institutions grafted upon the federative form of the American constitution, gives us the utmost confidence in the final evolution of Canada into a great and prosperous country. I am an enthusiastic believer in the prophetic assertion of the right hon. leader of the Liberal party (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who, in a patriotic utterance, exclaimed that the twentieth century would be the century of Canada, as the nineteenth has been that of the United States. But in the face of all this, are we prepared to affirm that our country has attained such a state of development, growth and wealth as to justify the hazardous policy which the present resolution calls for? No, I do not think so and I venture to say that Canada has now reached that period of evolution in which the whirling and acute activity of her citizens, the demands of her industries and commerce, the requirements of a more perfect state of civilization, ought to impress on the mind of the leaders that it is their duty to direct all their attention and all the power at their disposal to obtaining for the people of Canada a moral, intellectual and material bettering.

The immense area of our land, the vast resources which it contains and the diversity of wants demanding help and redress are so many reasons calling for the action of parliament and the influence of our capital. Canada's wants, at present, Sir, are too pressing to allow of the idea that we can afford to expend millions by assuming the responsibilities involved in the present resolution. Have we not our great northwest, to which every year thousands of immigrants are flocking, willing to add by their labour and their intelligence to the wealth of the country, if their products can easily and economically reach the great markets of the world? It is true that immense sums of money have already been spent in the direction of securing a sure and direct transportation, in building our two transcontinental railways, but is this sufficient, is that all that is to be done towards giving to our northwestern population the facilities and accommodations to which they are entitled?

We know that hundreds of thousands of bushels of grain are left in storage in the west each year owing to the lack of proper transportation capacity. This state of things cannot last and has to be remedied in the near future by the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. The northwestern settlers are clamouring for an adequate and economical transportation route and it is but fair to listen to their demands and to put them on an equal footing with their American northwestern competitors. The construction of the Georgian Bay Canal has occupied and occupies yet, I am proud to say, a prominent place in the Liberal programme, and I have such confidence and faith in the judgment and foresight of our leaders as to be firmly impressed with the idea that, instead of sacrificing millions in the construction of battleships and arming our coasts to flatter the imperialistic propensities of those whose erroneous patriotic ideas have misled them, provision will be made to ensure the construction of this great waterway. Millions will have to be spent for that purpose, it is true, but this expenditure is fully justified by the extraordinary results it will have in developing a vast area where flourishing cities will rise, giving life, comfort and happiness to millions of people.

Sir, Canada, it seems to me, has done something towards uniting the empire and in favour of imperialism, by the construction of our two transcontinental railways. The shortening of distances between England and her colonies beyond the seas, the great facilities offered to the mother land in giving her the benefit of using our railways to transport her troops and war material across America, on Canadian territory, in case of need, ought to be considered a generous contribution, on our part, to the building of the imperialistic edifice.

Sir, it is not, I humbly submit, by military strength alone that the English empire is to maintain its integrity, its high standing, its influence in the world and is to continue its glorious course, but it is also and mainly by giving to the people of the colonies that which is dearest to all, freer institutions and help in the great struggle for the general prosperity and comfort. Thus, England will be sure to find in a happy and contented population a true and strongly anchored loyalty. These are the stoutest links in the creation of a sound and high spirited imperialistic union. Have we not the experience of history to prove the truth of this? One of the most apparent causes of the downfall of the great Roman empire and others was the inauspicious influence and hard ruling of militarism.

Sir, there are other battles to be fought than those carried on over land and sea by armed forces. The pacific war now going on amongst all civilized nations, or in other words the competition existing in commercial, industrial and educational matters is warning us to fully prepare ourselves by prompting public opinion with a proper policy if we wish to keep our place and rank in the present tremendous stress of human activity. 'The nation which is not progressing is retrograding' says Lord Rosebery. If, sanguine in our adolescent capacity or erecting a false and tyrannical patriotism, we allow our national resources to be squandered, or our energy to be misused, we will have to bow down before the wisdom of really progressing nations, less endowed, may be, than we are, and confess our great error.

I am in favour, Sir, of having a sufficient fleet for protecting our fisheries, and nothing more, and I am sure in saying this that I substantially reflect the opinion of my constituents.

We of the province of Quebec love the mother land and our loyalty cannot be questioned, I am sure, except perhaps by those who delight in high sounding formulas of patriotism and believe loyalty to consist merely in extravagant theories and unfair exigencies. We are, Sir, proud to be British subjects, always ready to fulfil our duties as such, but we are before all true and staunch Canadians.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. At this late hour I do not wish to prolong the debate by any lengthy remarks. It appears to me, however, that several important questions have developed during the course of the discussion, and that whilst the original motion was couched in the mildest form possible, and calculated to bring before the attention of the House the question of naval defence and the urgency of matters imperial, with the condition of our forces as they are at present, still developments in Europe have brought about a new condition of affairs, and it is necessary for this House, if possible, to give a stated opinion at an early opportunity as to its position, not only with regard to its own defence, but with regard to imperial defence. Let me point out that the lines of argument diverge. While the question of our own defence, is necessarily a portion of the imperial defence, the matter of imperial defence alone affects the situation particularly at the present moment. Several hon. members have laid out a plan as to what we should do in the future in the way of imperial defence and they have commended to us the plan of local defence such as they have adopted in Australia, which is a programme that requires a number of years to carry it out. I think there is no one in this House who will dispute the advisability of carrying out some such programme. But we find that peculiar conditions have arisen in the world's situation at the present moment, and that the mother country is threatened. While we are talking here, I am reminded of that old saying of Cicero: 'Gentlemen we deliberate, and Catiline is at the gate.' We are deliberating a great deal to-night as to what we should do six or seven years hence, but what the whole world is waiting to hear from us is a definite statement of what we are going to do in the present circumstances which have arisen in Europe.

Now, carrying out the idea first involved in naval defence for Canada, I do not see any reasons why we should not immediately institute some system of naval defence along the lines of torpedo boats, or torpedo destroyers, and destroyer cruisers, which would be invaluable to us in case of war. A great many members suggest or imply that it would be impossible for us to build these at home. Now I do not wish to be considered local in any way, I have always taken a national or Canadian view of every subject; nevertheless, I may be permitted to say that within the riding which I have the honour to represent there is a shipyard wherein they have launched ships over 500 feet in length, which is said to be the length of the Dreadnought. They have built ships, and they laid down the keel of one ship on the 26th of June last and launched her on the 1st of November, all complete, 375 feet long, 7,000 horse power, a 22 knot ship, with complete equipment, in that short time. If it was necessary for this government to ask them to supply four speedy cruisers 250 feet long, which could go through the canal, with a speed of 26 knots, I can assure you that I have it on the word of the men who designed these ships, and have built 22 steel ships in the last four years, that it would be only a small matter for them to as-

semble the material, provide four ships and have them in the water by the 1st of October. The dock they use is 550 feet long, and would accommodate the Dreadnought.

I regret very much that as Canadians we have not fostered more this spirit of shipbuilding on the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts. We are now manufacturing steel, the best steel in the world. We have two large steel plants. The steel plant at Sydney is a greater plant than any they have in Great Britain with larger and better furnaces, and in every respect a greater and larger steel plant. They have had there, for four or five years, a plate rolling plant to roll plates for ships, which they have housed away and never placed on the foundation, because nothing has been done to encourage this most important industry. I feel that we should seriously, as a House of Commons, consider the advisability of adopting some system whereby shipbuilding would be encouraged in the maritime provinces, and also on the St. Lawrence and on the Pacific coast. We find that Germany, whom we have heard mentioned to-night, up till seven or eight years ago when she began to build her own ships, purchased her ships in England. Now there are in Germany eight ship yards where ships are built, and we are assured by a no less naval authority than the 'Naval Annual,' that they can lay the keels for 12 Dreadnoughts at once and complete them inside of 24 months if necessary. We find that Japan at one time purchased her warships from Great Britain, but she realized the importance of carrying on this industry in her own land and she has established shipbuilding yards in Japan where she builds her own cruisers and her own commercial ships. Shipbuilding is a splendid enterprise, an enterprise that gives employment to a great number of men and it is the greatest national enterprise that a country can have; greater than the manufacture of guns and weapons of defence. We should undertake the work of building carriers because the money that is paid to foreign carriers to convey our products from Canada to Great Britain and other countries is a large sum which we should retain in our own country. As I pointed out we should immediately assume the position of establishing a local defence of our own. Our local defence should consist of torpedo boats and destroyers, and they could convoy our merchant ships, in case of war, to England and save them from the attacks of cruisers. I think we are all presumed to be at one upon that question. Now, let us come down to a more urgent matter, and that is the question of what we should do in the present situation to assist the motherland. We find that Great Britain at the present moment is undergoing what some hon. gentlemen are pleased to call a music hall scare. I can assure hon. gentleman, from my knowledge of the facts and from the correspondence of business men in England who have a knowledge of the situation, that it is not a music hall scare. The fact is that the supremacy of Great Britain on the sea is challenged. Another nation has laid down within the last year, and will have laid down by April of this year, the keels of twelve Dreadnaughts. These Dreadnaughts will all be in commission by 1912 and Great Britain's supremacy as a world power will at that moment cease unless she can not only keep up with the naval programme of this rival nation but go farther. The burden of such an extensive enterprise as the building of so many warships at such an enormous cost has achieved such vast proportions that the English people, looking at it from purely a business standpoint, have said: 'It is cheaper for us to carry on a war now.' That is the position they have assumed. They have at the present time a naval preponderance over any other nation in Europe which they will lose in four or five years, and it is necessary for the national safety if they are going to have war that they shall have it now. They will have to spend a great deal of money in carrying on a war at a future date because war will be just as expensive then, if not more so, than it is now. They reason that if there is war now they will wipe the fleet of any nation that dares to challenge their supremacy off the sea and have peace again for the next twenty-five years. Those are sound logical reasons. We find that, following any great question of this kind we certainly have the music-hall element, but we have now the colonies making a response to the cry of war and offering aid to the empire. We know that this is an occasion for offering assistance to the empire. It is true that we offered the motherland the assistance of our men, and our rifles, and when we offered the services of our young men to the mother country we offered her a greater sacrifice, something that was even greater in monetary worth, if you like to put it in that way, than even the building of a Dreadnaught. We gave that freely at that time. We did not say that it was something that we would do only once or that we would continue from year to year, but we recognized the necessity of the situation and we rose to the occasion and offered our young men. They proved to the whole world that they were able to hold their own with the best troops in the world.

I was very much surprised to hear the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Congdon) express the sentiments that he did. I have had the opportunity of reading books about the Yukon, although I have never been there, and I had thought that

the men of the Yukon were men with red blood in their veins, men who were prepared to defend their country and to protect her soil. Instead of that the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman sounded very much as if the men in the Yukon, who sent him here, would be prepared, when war raised its horrid front to dash under the barn or take to the tall timbers. Now, we have discussed this question and a resolution has been presented by the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I trust that he will see his way clear to amend that resolution and I would ask if there is any self-respecting member of this House who is prepared to assert that we should only do a certain thing and go no farther. I feel satisfied that if war were declared the people of this country would be prepared to go to almost any length to maintain the integrity of the empire. Some of us realize that war is a terrible thing and my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has told us today that peace is almost impossible if England is in danger. If that great mother of nations, the cradle of liberty, were threatened what would happen to us? Where would Canada be if England lost the command of the sea, if England's liberty were lost and if England became the colony of another nation? What would happen to Canada? Would not we also be penalized? If England lost the command of the sea and an indemnity were demanded would it not be the most natural thing in the world that the conquering nation would demand an indemnity in the shape of a colony? If, in the bargaining that goes on in the chancelleries of Europe—and history tells us of many such bargains in the past in which colonies have been turned over to foreign nations—how would we look, having contributed nothing to the common defence, if we found ourselves the colony of a European country? Whilst I agree with the right hon. First Minister that it is not necessary for us to enter into any obligations to contribute an annual sum, it is necessary for us to realize our duty to the country to which we belong and be prepared to offer not only men but money if necessary.

Mr. ERNEST ROY (Dorchester). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much interest to the speeches delivered this afternoon and evening on the important subject matter of the resolution submitted by the hon. member for North Toronto. I should also say, as a new member of this House, that the manner in which the debate has been conducted, has exalted in my eyes the action of parliament, and that I am happy to form part of a body in which subjects of such high importance are so treated.

I find that all the members who have spoken on the question have come to the identical conclusion that Canada should contribute to the defence of the Empire.

The latter portion of the resolution submitted by the hon. member for North Toronto reads as follows:

> Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibility and financial burden incident to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great seaports.

The hon. member's speech differs somewhat from his motion. He declared that not only should Canada have a navy to protect her shores and her large seaports, but that she should also help the empire in her wars with other countries. Should we, Sir, endorse such an expression of opinion?

I love my country, Canada, and I know all she owes to Great Britain, but in such matters sentimental considerations may not be without danger. Before acting it is necessary to take into consideration the situation of Canada and all the special circumstances which surround the question.

It is said that Canada owes much to England. In what does the obligation consist? Especially in this, that England has granted us liberties which have enabled us to attain among the nations a position which is now beginning to be recognized as of importance.

It is also said that Canada owes much to England because the latter opens to us a very important market. True, but in this respect other considerations besides those of gratitude should be taken into account. When England first cast her eyes towards Canada it was not in a spirit of sacrifice but in a spirit of conquest, the object being to extend her commerce, her power, and her influence. It must not be forgotten that if the English market is open to Canada it is because England finds an advantage in purchasing Canadian goods. The advantage in this respect, being mutual there is cause for gratitude on both sides and the sentiment should be reciprocal.

It is said again that England has furnished us with millions which have helped to build our railways, to develop our territory, to excavate our canals and extend navigation to the interior of the continent. That is also true, but on the other hand Canada has proved a good field for the investment of English capital seeking dividends, and in this also we should be mutually grateful.

It is further contended that Canada should be grateful to England because of that military strength which has enabled us to develop in peace our natural wealth.

True again. But let us remember for what purpose England has sought to extend her influence to every part of the world. From east to west; it was because she desired to open to her sons—whose energy and gifts as a colonizing people cannot be denied—new fields in which those talents might be freely exercised and their rights undisputed. They have given to several countries of the world a progressive civilization and ideas of practical liberty, together with the advantages resulting from skilful administration and active trade. India, the Australian continent, New Zealand and several other countries are the living proofs of this. Thousands of England's sons come to Canada every year. We generously give them a peaceful home on the fertile western plains: they become sharers in our happiness and our wealth. And if on one hand we owe gratitude to England for the protection which has enabled us to develop our wealth, does not England also owe us some gratitude for the prosperity which her sons are to-day invited to share with us. It is right to place on each side of the balance that which pertains to each; doing that it will then be found that if England has done much for Canada, Canada, on the other hand, has done something for England.

All this leads me to say that it is not right to contend that Canada in the past has not done enough for Great Britain from a military point of view. The soldier who leaves his home and marches against the enemy offering his life for for his country, is a patriot whose heroism is highly praised. But what of the tiller of the soil whose corn feeds the armies and whose money supports them: is not his work at least as patriotic and as useful to his country? When we expended millions for the purpose of opening to agriculture the western fertile plains now becoming the granaries of the universe, were we doing nothing for the empire?

It has also been said that the amendment offered by the hon. the Prime Minister of Canada to the motion of the member for North Toronto, does not enunciate a well-defined policy nor entail prompt action in the creation of a navy. It is necessary in such a matter to act with great prudence and deliberation and to carefully consider all the circumstances surrounding us, before giving any exact and detailed statement of the policy which Canada should adopt.

We belong to the American continent over which prevails a principle called the Monroe doctrine. If I am not mistaken, that doctrine, much modified since its first enunciation, proclaims that no foreign power shall establish any new state nor make any new conquest on the American continent. Pre-existing colonies are allowed to remain in the statu quo. Now, if we undertake to-day the creation of a navy in Canada and assume the risk of forcing this country into the militarist movement, it is to be feared that complications will naturally ensue. Our population is now seven millions, in twenty or forty years it may reach thirty or forty millions if the present rate of immigration is maintained. In a few years we will be a nation of some importance. Before entering into the military movement, we should weigh the inherent risks. Will other nations view our armaments with equanimity or indifference? Will the United States, for instance, witness without anxiety the growth, beside the vast power of England, of the military and naval establishments of Canada? Will Germany behold without emotion the military organization of Canada upon the lines of an old time European power? I do not think so, for whenever a European state increases its means of attack or defence, the diplomatic body becomes visibly perturbed, and cabinets study that important event which is invariably regarded as an act of aggression towards other countries.

What I have said does not imply that Canada should not adopt military measures for the defence of her coast and of her territory. I may, with the hon. member for North Toronto, deplore that in the 20th century, and in our advanced stage of civilization, we should still be face to face with the military problem and obliged to expend such large sums of money for warlike purposes. It is true that for two thousand years Europe has accepted the Christian rule and that the Decalogue proclaims to the nations 'Thou shalt not kill,' 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods.' Yet it cannot be denied that Christian nations who confess that creed still spend the greater part of their revenues and of their time in preparing for wars of defence or of aggression, for among them the idea of conquest still obtains. Defence naturally implies the idea of conquest on the part of the enemy. We must no doubt regret that in spite of civilization, nations cannot live in a manner more perfect and practice without fear of violence those principles of justice and equity which the Decalogue teaches, but Canada being a nation surrounded by other nations whose interests may conflict with her own, is bound to provide means of defence.

How should this be done? I say that the matter should be very carefully considered. The pretext of defence should not induce us to exhaust the sources of our energy. The expenditures must not be so great as to place us in the dilemma on the horns of which the European nations now find themselves. We must not for that purpose so

deplete our budget that nothing will remain to favour the emigration from Europe of those who might find here bread that is difficult to come by in their own over-populated fatherlands. We must, therefore, act with prudence.

I question whether it would be wise to declare that Canada is ready to commence the immediate organization of a navy and to enter at one into the military movement.

Should Canada assert her intention to take immediate action on this matter, is it not to be feared that certain European consular bodies might take umbrage at this move of ours and should deem it advisable to rush conclusions in order to thwart this new element of contract ? Much could be said on this point. Let Canada organize a naval force to protect her coast line and her sea ports both on the Atlantic and on the Pacific; no one objects. But there is more to be be considered. If we say, in addition to the policy already laid down, that this force not only shall defend Canada, but must also take a part in Britain's wars, even those wars in which we are not concerned at all, then I say, Sir, that we are assuming much of a risk. My words are here nothing but the expression of many another one's opinion. When the day comes that we shall undertake all of Britain's wars, we shall incur the hostilities of other nations and open ourselves to their attacks. Their first care will be of course to neutralize our means of action by destroying our fleet, which we will be unable for many years to come to put on a sufficiently powerful footing to meet their attacks.

The attention of certain European countries might also be drawn upon us by this policy, and they might find it advantageous to set all possible means at play in order to keep our country from enlarging the scope of her influence, or to seize her, or to parcel her up in some way, before she has become too strong. Mr. Speaker, the bearing of the decision which we are called upon to take on the resolution of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is all the more apparent that Canada is not at present threatened with war and in fact has none to fear, because, as I said before, we are protected by the Munroe doctrine. I admit, however, that this is not sufficient to allow us to sit down quietly. We are compelled by self-respect to do something to protect ourselves. Nevertheless, the Munroe doctrine imposes upon the United States the obligation of protecting us against the attacks of conquering spirit either from the east or from the west. Is it in the interest of the United States to seize Canada ? I hardly believe it. Why should it ? Is it not getting along on friendly terms with Great Britain ? Does not the occupation of Canada by Great Britain make it sure for them that she would defend her colony against any foe from the east ?

I will not keep up this debate any longer by my observations. I say in short that I don't believe it is necessary that we should state in the resolution that such action must be immediate. The important point to assert is that everything which will be attempted in that way will be undertaken only after formal understanding with the British military authorities, in order that means of defence will be designed, which at the critical moment will offer adequate co-operation to the mother country. I do not think it is fair either to say that Canada has done nothing so far to help the mother country. If she did not contribute directly by her money, she did it in another way by the wonderful development she gave to her territory.

There is no immediate danger of hostilities. It is true that in the past few years, the leading nations of Europe have made what may be termed extraordinary expenditure towards the defence of their respective possessions. It is true that Britain who has so far held the undisputed supremacy of the seas, might be led to think at times, owing to the stand taken by other nations, that this supremacy is attempted to be wrested from her, but it must not be forgotten that Britain's superiority is acknowledged not only in her military force, but also in the strength of her diplomatic corps. She has been seen for a great many years to have nothing but internal wars to fight, such as that for instance, which she fought lately in South Africa. She has rather acted as a charming mediator between nations which did not always agree and which have waged war against each other. After all why be more pessimist than Britain herself, when she does not foresee any immediate danger. What she wishes us to do, is to get up a naval force, which will be in a position to defend Canada when attacked.

Britain sticks to the policy which she formerly laid down towards her colonies. She says : I give you full power of governing yourselves ; now that you are a nation, do as a free nation would.

This House is no doubt unanimous in its opinion that Canada should get up a naval force which will enable her to rank first among the nations, and thus command that respect which otherwise she would not command from those nations having hostile intentions against her. This unanimous feeling is the best evidence of the enlightened patriotism with which we are actuated.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Before this debate closes it is perhaps my duty to say a few words. I congratulate hon. gentlemen who have spoken upon the patriotic tone which has characterized their remarks, and on

the dignity which has characterized the debate. The loyalty of Canada to Britain is beyond all question, and it is also undeniable that under the British flag Canada has prospered beyond compare. The question which we are discussing to-day is an important one in that it concerns the relations which this great Dominion bears to the empire; it is a question which in the past has attracted and is well worthy the consideration of a patriotic people. In view of the high position which Canada has taken in recent years amongst the nations of the world and her great development in population and wealth it is to be expected that with the dawn of this new era Canadians should more and more devote themselves to the study of a subject so momentous to the national weal. There is no doubt that our new status brings with it new responsibilities, which, if we are to judge from the discussion to-day, Canada is ready to assume. The times have changed and conditions have changed with them. It is not so many years ago in the life of this country when even commerical treaties involving the interests of Canada were conducted by the home government without conference with the Canadian government and concluded without their consent. But to-day no commercial treaty affecting the interests of Canada can be made without Canada being represented at the negotiations. In some instances the negotiators for His Majesty were exclusively Canadians, and in the past year we have seen that even what might be called political treaties, which were of concern to Canada, were submitted for approval and assent to this government before they were signed by the representative of His Majesty. One of the responsibilities which the new era has brought upon us is that we must provide for our country adequate naval protection. Certain remarks which I made at the Imperial Conference in 1907 have been quoted during the debate, and one of the hon. gentlemen who did me that honour seems to have misconstrued my statements on that occasion. When we met in the Imperial Conference the document which has been read by the leader of the opposition was submitted, and in that document the assertion was made that Canada had done nothing in the way of naval expenditure. It was pointed out that the naval expenditure of the United Kingdom amounted to £33,389,500, that of Newfoundland to £3,000, that of Australia £255,651, that of New Zealand to £40,592, that of the Cape of Good Hope to £50,000, that of Natal to £35,000, and the document then asserted that the Transvaal and Canada had not contributed anything for this purpose. I thought it my duty to state at this juncture the exact position of Canada in that respect. Not only did this document contain the statement referred to but important publications both in Great Britain and Canada had made the same assertion. I pointed out that this allegation was erroneous and that Canada had relieved England of certain naval expenditures which England formerly bore. By the treaty of 1818 it was stipulated that the Americans would have the right to take fish within the three mile limit in Newfoundland and the Canadian Labrador. This was a treaty which had been made by the mother country without the consent of Canada, because in those days the consent of Canada was not asked to such a treaty. From 1818 to 1873, except during the years the reciprocity treaty was in force, the duty of the protection of our fisheries and the enforcement of the regulations was assumed entirely by the British fleet. That was a duty which would have entailed on the British treasury the expenditure of a large sum of money. At one time not simply one vessel but several were assigned to the protection of our fisheries. In 1870 we established a marine police as an auxiliary to the British vessels engaged in that service. But after the denunciation of the treaty of Washington, from 1886 until to-day Canada has assumed alone all the responsibility of protecting her fisheries, not only on the Atlantic coast, but also on the Pacific coast; and since that time we have spent for the protection of our fisheries, on our hydrographic survey, which also was formerly carried on entirely by the British fleet, and for our wireless telegraphy service, which of course did not exist before, no less a sum than $5,186,701.16.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman, for information, whether expenditures of this character, if there be such expenditures in Great Britain, are included in the sum mentioned as the total naval expenditure of Great Britain?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. I may say that when this question was being discussed before the imperial conference, I asked Lord Tweedmouth whether the £33,000,000 mentioned as the naval expenditure of Great Britain included the cost of the hydrographic surveys, the fisheries protection service and the wireless telegraphic service, and he told me that the cost of the fisheries protection service was included.

Mr. COWAN. Is it not a fact that since then these items have been excluded from the naval expenditure?

Mr. BRODEUR. I could not say whether these items have been excluded or not from the naval expenditure of Great Britain. I am speaking of what happened at the imperial conference. It was stated that Canada was not expending anything on the fisheries protection service, and I thought it my duty to call the attention of the members of the conference to the fact that that

statement did not represent the situation exactly as it was. I do not know whether any change has been made since, but I am convinced that the naval expenditure of Great Britain to-day includes not only the construction of ships, but also the fisheries protection service, the hydrographic survey and the establishment of wireless telegraphic stations.

There are some other services which have been taken over by Canada. Reference has been made to the stations of Esquimalt and Halifax. It is true that the transfer of Esquimalt has not yet been completed; but I expect to be able to report in a very few days that the matter has been entirely closed up, and that the expenditure on that port will in future be carried on by the Canadian government. The Halifax station has been handed over to us temporarily for a special purpose. The understanding or contract between the imperial government and the Canadian government with reference to that station has not yet been signed, as it will require legislation by the imperial parliament; but I understand that this legislation will probably be passed at the present session of that parliament. Lord Tweedmouth stated on the 30th of July, 1907, that the cost of the establishment at Halifax had been £31,600 and that at Esquimalt £27,300, or a total of £58,900, or about $300,000. Provided the Canadians kept up those two docks and harbours in proper condition, he said, they would be doing a very great service to the empire at large.

Mr. SPROULE. Was that the ground on which we were to take them over—simply that we were to keep the docks and shipyards in an efficient condition?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, we shall be obliged to maintain those stations in the same state of efficiency that they are in to-day in order that they may be used as coaling stations and for other purposes. At the present moment we are using the Halifax dockyard, with its magnificent equipment, for our buoy service. All our buoys and ships are being repaired at that station.

Since I am on this question of Canada's contribution to the navy, I might quote some remarks made in the same discussion by the First Lord of the Admiralty upon the contributions of the other self-governing dominions. My hon. friend from North Toronto quoted to-day the contributions which had been made by Australia, New Zealand, the Cape and Natal. We must not forget for one moment that those contributions are made under certain conditions. Take the case of Australia, which has handed over £200,000 to the British treasury without anything in return. There are some obligations stipulated in the contract between the Australian and the imperial governments which render that contribution of £200,000 and even the contributions made by the other colonies somewhat onerous on the British treasury. The amounts subscribed by the different colonies are as follows:

Newfoundland..	£ 3,000
Australia..	255,000
New Zealand..	40,000
Cape of Good Hope..	50,000
Natal..	35,000
Total..	£383,000

Taking simply the case of Australia and New Zealand, I find that the total sum of £383,000 is more than offset by the burden which the contract between Great Britain and the governments of Australia and New Zealand imposes on the imperial treasury. I find, by a speech made by Lord Tweedmouth on the 30th of July 1907 in the House of Lords,that the obligations imposed by this contract have cost Great Britain £581,954, or £200,000 more than the amount subscribed by those different self-governing dominions. Here is the statement of Lord Tweedmouth, which I will take the liberty of reading, taken from the 'Times' of the 31st of July, 1907:

> Having reference to the way in which the colonial contribution was initiated, I mention that under the outstanding agreement with Australia that colony was obliged to give £200,000 a year to this country and New Zealand was similarly pledged to give £40,000 a year, on condition that a certain squadron should be kept in Australian waters. That agreement was still in effect, and could not be broken without the vote of the Australian and New Zealand parliaments as well as of our own. The annual cost of that squadron was £581,954.

So that this contribution given by those self-governing dominions instead of being a monetary benefit to the British Treasury, has entailed upon that Treasury an expenditure of £200,000 more than the whole amount contributed.

Mr. BARNARD. As a matter of fact, had not the government of New Zealand, since the date of that quotation, increased its subscription to £100,000, and made it unconditional?

Mr. BRODEUR. I understood that the contract made in 1902 was made by the imperial government with the Australian and the New Zealand governments and that, as stated by Lord Tweedmouth, it cannot be cancelled except with the consent of the three interested parties. At present I think there is an offer on the part of New

Zealand to make her contribution £100,000. I do not know whether that offer is conditional or not, but I simply take the facts as I find them.

Mr. BARNARD. If my hon. friend will look at the imperial Blue-book of a much later date, he will find that in December, 1907, New Zealand increased her subsidy from £40,000 to £100,000 and, in reply to a question from the imperial government made it unconditional.

Mr. BRODEUR. There may have been such an offer, and I am not questioning my hon. friend's statement, but suppose there was, that would still leave a difference of £140,000 against the British government. I am not disparaging, in any shape or form, what the different self-governing dominions have done, but I say that the conditions imposed by some of them are such that the British treasury is out a sum of £200,000 or at least of £140,000. And Canada, which is represented as not doing anything, has been undertaking the defence of her own coast, as far as fishery protection service is concerned. Canada has been spending $5,100,000 on this service since 1886, and we are spending also a very large sum for the aid of navigation, if not of a navy proper. My hon. friend thinks that our fishery protection service is not what is desired. Possibly it is not absolutely perfect, but it must be borne in mind that new vessels are coming out every day which were not in use some years ago, and we are taking steps to build cruisers to cope with new conditions and protect our fisheries more effectively. I was alluding to the fact that we in Canada, have made other expenditures which show that we are improving our navigation. Take the expenditure of last year in connection with lighthouses, ship channels, and wireless stations. We have spent in this connection $3,048,386. That expenditure, I admit, does not turn absolutely to the benefit of naval defence, but at the same time it shows that Canada is doing something for the development of our means of transportation. And if we consider the situation of Australia and other self-governing dominions, we do not see that they are obliged to make such expenditures as those regarding the maintenance of lights and the development of the improvements of means of transportation. On this question of defence, there are two means of contributing. The one is what I might call the national defence; the other one is a contribution which might be made directly in the shape of a sum of money or it might be made indirectly by the construction of some big ships. The imperial authorities did not ask us at the Imperial Conference to contribute any sum of money. No, what they were most anxious for was that we should do something for the protection of our sea coast and, as was well illustrated in a discussion I had on this matter with a naval authority when I was in England, the construction of torpedo boats and destroyers and small craft of that kind will render perhaps more service to the British navy than the construction of great warships. Suppose a war should be declared, suppose the coast of Canada should be attacked and that we have only one or two warships, what would these warships be able to do? Nothing, or almost nothing. On the other hand, if we had some of these small boats in order to protect our coasts, it is to be presumed that in a short time large warships could come to our rescue and in the meantime our coasts could be defended by these destroyers and torpedo boats. It has been stated in the debate to-day that there is only one opinion in Canada on the question of local defence. I was very glad to hear my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) express that view which has been concurred in to a very large extent by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I shall quote an authority showing that in Canada there is only one view irrespective of party upon the question of local defence. I beg to quote from an article by Sir Charles Tupper, published in the 'Nineteenth Century,' of April, 1907. Sir Charles said:

> It is known that from the outset I have felt the interests of Canada and the true interests of the empire to be opposed to the demand for colonial contributions to the imperial navy. Those loudest in that demand admit that a voice in administration by the colony contributing is essential, and all the naval experts concur in the opinion that any diversion of authority would be fatal. But this is not for one moment to say that each colony should not contribute to the extent of its ability to the defence of the empire. I hold strongly that it should, and I maintain that Canada has discharged that duty in the manner most conducive to imperial interests. Canada protects her fisheries by her own cruisers, and when the imperial government expressed a wish to be relieved of the expense of maintaining the strategic points at the harbours at Halifax and Esquimalt, the Canadian government at once relieved them of that large expense. The empire can be best defended by strengthening its weakest part.

At this late hour I need not dwell on the question of contribution to the British navy with such an opinion as has been expressed by Sir Charles Tupper. There is no doubt that the supremacy of Great Britain on the sea is absolutely essential for the protection of our commerce, for the advancement of civilization and in the interests of the world. I maintain that as long as this supremacy exists we in Canada may safely continue to develop our natural resources, to extend our commerce, and to make this country a great and powerful nation which, in case of need, will be there ready with

vast resources and vast wealth to co-operate with the empire in order to maintain forever the supremacy of Great Britain at sea.

Mr. A. M. BEAUPARLANT (St. Hyacinthe). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in introducing his resolution, the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) laid down the principle that the physical or material power of a nation is the basic principle and the means by which it secures its development and its civilization, while preserving thereby its acquired wealth.

I agree with the hon. gentleman that such a principle will prevail so long as the present method of settling international disputes obtains.

But he will agree, I hope, that such is not the rule of equity applicable to conflicts arising between private individuals, between groups of population, or between cities and provinces.

He will agree that, because a man is endowed with greater physical strength than his neighbour, he is not entitled to claim larger rights before the courts of the country, or under the laws which govern the home administration in all civilized countries at least, and to the framing of which the hon. gentleman has himself contributed, in his capacity of an old parliamentarian, inspired no doubt by that premordial and true feeling of wisdom and equity which governs all right-minded men.

I shall revert later on to this aspect of the question. Let us for a moment review the question, from the standpoint of the existing relations between the various nations.

Now, from that latter standpoint, I see no more immediate danger than opportunity, which should induce us to subordinate to that principle the national undertakings now under way.

Without stating it in explicit terms, the mover of the resolution before the House wishes to make a direct offer to the British Admiralty. His position in this regard coincides with that taken by a good Toronto paper, the 'News.'

That newspaper recently published two articles, one of which relating to the Grand Trunk Pacific and the other bearing on the question which is before us.

As a heading to the first of these two articles, there was a cartoon representing our Finance Minister extracting from the pocket of another individual representing Canada, certain sums of money intended for a third individual personifying the Grand Trunk Pacific. The conclusion of that article as also that of the cartoon used as a heading was a blame directed to the Canadian government, on account of the expenditure incurred for an undertaking which, however, is of a national character. The second article had as a heading a cartoon representing New Zealand and Australia eager to bring to Great Britain those pretty boats called 'Dreadnoughts.' Then, in the background stood an individual representing Canada, viewing that spectacle, motionless and impassive.

The conclusion of that second article and the accompanying cartoon was a blame inflicted to Canada for hesitating to incur the necessary expenditure so gratifying to Great Britain.

Now, without applying too strictly the principle that 'well-ordained charity begins at home,' which savours of egotism, I disapprove of this newspaper who shares in the opinion of the member from North Toronto trying to subordinate our own national undertakings to an undertaking which is to be carried on a territory altogether different from our own.

And should some overzealous minds be scandalized at my statement, let me remind them that the first Lord of the British Admiralty, Sir Reginald McKenna, has himself recently stated that the British navy was so far ahead of its rivals that there was no immediate danger. Closer to us, one of the leading minds in this House, the member for South York, made from his seat in this House, on the 11th of February, 1907, the following statement: 'I am one of those who believe in Canada first and empire next.' With the exception of the member for the Yukon, no member of this House has made a more categorical statement.

The 'Saturday Review,' of London, stated at the same date, that it was high time for Canada to think of using her own treaty-making power.

Therefore, I do not stand alone here in protesting against imperialism and militarism. As to us, French Canadians, our adherence to British interests is grounded on reason, which is more lasting than mere sentiment, as may be gathered from the history of the American colonies. Those who would rather make a gift to Great Britain than coming to her assistance in time of need, evidently abdicate the faculty of discussing certain events which have arisen in the past history of other nations and may arise here in the future, and I for one do not wish to divest myself of that privilege.

Our sympathies are grounded on the proverbial British fair play, evidences of which Great Britain has given us in the parliamentary system granted to us under the successive Acts passed in 1774, 1791, 1840, and 1867.

Perhaps the most regrettable event which has ever marred our relations with Great Britain was the violent character of the means resorted to in order to quell the insurrection of 1837, at a time when Great Britain had in her power and at her mercy a few powerless insurgents. Even from the standpoint of British diplomacy, toleration

and humanity would have been the wiser course to follow; and one would have first to eradicate from the hearts of the Canadian people an inborn feeling, should one expect these events to be mentioned without stirring up some painful recollections.

But between Great Britain and us there has been laid the foundation of generous compensations. We have learned how to forget, in view of the liberal treatment above alluded to.

Such adhesion on my part, however, restricted it may be, but resting on the above stated grounds, may perhaps carry more weight with and be more acceptable to those who hear me, than a sweeping and unqualified approval, the grounds of which would be likely to breed suspicion or could not be accounted for.

With the above qualifications thus frankly stated, I may now examine the question before the House.

One of the first points that call our attention in the resolution before us is the financial liability involved in the application of the principle extolled therein.

The combined cost of the British Army and Navy is in round numbers $400,000,000 every year.

Is Canada prepared and willing to contribute her proportionate share to such an expenditure to be incurred every year?

The surpluses accumulated within the last few years are no longer sufficient to meet our national undertakings. While in England, recently, our Minister of Finance had to negotiate a loan for the purposes of the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Georgian Bay Canal, a scheme which is perfectly practicable in a near future, may probably call for further loans.

I am far from posing as a financial expert, but I may state here that I do not see any other means of meeting the foreshadowed expenditures than by adding to our Customs Tariff, at least the 3:07 per cent taken off, within the last twelve years, a reduction which I think has benefited the whole people of Canada, or else by raising some special taxation.

Is the contribution to the Imperial Navy of such an opportunity that the Liberal Government of Canada should believe themselves justified in changing their fiscal policy, approved of by the electors of this country at the polls at four general elections, and on grounds which have not been submitted to the consideration of the Canadian electorate?

On the other hand, are the citizens of Toronto, Hamilton, London or Sarnia more willing than the citizens of Montreal, St. Hyacinthe, Three Rivers or Quebec to submit to that special taxation or to borrow from Great Britain in order to make a gift to Great Britain.

Still, I for one am willing to make all those sacrifices, but only for the purposes of the creation of a navy to remain under our own exclusive control and for us alone, and by means of which we may, when opportunity offers, lend our help to Great Britain whose prestige is for us a guarantee of security.

Coming in such a way to the assistance of England would be more useful and more satisfactory to us, the more so as we should then avoid pledging our future.

Although in principle I am disinclined to give my support to any expenditure of a military character, still one must take into consideration the conditions of equilibrium between the different nations, and so long as those conditions are not settled in a more desirable way I am willing to give my consent to any necessary sacrifices for the protection of the country.

Without entering here into the question of universal peace, a system which is by no means impracticable, but which may for a long time remain a speculative question, one may at least express the opinion that, should the different nations devote to that purpose one half of the sacrifices made and efforts put forth to secure the triumph of their respective claims without always inquiring as to the proportion of equity they contain, they would secure greater advantages and more wealth than are reaped by the victorious nations themselves from present conditions. I am far from pretending to be familiar with universal history, but I am free to confess that should anyone be able to single out even among the most powerful nations one solitary example of a people for which war has not proved the worst of evils, he would reveal to me a fact, the existence of which, as a modest student of history, I have never had the least suspicion. Victory and even conquest which is sometimes the sequel of victory, constitute but a partial compensation for losses resulting from the clashing of navies and armies.

England and France are the two countries which have played the most prominent part during our era. Stupendous as has been the work of England, as we all readily admit, I do not think that a single decade has elapsed in her history without her having had a war to sustain.

As to France, after so many quarrels and struggles, she does not own to-day a single square meter of territory more than she possessed 1,400 years ago, under her fourth king.

But such is not the question we have to examine now, at a time when some feverish individuals seem to hear rumours of conflicts, which is always an opportunity for starting a movement of a similar nature to the one which is now in full swing. One must take into consideration the pre-

sent conditions of settling conflicts between nations.

So long as powerful nations shall not take a serious and effective lead in compulsory national arbitration; so long as it shall be considered proper to submit to a disinterested third party and to no other the dispute arising between two private individuals, while refusing to apply the same measure of justice to the quarrels between nations; so long as governments whether democratic or autocratic, shall bind their subjects by laws to which they themselves refuse to submit; so long as it is conceded that there is more of right and justice in a fourteen-inch gun than in an eight-inch gun; so long as right shall be might in international matters, we are bound to make the sacrifices necessary for our own protection, but let the fruits of those sacrifices remain under our own control. That is the most rational method we can adopt of helping Great Britain and it is in the interest of both parties that we, a nation in course of formation, should avoid the less reasonable method of offering sums of money to the British nation whose energetic efforts have been accumulating for centuries such colossal wealth.

My conception of patriotism may differ from that of several members of this House. There enters a good deal of narrow egotism in the ordinary feeling called by that name. It consists in a sort of nepotism of family preference applying to the nation and which, it seems to me, should make way for the far more attractive humanitarian concept. After such a declaration on my part, which, I hope, will be considered sincere, I will not, I suppose be accused of national prejudice.

On the contrary, I am desirous, in all loyalty and with the assurance that my action will not be misconstrued, to offer friendly co-operation to the sons of that British race who in two leading events of their history and in the evolution of their nation, have secured political and civil liberty at less heavy a price than another great nation in an identical attempt made later on.

The Anglo-Saxon in Canada is the equal of those of his race, both in England and in the United States; he is proud of his past and desirous of casting aside all that may impede his progress; there is nothing to prevent our working together, our interests and aims being in the main identical.

It has often been pointed out that there are between us differences of language, creed and tradition, but with similar differences of race, small countries such as Switzerland and Belgium, who have neither our great rivers or extensive plains, have secured the respect of the world at large and a prominent position in industrial, mental and moral development.

The present question has no reference to matters of language, creed or tradition, it refers exclusively to the nature, conditions and advantages of our political relations, and to the control to be exercised over any given portion of the empire. In this I feel sure that my opinion will be shared by the majority of English-speaking members in this House. A people numbering among its leaders such men as Gladstone and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, who so ably advocated the cause of home rule for others, cannot object to the principle of home rule when applied to ourselves.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The suggestions which have been made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition are such as can be accepted by this side of the House, and I have no objection to adding the words, so that the resolution will read as follows:

The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service.

With regard to the paragraph stating what we have already done in alleviating the burden of the British taxpayer, there is no objection at all to striking that out. I therefore move the amendment in the following form:

That all the words after 'that' be struck out and the following substituted thereto:

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

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

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

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

Amendment agreed to, and motion as amended agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose to-morrow we take up the Grand Trunk Pacific proposals?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 30, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 113) to amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. MACDONELL. The Bill which I have the honour to introduce is a short one. It seeks to remove some of the imperfections and inaccuracies of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1907, which have been revealed during the two years in which the Act has been in operation. The amendments are, very shortly as follows: The Bill seeks to amend section 15 of the Act which is a section dealing with the procedure for the reference of disputes to boards and the manner in which the application to the board must be made. The amendment seeks to put the men in the same position in regard to the notice as the employers are under the Act as at present. The Act as at present requires, in the case of the men making a demand for a board, that they shall have convened meetings and obtained authority to enable their officers to say that a strike has been decided upon in the absence of their demands being acceded to. This amendment seeks to make it unnecessary to hold these meetings for the purpose of authorizing the officers to make the necessary declaration. It is reported that a very great deal of time is wasted and that in certain cases thousands of dollars are unnecessarily expended by the men being convened and holding these meetings at which the required authority is obtained. The amendment seeks to put the men on the same basis as the employers in that regard. The second amendment is simply desired to increase the compensation awarded to the members of a board of conciliation. It has been manifest during the reference of disputes to boards which have taken place under the Act that the board sits sometimes almost day and night continuously. It sits well into the night in order to accomplish a settlement, and the amendment proposes to increase the compensation from $15 to $25 a day and to put all the members of the board on an equality with regard to compensation. The chairman now receives $5 more than the other members. As all the members of the board perform practically equal service and as they all sit the same length of time it is believed that the compensation shall be identical. Then, the Bill seeks to amend section 57 of the Act in some important respects.

That section is the section requiring the condition of the parties to remain unchanged pending proceedings before the board, and it also requires that employers and employees shall give at least 30 days notice of an intended change respecting conditions of employment in the matter of wages or hours. It is confined to disputes arising in connection with wages or hours, but the Bill extends so as to make it include any intended change with respect to any condition of employment. If this amendment carries, the notice will not only require to be given with respect to changes desired by either party with respect to wages or hours, but also as to any other condition of employment; it being felt that many others of the conditions of employment are just as important to the parties concerned. Section 57 is also sought to be amended by compelling the party who gives the notice to apply for a board of conciliation in the event of the other party not accepting the contemplated change, so that whether either employer or employee seeks to alter existing conditions of labour by making some change and gives notice to that effect, if the other party does not acquiesce then the onus of obtaining the board is on the party who seeks to make the change and has given notice. As the law at present stands it permits either party to do that and it has not been found that it works altogether equitably. I think myself that the onus, as in the case of every other dispute, should be cast upon the party who gives notice of the change. Then again section 57 says that where a dispute has been referred to a board, until the dispute has been finally dealt with by the board neither the employers nor the employees affected shall alter the conditions existing with respect to wages and so forth. The change contemplated by the Bill is intended to prevent a change in the conditions of labour taking place at any time after the giving of the notice. At present the section permits the employer or employee to change the conditions after the notice has been given and before the board has been appointed. The parties are practically at issue when the notice has

been given and it is felt by many that after notice has been given and when the parties are practically at issue, no change in the conditions should be permitted until the dispute is dealt with and disposed of by the board. At present changes can take place at any time before the board is constituted, but this amendment will cover the whole period of time and prevent any change in the conditions of labour taking place between the initiation of the notice and the final disposition by the board.

Mr. FIELDING. As the hon. gentleman read his Bill I would be inclined to think it comes within the prohibition respecting money Bills. I understood the hon. gentleman to say it would increase certain allowances and expenditures. We can see as to that before the Bill reaches a further stage and I do not wish to press the point now.

Mr. MACDONELL. The minister is quite right with regard to one section of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COLD STORAGE IN HALIFAX.

Mr. A. B. CROSBY (Halifax). Before the orders of the day are called I desire to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he has received any communication from the commercial committee of Halifax, a body composed of members of the city council and of the board of trade, with regard to the establishment of a cold storage in that city. I understand that a communication has been addressed to the minister inclosing a resolution which asks the government not to take up the question of cold storage with any company until the commercial bodies of the city of Halifax have approved of a charter which they consider will be in the best interests of the city.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I have received a communication from the board of trade of Halifax as well as other communications from that city and from various persons in Nova Scotia in regard to this matter. The communication from the board of trade requested me not to come to any conclusion unless the board of trade of Halifax approved the company. I replied that I could not pledge myself to that, but that any recommendation from such an influential body as the Halifax board of trade would receive every consideration from me before I arrived at a decision.

Mr. CROSBY. My understanding is that they desire to have an opportunity of approving of the charter, not of the company.

Mr. FISHER. I did not understand it so.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS IN THE WEST.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE (Strathcona). I wish to ask the Minister of Railways whether he has received any representations regarding the width of the openings at private railway crossings? As the minister is well aware there will come into being hundreds of such crossings in the west this year. The Act provides that the maximum width of such openings shall be 16 feet but the fact is that a great deal of the farm machinery now used in the west cannot pass through such an opening. It is contended that the maximum width should be 18 feet. In view of such representations I would ask if the minister intends to bring in legislation to remedy this defect in the law?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). I have just received a communication from the chief of the Board of Railway Commissioners with reference to this matter but I have only had time to glance over it. I should judge however from the communication that legislation in this respect is not necessary. With his usual practical turn of mind the chief commissioner has already prepared a draft order with reference to the width of openings at crossings, and fences, and gates, and other matters in connection with the railways in the west in particular. This draft order he is sending out to the different railways and he will give those interested an opportunity to be heard at a meeting of the board in Ottawa in May next. I think it is quite safe to say that the order will provide that the openings shall be at least 18 feet wide.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES INVESTIGATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the Prime Minister whether he will be able to carry out what was understood on Wednesday last when he said that he would place his policy in connection with the report of Mr. Justice Cassels before the House not later than to-day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The order in council has just been placed upon the table.

DISMISSAL OF INTERCOLONIAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. A. B. CROSBY. I wish to ask the Minister of Railways whether he has heard anything about the dismissal of a number of freight handlers in the city of Halifax and if so would he state why they have been dismissed. I am credibly informed that after the dismissal of these men some of whom have been engaged on the Intercolonial Railway for the last five or six years, others were taken on in their places.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have heard nothing of it except what appeared in the newspapers.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC LOAN.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolutions:

Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to advance by way of loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company a sum not exceeding ten million dollars for the purpose of aiding the company in the completion of the construction of the prairie section of the western division of the National Transcontinental Railway, the sum so advanced to bear interest at the rate of four per centum per annum, payable half yearly, and to be repayable in ten years from the time the loan is made, or if advanced in instalments, then in ten years from the time the first of such instalments is so advanced; and to provide,

That such sum, whether advanced in one or several instalments, shall be advanced upon the pledge of an issue of bonds, bearing interest at the rate of four per centum per annum, payable half yearly, to be made by the company as collateral security for the payment of such sum and interest, the principal amount of the bonds received in pledge to equal the sum advanced, such bonds to be secured, subject to any prior lien or charge, by a mortgage, or deed of trust by way of mortgage, of the prairie section, and of the undertaking, equipment and property, tolls, rights and franchises of the company in respect of said section, and to be guaranteed as to the payment of the principal and interest thereof by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada; the form and provisions of such mortgage and of the bonds to be secured thereby, and of the guaranty thereof by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, to be substantially as set forth in the schedule of the Act to be founded on these resolutions;

That His Majesty, in the event of default in the payment of half-yearly interest, or in default in the payment of the principal sum advanced under the provisions of such enactment, in addition to and without prejudice to any right or remedy against the company in respect of such default, and in addition to and without prejudice to any right or remedy His Majesty may have as pledgee of the whole or any part of such bond issue, shall, for the purpose of remedy, be deemed to be the holder of such bonds and entitled to all the rights and remedies available to bondholders arising according to the terms of such mortgage when default is made in payment of interest or principal of such bonds; and that default in payment of interest on, or principal of, any advances made under the provisions of such Act, shall be deemed to be default in payment of the interest on or principal of such bonds to the amount accrued thereon according to the tenor thereof;

That the Governor in Council may, in addition to the sums now remaining unborrowed and negotiable of the loans authorized by any Act of parliament heretofore passed, raise by way of loan, in accordance with and under the provisions of that portion of chapter 24 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, relating to the public debt, and the raising of loans authorized by parliament, such sum or sums of money not exceeding ten million dollars, as may be required for making the advances contemplated by these resolutions.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the object of this resolution is to authorize the government of Canada to loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, upon what is deemed to be adequate security, a sum not exceeding $10,000,000 to assist the company in meeting the unexpectedly large increase in the cost of the prairie section of the railway. It should be clearly understood that this resolution does not contemplate any change whatever in the contract between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the government. It is rather in the nature of a banking transaction. It is proposed that the government shall become the bankers of the company, to lend it this sum of money, which no doubt the company could raise, largely if not wholly, in the ordinary way in the money market, but which in present conditions it would probably be obliged to raise under circumstances involving a considerable sacrifice, which would not be to the advantage of the company, the enterprise or the Dominion at large.

The Transcontinental Railway, beginning at Moncton in New Brunswick, at a point of convenient connection with our Atlantic ports, runs westward to the Pacific at Prince Rupert in British Columbia, a distance approximately of 3,560 miles. The eastern division of this line, extending from Moncton to Winnipeg, is a fraction over 1,804 miles. That division is being constructed by the government through the instrumentality of the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, and is ultimately to be leased to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The resolution which I have the honour to present to the House does not in any way relate to the construction of that eastern division. The western division, extending from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert, a distance of 1,755 miles approximately, is being constructed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company with the assistance of the government in the way of certain guarantees. This division is divided into two sections, known respectively as the prairie section and the mountain section. The financial arrangements respecting these two sections are somewhat different, and therefore it is of importance to note the point of division between the two. As respects the prairie section, the government guarantee the funds for the company to the extent of three-fourths of the cost, provided, however, that the amount shall not exceed $13,000 per mile. In the case of the mountain section, the government guarantee the bonds of the company to the extent of three-fourths of the cost, whatever it may be. In view of this difference in the financial arrangements as to the two sections of the western division,

it was important that the point of division should be accurately determined. That matter was dealt with in section 4 of the agreement of the 29th July, 1903, which reads as follows:

The said western division is further, for convenient reference, considered as being divided into two sections, one extending from the eastern terminus thereof westerly to the eastern limit of the Rocky mountains (herein designated as the 'prairie section'), and the other extending westerly from the said eastern limit of the Rocky mountains to the western terminus of the said division (herein designated as the 'mountain section'). The said eastern limit of the Rocky mountains shall be established after the location of the line, and after actual surveys have determined the profile thereof upon such location, and shall be fixed and agreed upon by the chief engineer of the company and the chief engineer of the government as the result of such surveys, having regard to the physical features of the country, and to the cost of construction, and endeavouring as fairly as possible to determine where the more easy and less expensive work characteristic of prairie construction comes to an end, and the more difficult and expensive work characteristic of mountain construction begins, and, in case the said engineers shall differ, the question shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator, to be chosen by them, and, in the event of their inability to agree on a third arbitrator, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada may appoint the said third arbitrator, and the decision of the majority shall be final.

As the work progressed, in accordance with the provision which I have just read, the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the chief engineer of the government took this matter up, and happily were able to agree upon the point of division between the two sections. On the 21st of November, 1907, they reached an agreement, which reads as follows:

Under clause 4 of the agreement between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, which forms part of the Act 3, Edward VII., chapter 71, the eastern limit of the Rocky mountain section has to be established after the location of the line and after actual surveys have determined the profile thereof upon such location. It has, therefore, been agreed upon by us, the chief engineer of the company and the chief engineer of the government, as the result of such surveys, having regard to the physical features of the country, to the cost of construction and having as fairly as possible determined where the more easy and less expensive work characteristic of prairie construction comes to an end and the more difficult and expensive work characteristic of mountain construction begins, that the 'prairie section' ends and the 'mountain section' begins on the east bank of the Wolf river at station 6280, as shown on plan and profile of revised location submitted by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for approval on the 10th September, 1907, signed by William Wainwright, 2nd vice-president, and H. A. Woods, assistant chief engineer, of the said company, and dated August 29, 1907.

(Sgd.)
BARTHOLOMEW BROSNAN KELLIHER,
Chief Engineer,
Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
(Sgd.) COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER,
Chief Engineer of the Government.

Ottawa, Ont., November 21, 1907.

Therefore, in accordance with the Act, the point of division between these two sections was fixed at Wolf river, a point about 120 miles west of Edmonton. The prairie section, then comprises a line from Winnipeg to Wolf river, the distance being 916 miles, and the mountain section a line from Wolf river to Prince Rupert, an estimated distance of 839 miles. If we apply $13,000 per mile, the contemplated government guarantee, to the 916 miles of prairie section, we find that it would provide the sum of $11,908,000. The balance required, under the terms of the contract, is to be raised by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company with the guarantee of the parent company, the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. The company estimated this balance would be £2,100,000 stirling, or $10,220,000, and this sum is fixed in the second mortgage. The mortgage applies to the whole western division, but provision is made that the amount to be raised under it, for the purposes of the prairie section, shall be £2,100,000, or about $10,220,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was that estimate made?

Mr. FIELDING. At the time the mortgage was prepared—July, 1905. It was estimated for the purposes of the mortgage. There were thus available for the road the proceeds of the government guarantee, $11,908,000, and the proceeds of the Grand Trunk Railway guarantee, which realized $9,601,926.30. There was thus available for the prairie section from the two sources $21,509,926.30. This provision was equal to $23,482 per mile for the 916 miles of prairie section as ultimately defined. If the road had cost no more than $23,482 per mile there would have been no need for any further assistance.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the par value of what produced that $21,500,000?

Mr. FIELDING. In the case of the government guarantee, it is not a question of par value. We are bound to give a guarantee which will produce $13,000 per mile; but in the case of the Grand Trunk Railway guaranty, they had to issue bonds and sell them for what they would bring on the market.

Mr. FOSTER. What I wanted was the amount of bonds which realized those proceeds.

Mr. FIELDING. The par value of the Grand Trunk Company's guarantee would be the £2,100,000 which produced the amount I have mentioned. The precise rate of issue I have not at hand, but will give it later. So that the reason why it is necessary to provide some further assistance for this prairie section is because the road has cost very much more than the earlier estimate. The reasons for this increased cost can best be given by the letter of Mr. Hays, which has already been submitted in some papers laid before the House, but which for convenience I will now read:

Montreal, Nov. 16, 1908.

Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—In compliance with the undertaking of this company set forth in clause thirty-four of the agreement with the government of the 29th July, 1903, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada should guarantee Grand Trunk Pacific bonds for the balance required for the complete construction of the western division, we issued and the Grand Trunk Company guaranteed Grand Trunk Pacific four per cent mortgage sterling bonds, which by the mortgage deed of trust securing them, were limited in amount to £2,100,000 for the prairie section. At the time these bonds were issued it was assumed that the amount fixed would be ample for the balance required for the completion of that section, but by reason of the high standard of construction made necessary by the terms of the agreement, increased cost of labour, rail and all other material and the extension of the prairie section one hundred and thirty miles further west than was contemplated, it is found that an additional sum of $10,000,000 will be needed to complete the section to Wolf creek, which is the dividing line between the prairie and mountain sections. To raise this additional sum it will be necessary to make a further issue of bonds as contemplated by section 34 of the agreement of the 29th July, 1903, between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and by the agreement of June 8, 1905, between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, that is to say, bonds to be issued by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and to be guaranteed as to principal and interest by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. Further legislation will be required to enable the companies to fully carry out what was contemplated by these agreements respecting the issue of bonds to provide the balance required (above the proceeds of the government guarantee) for the completion of the prairie section of the western division, and we desire to have an assurance that your government will, at the forthcoming session of parliament, introduce and support such legislation at the earliest date practicable.

Owing to the depression in the money markets of both Europe and America as respects this class of bonds, it is unlikely that we can sell these securities immediately or in the early future upon favourable terms. If thrown upon the money market under unfavourable conditions they would probably have to be sold at a sacrifice price, which would materially diminish the amount to be realized from them and might injuriously affect the credit of the two companies concerned. Under such circumstances and in view of the urgent desire of the government that the enterprise shall be prosecuted without any delay, we ask the government to assist us in the utilizing of these bonds by taking them at their par value as a security for a loan not exceeding $10,000,000 to be made to the company by the government for a period of ten years. As to the rate of interest, the bonds should bear 4 per cent, and, no doubt, the government would be able to borrow at that rate or something less. Consequently, so far as interest is concerned, the government could suffer no loss. As to security the government would not only have the obligation of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, but also the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. Therefore, there could be no question as to the security of the government for a loan to be so made. It is a case in which the government could, by the use of its credit, aid the company materially without incurring any financial loss whatever.

Our view is that the whole scheme shows an intention on the part of the government to aid the company with its credit to the extent of three-quarters of the cost of the undertaking.

In the case of the prairie section a limitation of $13,000 per mile was put upon the amount because it was supposed that that would be a sufficient sum. Experience has shown that this was a mistake and that the cost of the section is, for reasons already stated, much greater than was at first estimated. What we are now asking is in effect that the original intention as to assistance to the extent of three-fourths of the cost shall be carried out. The loan which we now ask, together with the proceeds of the three per cent first mortgage bonds guaranteed by the government for the prairie section, will barely equal three-fourths of the cost of that section. Statement of account showing amounts expended on construction to September 30, 1908, and balance required for the completion of the prairie section is enclosed herewith.

As the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada has to date guaranteed bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific to the extent of more than $30,000,000, the proceeds of which have been used in connection with the construction of the railway and equipment, and in addition has also advanced a very large amount from its own funds in order to keep the construction work going, it is essential we should receive the further assistance asked from the government in order to enable us to proceed with and complete the work. I would therefore urge that such measures of immediate relief be given as will enable us to do this and avoid the disastrous effect on the credit of both the railways and the country which would necessarily result from a stoppage of the work.

Very truly yours,
(Sgd.) CHAS. M. HAYS,
President.

Attached to this is a statement showing the expenditure on the section and the bal-

ance required to complete it. The company's statement as to the cost of the road was referred to the government engineer, Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, and his report was obtained. His estimate of the cost of the prairie section was somewhat larger than that of the company. The company's estimate, allowing for value of construction equipment, gives the cost per mile at $34,059. Mr. Schreiber's estimate, making the same allowance, gives $34,943 per mile. There is thus but a slight difference per mile between the two. The balance required, according to the company's estimate, is a total of $9,688,425. The balance required, according to Mr. Schreiber's estimate, is $10,497,522. We take the loan of $10,000,000 as being substantially in accordance with what these figures show as the amount required to enable the company to finish the prairie section. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, of course, is bound to produce the balance required over and above the guarantee of the government. While it is correct, as stated in Mr. Hays' letter, that reference is made to three-quarter's of the cost of the road, it is also a fact that there is a distinct limitation put upon that cost to the government, as respects the prairie section, because it is stated that the amount to be raised from the guarantee should not be more than $13,000 per mile, and, whatever may be required in excess of that, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is bound to obtain and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the parent company, is bound to assist in raising.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) leaves that point, I would like to ask a question, as I have not followed with complete understanding the figures which he has just given. If he will refer to page 1 of the information brought down, he will observe that the prairie section has been financed up to the present time in this way:—

$10,335,482.91, proceeds of 3 per cent bonds guaranteed by government on account of $13,000 per mile;
$9,601,926.30, proceeds of prairie section Railway Company;
'A' bonds guaranteed by Grand Trunk $7,094,044.30, advanced by Grand Trunk Railway Company;
Total, $27,031,453.51.

As well as I can understand, about $5,000,000 is required to finish the prairie section.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The prairie section will cost $32,000,000, of which $27,000,000 has been provided including the advance by the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. FIELDING. It is contemplated that the Grand Trunk shall take out of this the amount which it has temporarily advanced. It is the Grand Trunk's money and not the money of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I think he will find that, according to the estimates of Mr. Hays and Mr. Schreiber, which are substantially the same, the latter being a little the higher, there is need of $10,000,000 to enable the Grand Trunk Pacific to finish the prairie section. But, of course, that includes the repayment to the Grand Trunk of the amount temporarily advanced.

As I have stated, it is clear that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the parent company, is bound to provide this money by its guarantee; the government's obligation is distinctly limited to the $13,000 a mile, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and its parent company the Grand Trunk Railway Company, took upon themselves the risk of the increased cost of the road. That is the letter of the contract, and, if we wish to insist upon that, we can say to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada: This is your obligation, you must raise the money as you find best. But while that is the letter of the law, we think it would be unfortunate if the company were forced to issue securities to raise the money at a time when, in all probability, the securities would have to be sold at a sacrifice. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is a new enterprise, and, like all new railway enterprises, its own particular credit is limited. The expectation is that, as in the case of other great enterprises, as time goes on and traffic develops, it will have a credit of its own. But every such enterprise has but little credit at the beginning and must rely upon other assistance. It is felt that, if the Grand Trunk undertake to issue these bonds themselves, they will be obliged to sell them at a considerable sacrifice. It is undoubtedly true, as stated in the letter of Mr. Hays, that, as respects securities of this character, the money market is not in a favourable condition; and if we insist that the company shall float these securities themselves, they will undoubtedly have to issue them at a price very much below par. Securities of a similar character—that is, Grand Trunk Pacific securities guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada—have recently been issued in London at a price of 90, and, if you take the charges for financing off that, I presume the result to the company was somewhat below 90. We think it would be a pity if the company should be forced to issue such securities at that price. We have faith enough in the enterprise to believe that, if the company is helped, at no distant day these securities will be worth par. And so, though the money market in England may

not give that value now, we propose to become the company's banker, to receive these bonds which they propose to issue at par value and lend them that amount at four per cent. We do not disguise from ourselves the fact that, in doing this, we are giving the company substantial help. Not, we believe, a money loss, but we are lending them the credit of the government in a manner useful to them. The securities will ultimately have to be repaid at par, but at present they would not realize par. The company will pay us four per cent. We have, in a recent transaction, paid a shade above four per cent for money, so, the statement of Mr. Hays that we might lend them our credit and not suffer loss may be open to criticism. Therefore, we admit that, in giving the company the benefit of this loan, we are taking at par a security which they could not float at par and giving them the benefit of four per cent though they themselves could not borrow at that rate, and the government has recently had to pay a little over four per cent.

Mr. HUGHES. In the estimate of $34,000 per mile by the company and the chief engineer, does that include rolling stock and other equipment?

Mr. FIELDING. No, there is a special issue of bonds for equipment.

It will be remembered that, in the early days of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, somewhat similar conditions arose. There were periods when, great as seemed to be the prospect of that enterprise, the money market did not view it with great favour; and application was made to the government and the government granted assistance. That assistance helped to tide over a difficulty that the company had, but, after a period of years, the result showed that parliament had acted wisely in granting the aid. There were differences of opinion at that time, but, no doubt, looking back over it to-day the men who did not approve of the loan at the time would be free to admit that the loan had justified itself. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company were helped over a difficulty, the road was completed, and as soon as it was in a position to establish its traffic, its credit began to improve, and, as a matter of fact, the company repaid the loan to the government before the money came due. We have every reason to hope that that will be the experience of this new enterprise. The prairie section has been generally recognized as a profitable section. The more expensive part, the mountain section, and the more difficult sections of the eastern division, are, with all their merits, not so profitable or so promising as an investment as the prairie section. We are lending this money with a special security on the prairie section and for the purposes of the prairie section entirely. We have every reason to believe that that section will, at a very early date, prove a profitable section, and we have an abiding faith that we will not risk seriously the credit or the money of Canada in lending this company $10,000,000 under such conditions. We get for it, first the promise to pay of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I frankly admit that that in itself, at this moment, is not of the utmost commercial value. As I have already stated, any new railway company, in the early stages of its enterprise, would not find that its credit of that character ranked very high. We take a mortgage from the Grand Trunk Pacific upon the property. That mortgage is not one of high rank; there are several other mortgages before it and I do not attach the greatest importance to the mortgage itself as a security, although it has some value.

Mr. FOSTER. What does that mortgage cover ?

Mr. FIELDING. It covers the prairie section. The whole transaction applies to the prairie section. The first mortgage on the prairie section, as on the mountain section, represents the government guarantee, so that the government already holds the first mortgage on the prairie section. There is then a second mortgage which represents the aid already given by the Grand Trunk Railway Company through its guarantee, and then there is the lien created by the statute to make provision for the equipment. All these will have priority over the new mortgage we are to take under this Act. A question was asked in the House as to the standing of this mortgage and I said at once that so far as the mortgage was concerned, it would necessarily be an inferior security.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this mortgage include the Grand Trunk Pacific road, its equipment and everything ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes as respects the prairie section and also the equipment of the whole western division. The first mortgage is practically held by the government through a trust company for the government guarantee. The second is held through a trust company by the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada for its own guarantee. Then follows the equipment lien and then will come the mortgage which we propose to take to secure this loan. Therefore so far as the mortgage is concerned, I do not regard the security as, at present of very great value.

Mr. AMES. This mortgage is on exactly the same things as the first two, on the property of the whole undertaking.

Mr. FIELDING. The equipment lien is on exactly the same property as the two

prior mortgages. It is not secured by special mortgages but by a lien created by statute.

Mr. FOSTER. Does our mortgage have the remaining equity in everything?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes as respects the prairie section. As I said I do not personally attach much present value to the mortgage security. There will come a time in the development of that property when the mortgage will become of value. For the present there are other mortgages ahead.

Mr. AMES. Is the amount of money raised, say on the second mortgage, differentiated as between the prairie and the mountain section or does the entire amount rest on the whole road?

Mr. FIELDING. It is one common mortgage on the western division, but a portion of it is specially assigned to the prairie section, so that only that much can be applied to the prairie section, but the mortgage is on the entire western division.

Mr. AMES. Would not the entire mortgage on the western division have to be paid off before the third mortgage would rank on the prairie section?

Mr. FIELDING. I think so, but the mortgage says that only this specified, limited sum of the proceeds of the mortgage can be applied to the construction of the prairie section. But it is a common mortgage over the whole western division and the hon. gentleman's view is, I think, correct.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Does the undertaking of the Grand Trunk Pacific cover that section of the road built to Lake Superior, or is that separate?

Mr. FIELDING. The Lake Superior branch is quite a separate transaction; the guarantee does not apply to that and it in no way relates to that transaction.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Do I understand that the government, in making this advance, is under the belief that the Dominion of Canada has the first mortgage under the transaction of 1903-4?

Mr. FIELDING. First mortgage on what?

Mr. NORTHRUP. On the prairie section of the road.

Mr. FIELDING. Surely they have.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Surely not.

Mr. FIELDING. The government-guaranteed bonds are certainly the first mortgage on the whole western division.

Mr. NORTHRUP. So my hon. friend understands.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend understands differently?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I do not think there is the slightest doubt about it.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman may be more wise than the rest, but I have not heard attention called to this question. If it is a new discovery I would be pleased to have his information with reference to it. We have advice that the trust company hold a first mortgage for the government guaranteed bonds on the whole western division.

Now we come to the guarantee to be given to us by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. They are obligated to provide this money and instead of providing it by selling their bonds on the money market they come to us and offer us the bonds; but these bonds are to bear the same guarantee as they would bear if they were issued on the money market, that is the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway itself. Now the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada on any enterprise is a substantial security. An hon. gentleman asked the other day what claims there would be ahead of this, what liens there would be ahead of this guarantee which the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada proposes to give us. I have had the matter looked into and I am advised that bonds to the value of £1,488,500 and Grand Trunk Railway Consolidated Debenture stock to the amount of £22,825,297, making a total of £24,413,797 are unquestionably a first lien and would come ahead of our guarantee. Next to that, as we claim, comes the guarantee that is proposed to be given here and the other guarantees of like character; the Grand Trunk Railway Company has several guarantees which would probably stand in exactly the same position. Then the question has been suggested by the company itself that the rentals of certain leased lines, amounting half yearly to £77,603 would probably be regarded as working expenses and hence would be a prior charge to this guarantee. While the company have suggested that, they have not stated it very strongly, and I am advised it is by no means clear that these rentals would be regarded as working expenses. On the contrary, it is probable they would not and would therefore not have priority over this guarantee.

Mr. AMES. How many partners will we have in this second lien and what would be their interest therein?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not the list here; the Canada Atlantic guarantee, I think, is the chief one, but there are one or two others. If the debate should be continued I would endeavour to ascertain more precisely. This mortgage does not rank above these, it merely ranks with them.

Mr. FOSTER. That is to say that the settlement between the government and the company is based on these rentals?

Mr. FIELDING. The company have not strongly contended that. They have so stated in conversation to one of our officers, but I am advised that it is a matter of doubt and I do not wish to be positive. The amount is not very large.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I noticed in the statute of 1892 that the borrowed capital of the Grand Trunk Railway Company is put at $91,862,737, and that this capital is described as follows:

Four per cent guaranteed stock....	$25,402,996
First preference stock..	16,644,000
Second preference stock..	12,312,666
Third preference stock..	34,884,535
Ordinary stock..	99,913,000

I had a question on the Order Paper the other day with the view of ascertaining which, if any, of these classes of stock would have preference over this guarantee. Would the minister inform me which, if any, have preference?

Mr. FIELDING. I think that, except such stocks as I have already mentioned, these would not have priority over the present guarantee. I have mentioned those which, I understand, have priority over the proposed guarantee: bonds amounting to £1,488,500 and Grand Trunk consolidated debenture stock amounting to £22,825,297, making a total of £24,413,797 which becomes a first lien with an annual charge of £1,064 19s. 10d. Several of those stocks that my hon. friend has mentioned unquestionably have not priority over the proposed guarantee. We have a statement of the Grand Trunk Company's affairs showing what amounts have been available for the payment of any obligations which might arise under a guarantee of this kind. The Grand Trunk Company's published statement shows what is the surplus available after paying all the charges that would come ahead of this guarantee. In other words this statement will show what amount would be available for the payment if need be of the interest upon these bonds. The surplus, after payment of the net revenue charges of the company, including the rentals above referred to, for each half of the following years, compiled from and as stated in the accounts of the half yearly meetings of the company as reported in the 'Economist' was as follows:

1904, 1st half, surplus...	£124,610		
1904, 2nd "	432,103		
			£556,713
1905, 1st "	£285,033		
1905, 2nd "	428,778		
			713,811
1906, 1st "	£309,861		
1906, 2nd "	523,465		
			833,326
1907, 1st "	£315,319		
1907, 2nd "	527,175		
			842,494
1908, 1st "	£180,494		
			180,494

We have the statement only for the first half of 1908, and the balance for the remaining half year would unquestionably be much larger. But, as we all know, the year 1908 was not a very good one in railway affairs, and so I anticipate that if we had the full figures for 1908 they would certainly be very much less favourable than those of the previous year.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand that this sum will be available to divide up between ourselves and all the other guarantors on the same basis if it were necessary to secure the interest on these guarantees?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I am advised that the situation is better than that; that all the other guarantees were provided for and that this amount would have been available to pay our guarantee if this proposed legislation had been in operation in any of the years which I have mentioned.

Mr. AMES. Together with the others?

Mr. FIELDING. The others had been provided for before this surplus was declared. If these statements are correct, and I am giving them on the faith of the London 'Economist,' and I accept them as being correct, if this guarantee that we now propose to accept from the Grand Trunk Railway Company had been in operation in any one of those years, and if it had become necessary to provide the interest, these sums of money would have been available for the payment of such interest. That is to say that while the interest charge would have been $400,000 or a little more than £80,000 there would have been, in one of the earlier years £556,713 available, in another year £713,811, in another year £833,326, in 1907, £842,494, and in the half of the year that we have of 1908 there would have been £180,494 to respond to the claim which might have arisen for this £80,000 annual interest.

If these figures are correct, as I believe them to be and I accept them in good faith, then it seems that there would be the most ample security for the government of Canada in advancing this money to the Grand Trunk Railway and to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. So, Sir, I think the proper view is this, that the Grand Trunk is one of the great companies of Canada, and although some classes of its stocks do

not rank high, its general credit does stand high. Though, like other railways, it has had a bad year there is every reason to believe that, with the revival of prosperity that we all feel is close at hand, our railway companies, as well as others, will share in that prosperity and that the various securities of the Grand Trunk will occupy a better position. I feel the utmost confidence that in lending our credit to the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific at this moment, we are helping them in a time of need, we are taking an exceedingly small risk and it is much better in the interest of the country, in the interest of the National Transcontinental Railway, and in the interest of the credit of Canada, that the government should show their faith in this enterprise and lend them this money, taking their bonds at par, rather than that we should allow these bonds to be thrown on the market and sold at a sacrifice price. Holding these views, the government ask the House to accept this resolution and the Bill which will be founded upon at a later stage.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly understand that parliament and the country are committed to this enterprise by the action of parliament in 1903 and 1904 and by the verdict of the people in 1904 when this contract, or the proposition to build this great railway, was submitted to the people of this country. Therefore, I agree that the enterprise must be carried out. Enormous sums have already been expended and it seems to me that the only question to-day before parliament is as to the terms and conditions upon which this enterprise shall be brought to completion, if those who undertook it in the first instance are not prepared to carry it out upon the conditions which were then entered into and which were embodied in two separate agreements and two separate Acts of this parliament.

Before considering that a little I think it would not be amiss that I should refer very briefly indeed to what has transpired since my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) came down to this parliament on August 30, 1903, and told us that time would not wait. The enterprise of building a transcontinental railway across this continent is a great enterprise and an enterprise worthy of the people of Canada if conceived in wisdom and carried out with integrity and business ability. But this enterprise seems to have been conceived in haste, moulded for political purposes and conducted with the wildest extravagance and folly. I would not say to-day that every representation made to parliament and to the country by the government in the initiation of this enterprise has been falsified by the events; I could not say that, because in a great many instances the event has not yet happened and thus the promise could not yet be falsified, but to the extent that the event has transpired it would be very difficult for any member supporting the Liberal government to put his finger upon one representation made to parliament and to the people that has been borne out by any event which has so far come about. What was the great burden of the song that the Prime Minister sang to this parliament on the 30th day of August, 1903. He said: There was great haste; time would not wait; pray heaven it be not too late already. And why all this? Because he saw fit to represent—and I do not think he was patriotic in that—that the people of this great Dominion were absolutely at the mercy of the United States in respect to the bonding privilege. Page after page of 'Hansard' is taken up by the right hon. gentleman in picturing the woes and the evils and the disasters that would fall upon the people of Canada if that bonding privilege were repealed, and he declared that in his opinion at least we might any day expect its repeal. Six years have passed and in the interim, as the right hon. gentleman well knows, we have not heard the slightest whisper or word about the repeal of the bonding privilege, and so it is that two-thirds of the speech which the right hon. gentleman then made before this parliament in reference to this matter stands as mere idle wind, designed as an excuse for undertaking this enterprise in such haste and with such want of consideration.

There was another statement which the right hon. gentleman made in parliament and out of parliament, and that statement was that this railway was designed to open up and develop the great northern regions of Canada. Let me quote from the recital of the agreement embodied as a schedule to the statute of 1903 and bears date July 29, 1903: 'I will omit the immaterial words:

> Whereas it is in the interest of Canada that a line of railway designed to secure the most direct and economical interchange of traffic between Eastern Canada and the provinces and territories west of the great lakes, to open up and develop the northern zone of the Dominion, to promote the internal and foreign trade of Canada and to develop commerce through Canadian ports, should be constructed and operated as a common railway highway across the Dominion from ocean to ocean.

Observe the expression 'to open up and develop the northern zone of the Dominion.' That idea was developed by the right hon. gentleman all through his speech. He said it was a railway to be built by way of the Pine river or Peace River Pass to open up the rich prairies in that country. Well, if you look at the maps placed before us you will see that that railway has been built from 100 to 150

or 200 miles south of the location which was pointed out by the right hon. gentleman in his speech to this House. It is not 100 miles or 200 miles south of that location all the way, because of course it was to touch at Winnipeg and at Edmonton; but how far does it go south of the Peace River Pass and the Pine River Pass, and to what extent does it open up any northern zone of Canada which at that date was not supplied with a railway. I understand of course that it runs through the northern portions of Ontario and Quebec, but that was not what the right hon. gentleman had in mind because he explicitly mentioned the rich prairies of the west which would be found in that northern zone through which the railway was to run. On many occasions did he use expressions both in this House and out of the House which are exactly in line with my contention. He told us that the railway was to touch Winnipeg and once more plunge into new territory; he told us that the railway from its commencement to its end in addition to being a trunk line would open up millions of acres of productive land; he told us that the railway would run north of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories and the mineral regions of British Columbia; that it would go over the route suggested by the Halifax Board of Trade, (which as I understand was north of Lake Winnipeg); that it would open up our hinterland and give breadth as well as length to Canada, and, that except at the terminal points it would be at least 30 miles away from any existing railway. As reported in 'Hansard' 1903, page 10415, he told us that the Grand Trunk Pacific must be at least 30 miles from any existing railway or from any railways that had been located. But, Mr. Speaker, look at the map of this railway and the maps of the other railways laid upon the table of the House, and you find that for miles and miles the Grand Trunk Pacific runs within a stone's throw of two other great transcontinental railways which were amply assisted by this parliament before this railway was ever thought of or spoken of.

The right hon. gentleman told us there were mountains of information with respect to every matter connected with this National Transcontinental Railway; and, inter alia, he stated that the mountain section would be 600 miles long and would cost $18,000,000. The result is that the mountain section is 836 miles long and his own engineer to-day estimates that it will cost $67,056,000 or nearly $50,000,000 more than the right hon. gentleman told us it would cost. The mountains of information in that respect seem to have been singularly deficient, and I think my right hon. friend will himself be the first to admit it.

Then again the right hon. gentleman told us:

> The surplus for this year (1903) will provide for the construction of this road from Moncton to the Pacific.

Well, the end of this financial year now approaching sees the debt of this country increased nearly $50,000,000 and the railroad is not one-third completed.

But there were further mountains of information. The right hon. gentleman said:

> We can abridge the distance between Moncton and Levis by from 120 to 140 miles.

What is the result? The distance from Moncton to Levis by the Intercolonial Railway is 488 miles and the distance by the Grand Trunk Pacific is now estimated to be 459 miles, or a net saving of 29 miles between Moncton and Levis and the estimated cost is $29,176,420, so that the saving in that distance over the Intercolonial Railway has cost us exactly one million dollars per mile.

Then, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance availed himself of these mountains of information and he said:

> The road from Moncton to Quebec would cost $12,500,000, the road from Quebec to Winnipeg would cost $51,625,000; the interest during construction would amount to $7,031,975, making a total of $71,156,975.

My estimate of $75,000,000, without interest, he declared to be excessive by $10,875,000. The result to-day is that the government admits that the railway from Moncton to Winnipeg, including interest, will cost not less than $124,403,000. It must be apparent to the right hon. gentleman, in view of these results as compared with his predictions, how exceedingly valuable were his mountains of information, and how true a prophet he was as to the cost of this railway to the people of Canada. There were some other predictions heard and some other criticisms put forward with regard to this road to which I may allude a little later on. For the present I will only say that one need not be surprised in the future if those predictions shall be fulfilled in as great a measure as the predictions to which I have already alluded and certain others to which I propose now to allude.

My hon. friend the Finance Minister the great financial authority of the government, was not quite content to estimate the cost of the mountain section at the sum of $18,000,000, at which it had been fixed by his leader, but he did fix it in 1904, a year after the Prime Minister's estimate of $18,000,000. He had the experience of nearly a year to guide him to an accurate estimate, and he gave us on this side of the House, as he said, the benefit of the doubt. My hon.

friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) had estimated the cost of the mountain section, including interest, at $56,000 per mile. The Finance Minister assured the House that was excessive. He said he was prepared to accept it under protest, but only under protest. At that estimate he said that the mountain section, 480 miles in length, would cost $26,880,000, or $40,000,000 less than that announced by the government to-day as the present estimate of the government engineers. And that was a pretty relevant statement, because he was basing upon it the amount of money which the people of this country would have to guarantee in respect of that mountain section, and he was also basing upon it his estimate of the amount of money, as interest on that guarantee for seven years, which would be paid by the people of this country without recourse. He estimated at less than $27,000,000 that which he now tells us will cost more than $67,000,000, upon three-fourths of which we shall pay interest for seven years without recourse. And so he assured the parliament and the people of this country that our guarantee on the mountain section would not exceed $21,000,000, yet according to the estimate brought down to-day, the guarantee which must be given by the people of this country in connection with the mountain section will be at least 150 per cent more than the amount which he named.

In 1903 he told us the same story about the surplus. He said, as reported in 'Hansard' of that year, at page 8589:

> If you had a surplus of $13,725,706, . . . if you take that sum and give it to a trust company . . . to invest at 3 per cent per annum, payable half-yearly.. .. they could pay every cent of obligation.

He will not say that to-day; he will not say to-day that double that sum would do it. Mr. Paterson said:

> The cost to this country would be about $13,000,000 or $14,000,000. The Finance Minister made a careful actuarial calculation and showed that $13,000,000 or $14,000,000 paid out in instalments for twelve years would pay all the cost.

My hon. friend the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) went further than any of them in this regard. He said that the Finance Minister had absolutely proved it, provided the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company carried out their agreement. These are his words:

> My hon. friend the Finance Minister—and I may perhaps ask that particular attention be given to this phase of the question, because I think it is the most important in the whole discussion—my hon. friend the Minister of Finance took the provisions of this contract in so far as they relate to the financial features and he went over it from end to end. He made a close, and a careful and an exact calculation as to the amount of money which we should have to pay if the Grand Trunk Pacific carries out its contract.

Hon. gentlemen have already observed how close and careful and exact the conclusion of my hon. friend the Finance Minister has proven to be. The hon. member for Brandon, who was then speaking as a member of this government, who was put forward in support of this agreement on every available occasion, and who perhaps made as strong and powerful a defence of the terms of the contract as was made by any hon. gentleman on the treasury benches, continued as follows:

> That was the nature of the calculation which was made by the Finance Minister. If the Grand Trunk Company carries out its contract, then there is no escape from the conclusion which was placed before this House by my hon. friend. You cannot get over it by laughing, you cannot meet the argument by jeering at it. There is only one way of meeting the argument that he presented to this House, and that is by showing that that Grand Trunk will not be able to carry out this contract. That is the only way you can meet it. If the Grand Trunk Company carries out its contract then we will have to pay just what the Finance Minister said, not one dollar more and not one dollar less.

My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. G. P. Graham) spoke on this subject in 1908. I am quoting from his remarks as found in 'Hansard,' at pages 12673 and 12674; and listen to the difference between the story of 1903 and 1904 and that of 1908. The Minister of Railways and Canals was trying to use the same argument about the net amount of cash which the country would have to pay out. This is the way that hon. gentleman expressed himself in 1908:

> The only burden that lies upon this country for this railway from Moncton to Winnipeg is a total of $26,850,676 of interest that will accumulate during the first seven years of the lease to the Grand Trunk Pacific.

He was speaking, you will observe, not with the whole railway enterprise at all, but simply with that portion which lies between Moncton and Winnipeg. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) made this further comment and statement:

> The increased cost is due chiefly to two reasons: first the greater cost of material and labour, and second the improved standard of the road.

I have heard a good deal about the improved standard of this road and have been at a little pains to ascertain what the Minister of Finance was speaking about when he made this calculation in 1904. I asked him. as will be found on page 3630 of 'Hansard':

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are these estimates for a four-tenth per cent grade?

Mr. FIELDING. They are estimated upon the larger sum of $35,000 per mile for the section from Quebec westward and $31,250 per mile for the section from Quebec to Moncton. ton.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the hon. gentleman any report of any engineer which says that the line can be built for that sum with a four-tenth grade?

Mr. FIELDING. No, but I have the statement of a very eminent engineer that the allowance made of 25 per cent above the first figure was a fair and reasonable allowance for that purpose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was that the Deputy Minister of Railways?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, Mr. Schreiber.

It appears that the estimate of $35,000 per mile, the Finance Minister arrived at by adding 25 per cent to $28,000 per mile, and the estimate of $31,125 per mile he arrived at by adding 25 per cent to his estimate of $25,000 per mile. I find that these, according to the view of the hon. gentleman at that time, were sufficient to provide for a four-tenth per cent grade. Therefore, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, in assuming there is any change, so far as grade is concerned, does not seem to have very carefully examined the statements of his colleague made in 1903-4, and that reason cannot be put forward as a legitimate one for the enormous cost entailed on the people of this country.

We had another representation to the people. The government would not allow the Grand Trunk Railway to part with their title to the $25,000,000 of common stock according to the agreement of 1903.

They said that to do so would be dangerous and that the interests of the country were being safeguarded by a position which made it necessary for the Grand Trunk Railway to hold that stock during the whole term of the lease. It would be absolutely unsafe and dangerous to permit the company to part with that stock because there might be speculation in it. Well, what transpired? The following year the government modified the contract at the request—I might say at the dictation—of the Grand Trunk Railway, and did in 1904 what it had declared to be fatal in 1903.

We were told in 1903 that the bargain was an excellent one for both parties. The Grand Trunk Pacific was behind it and would certainly carry it out. I shall not weary the House with many quotations in that regard but I shall give a few. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance was particularly emphatic. He said, referring to the Grand Trunk Railway:

> We have not been content that they shall stand behind it. We have required, and they have readily consented, that they shall be in it and of it and form the whole thing.

But to-day we are met with the modest request that we shall furnish $10,000,000 for the construction of the prairie section, $7,000,000 of which is to go to repay the Grand Trunk Railway for their advances, although that same company is in it and of it and forms the whole thing. Well, one is not startled by the modesty of the request, to say the least. I do not imagine that any hon. gentleman in this House will be startled by the modesty of a request such as that, but it is exactly the request which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is placing before the House in the motion he has submitted to us to-day. Further on I find him saying:

> However, without reviving a previous discussion, I may say that this is what the Act requires, and that they have assured us that they are prepared to do what the Act requires.

The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) then Minister of the Interior, said:

> It was a clear, distinct and unambiguous contract with a responsible company.

The Minister of Agriculture said:

> Sir, we make a clear cut proposition embodied in a contract, signed and sealed with a reputable corporation of great resources which is going ahead with this project as rapidly as possible.

And the then hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who was put forward to answer the ex-Minister of Railways, Mr. Blair, who had recently resigned his portfolio because he differed with the government regarding its policy in this connection, said:

> We have the entire strength, resources and character of the Grant Trunk Railway behind the Grand Trunk Pacific. The two are united together.

And last, but not least, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, said:

> I do not deny that the Grand Trunk Railway is at the bottom of this enterprise. It cannot default on the eastern part, because if it does, it defaults on the western part. It cannot default on one part without defaulting on the whole. Therefore we hold them tight to their bargain, and they cannot deviate from it.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was good enough to tell us to-day that this proposal of his does not in any way alter or interfere with the contract made in 1903, as modified by that of 1904. Does it not? Let us look at it. If the contract of 1903, as modified by that of 1904, were carried out, the Grand Trunk Railway would be obliged to guarantee bonds for the prairie section to an amount which would realize between $20,000,000 and $21,000,000; but after this resolution passes the House, will there be any necessity for the Grand Trunk Railway to guarantee bonds to that amount? My hon. friend the Minister of Finance knows very well they will not then be under the necessity of carrying out that

part of their contract. Therefore, while it does not formally or technically alter the terms of the contract, it does, in fact, and in substance, modify it exactly in the way I have pointed out.

We were told by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who was in the House at that time, that it was really a good bargain. He said:

I believe a really good bargain may be one which is to the advantages of both parties. I think that this is notably an instance of this sort.

It was a bargain to the advantage of both parties—that was in 1903. It was still more a bargain to the advantage of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk Railway after the modification made in 1904. Let us look at those modifications. I shall not refer to those of a minor character but only to the more important. In 1904, the government came back for further amendments, which, among other things, provided for an increase of guarantee on the mounain division so that we should guarantee three-fourths of the cost, no matter what it might be. Our guarantee up to that time had been limited to a cost of $30,000 per mile. They gave to the Grand Trunk Railway, as I have already mentioned, the power to dispose of the common stock, notwithstanding the declared policy of the government in the previous year against any provision of that character; and they extended the time for the building of the road by three years. No very formidable reasons were advanced why these modifications should be made. My right hon. friend did mention, and he devoted a very considerable portion of his speech to matters of this kind—that on June 15, 1671, wild roses had been found blooming at a point 200 miles distant from the location of the road as now fixed. It was also very frankly stated in the House at that time that the Grand Trunk Railway Company would not accept the first agreement and we were therefore obliged to modify it; the Grand Trunk shareholders would not approve the agreement as it was and therefore concessions had to be made. So we ratified the modifications by a vote of the majority of this House and the contract went into effect some time in 1904. We on this side characterized the terms of this agreement as absolutely insufficient to prevent the Grand Trunk Railway Company from carrying its traffic to Portland as it had done in the past. The Prime Minister had said during the debate, I think in 1904:

We cannot undo the past altogether; Portland has been made the winter terminus of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I do not expect that they are going to abandon what they have.

Later on in the same debate he said:

I have read his (Mr. Borden's) speech carefully, and I must say—it may be my fault, and I shall be glad to be illuminated—if he will explain how, having brought the freight from the west of North Bay, he can send it on to St. John and Halifax, over the Grand Trunk, I will be glad to hear him.

I should think there would be about as much prospect of sending it to St. John and Halifax as there would be after the Grand Trunk Pacific had brought it to Quebec, within striking distance of Portland where all their great interests lay. But I am not so much concerned with arguing out that old matter. I want to emphasize certain remarks delivered by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) in this House during this very session. He said:

We have, it is true, an understanding and agreement with the Grand Trunk. But the Grand Trunk has its own connections to Portland, and will shortly have connections further east. And while it will live up to its agreement with us, it does not give the Intercolonial Railway a pound of freight that it can get out of giving to that road; it gives as much as it can to its own line and carries it to Portland.

It must not be forgotten that the Grand Trunk Railway took good care that it should not be bound by a single one of those provisions which are contained in the agreements of 1903 and 1904. It did not become a party to these contracts. We pointed out then that without infringing one line or one syllable of either of those contracts the Grand Trunk Railway Company could send out, and we believed it would send out, an army of canvassers all through the great west of this country who would take good care that the very great majority of the orders routing freight over this railway would route it so that it would go to Portland and not to St. John and Halifax; and this parliament cannot lay its finger upon the Grand Trunk Railway Company or the Grand Trunk Pacific Company if that is done. When a minister of the Crown, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr Graham) has told us very frankly that it is not only the interest but the absolute intention and determination of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to send its traffic to Portland in the future as it has done in the past, can we plume ourselves upon the assurance that in the contracts of 1903 and 1904 we have, after all, any guarantee of that which was placed before parliament as the crux and essence of this enterprise, that the great trade of western Canada should be gathered up and sent to our own maritime ports in eastern Canada. Well, Sir, time will tell who is right and who is wrong; whether hon. gentlemen on the

other side of the House, now sitting on the treasury benches, to the great misfortune of the country, were correct in their predictions or whether we were correct in our criticisms. Time will tell ; no one of us can determine that with absolute accuracy to-day.

Let me refer to the action which this government has taken in carrying out this contract along general lines. The statute of 1903 provided that this road should be built under the management and direction of a commission to be appointed by this government. The government of the United States then or not long afterwards proposed to engage in a great enterprise of its own, the building of the Panama canal. That government took the same course in one respect that this government took, it decided that the Panama canal should be built under the management and control of a commission appointed by the executive of the United States government. Every one knows that the value of a commission. the value of the work it can do, the value of the services it can render to the people of a country, depends almost entirely upon the experience, the character and the ability of the men who constitute that commission. I desire to utter no word against any member of the commission appointed by the government as a citizen of this country, but I am perfectly within my rights as a member of this parliament, in pointing out to the House and to the people of Canada, as I do point out, that not one of those men had the slightest iota or atom of experience in respect to the important work in which they were to engage as a commission. If I desired any work to be performed in the respective spheres in which these gentlemen had been engaged up to the time of their appointment, I might very probably go to one of them. If I had desired advice in respect of a matter of law of the great province of Quebec, I very likely would have gone to the firm of which the chairman of that committee, Mr. Parent, was at one time a member. I am not here for the purpose of casting any discredit upon Mr. Parent, either in his public or professional career; I am here to point out that, so far as railway construction is concerned, Mr. Parent had absolutely no experience whatever, and the government ought not to have appointed him to be chairman of that commission. If I desired information as to the law of Nova Scotia, or desired a suit to be taken on my behalf by some member of the bar of that province, I might go to my friend Mr. McIsaac, who is a lawyer and who has had a public career. But every one knows that he had no experience in railway construction, and therefore ought not to have been appointed to the position to which the government appointed him. If I desired to be instructed in the manufacture of stationery and corsets, I might go to Mr. Reid, who was appointed a member of this commission, but I would not think myself constrained to go to that gentleman for advice in connection with the construction of a railway. And, if I desired information as to the purchase of grain, or in connection with agricultural pursuits, I should, no doubt, get valuable advice and counsel from Mr. Young, who was also appointed a member of that commission, but I have yet to learn that Mr. Young had any important advantages in the way of experience which should have qualified him in the eyes of this government to be a member of that commission.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we all know why these men were appointed. We know that they were not appointed by reason of their experience, but by reason of the partisan service or supposed partisan service that they had rendered to the Liberal party. That goes without saying.

Now, what course did the government of the United States take in a similar matter? My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), before 1896, was wont to point out the errors and evils of administration in the United States, and the defects of their system of government, and to bewail the fact—he stated it to be a fact—that the methods which had prevailed in the United States were becoming prevalent in this great Dominion of Canada under the wicked rule of a notorious Conservative administration. That was the song the ringht hon. gentleman sang in those days. Well, let us look at the record in the United States as contrasted with the record in Canada, and then let any hon. gentleman in this House, follower of the Liberal party though he be, stand up in his place and say that he is proud of the comparison between what the government of the United States did and what the government of Canada did in this regard. On February 29, 1904, the President of the United States appointed an Isthmian Canal Commission of seven members, who were duly confirmed by the Senate on March 3. The commissioners were John G. Walker, a rear-admiral of the United States navy, on the retired list, who had been at the head of former canal commissions for the purpose of investigation and report; George W. Davis, a major-general of the United States army, on the retired list; William B. Parsons, an eminent civil engineer, of New York; William H. Burr, Professor of Civil Engineering in Columbia University, N.Y.; Benjamin M. Harrod, formerly city and state civil engineer, of New Orleans, Louisiana; Carl E. Grunsky, civil engineer,

of San Francisco, California, and Frank T. Hecker, a civil engineer, of Detroit, Michigan. Rear-Admiral Walker was made chairman of the commission, and General Davis was appointed governor of the canal zone. Dominic I. Murphy, of Washington, D.C., was engaged as secretary to the commission, and Charles E. Magoon, an eminent jurist, of Lincoln, Nebraska, as general counsel. Later, the government of the United States, through causes into which I need not enter, found it necessary to reorganize that commission. And they did reorganize it. A new commission was appointed, consisting of Theodore P. Shonts, of Illinois, a civil engineer and railroad president; Charles E. Magoon, of Nebraska, a distinguished jurist, who had been legal counsel to the old commission and, before that, law officer of the Bureau of Insular Affairs of the War Department; John F. Wallace, a civil engineer, who had been chief engineer under the old commission, and who had had much experience in railroad and canal work; Mordecai T. Endicott, a rear-admiral of the United States navy on the retired list, who had been chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Navy Department, and had been a civil engineer before entering the navy; Peter C. Hains, a brigadier-general of the United States army on the retired list, who had been educated at West Point, had served with distinction in the civil war, and had been identified with many important harbour works and other engineering undertakings of the government; Oswald H. Ernst, a colonel in the United States army, who had been educated at West Point and had served with distinction in the Engineering Corps, and Benjamin M. Harrod, of Louisiana, an accomplished civil engineer, who had been a member of the former Canal Commission.

Well, there are the two methods. In the sober judgment of this House, which is the best method in the interest of the people of this country? Can there be any doubt about it? Can any hon. member say, upon his conscience, that the course which this government carried out in the constitution of this commission was really a course in the best interest of the people?

Now, the Grand Trunk Railway Company is here for better terms. That is what it amounts to. It is here practically for a modification of the contract of 1903, which has already been modified, in 1904. We are asked to provide a very large proportion of the financial support necessary for the construction of this western division. I will send across the floor to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), a statement that embodies a rough calculation—I do not pretend that it is accurate in every respect—of what the country is contributing and what the Grand Trunk is contributing to the western division.

The country contracts to guarantee the interest upon the prairie section, 916 miles long, at $13,000 a mile, or a total guarantee of $11,908,000. The mountain section, roughly speaking, is estimated to cost $67,000,000. Now, if you should issue bonds bearing 3½ per cent, interest at 90, sufficient to afford a sum of $67,000,000, you would find that the total bond issue would amount to $73,000,000. Seventy-five per cent of that which we have undertaken to guarantee would amount to $54,750,000, or a total amount to be guaranteed by the people of this country of $66,658,000. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance will observe that in making an estimate of $13,000 a mile, I have not taken into consideration that the contract provides, as he stated this afternoon, that an amount must be guaranteed which will actually provide $13,000 per mile. I have not taken that into consideration, nor have I taken it into consideration in estimating the amount of the guarantee by the Grand Trunk Railway Company; so that my calculation may require some little modification in that regard, but nothing very material. Well, then, the proposed loan which the Finance Minister now asks the House to sanction amounts to $10,000,000 and our liability with respect to that is, of course, as great as our liability with respect to any of these guarantees. As a matter of fact, we have less security for it than we would have for the guarantees which have been alluded to. The total therefore in the shape of loans and guarantees would, roughly speaking, be about $76,658,000. Then, in addition to that, we are bound to pay interest without recourse for seven years upon the bonds which we guarantee with respect to the mountain section. The interest on $54,750,000 at 3½ per cent for one year amounts to $1,916,250, which amount, multiplied by seven, makes $13,413,750 as our actual cash contribution towards the building of the western division.

Mr. FOSTER. At what interest rate?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am estimating it at 3½ per cent, and I am putting the bonds at 90. That is a matter of conjecture and it may be that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance may find some fault with my calculation in that regard. I do not know as much about the probable figures as he would know, and I would be ready to defer to his superior judgment in case he thinks the calculation I have made is not upon a fair basis.

Now, the Grand Trunk Company would, in the ordinary course, contribute a guarantee of about $20,500,000 towards the prairie section, but I would assume that their guarantee in that regard would be cut down by the proposed loan of $10,000,000, which would diminish it to $10,500,000. If our guarantee upon the mountain section amounts to $54,750,000 the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway Company will amount to one-third of that, or one-fourth of the whole, which would be $18,250,000. So that the total amount contributed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the western division would amount, as I estimate it, roughly speaking, to a guarantee of bonds of $28,750,000. The figures are as follows :

WESTERN DIVISION.

Country contributes.

Prairie section, 916 miles at $13,000=	$11,908,000
Mountain section, $67,000,000	
Bonds at 90 p.c.,$73,000,000..75 p.c.=	54,750,000
	$66,658,000
Proposed loan..	10,000,000
	$76,658,000
Cash payment interest for 7 years...	13,413,750
One year = $1,916,250	
	$90,091,750

Grand Trunk contributes.

Prairie section..	$10,000,000
Prairie section..	$10,500,000
	$28,750,000

Now, I estimated last year that the eastern division would cost the people of this country not less than $180,000,000. If I were to make an estimate to-day I would be inclined to increase rather than diminish it. The western division, roughly speaking, will cost $100,000,000. So you have altogether an expenditure of $280,000,000 upon this road in one way and another. This does not include the seven years' interest which we are to pay without recourse in respect of the mountain section. In the first place you have, on the western division, the government of this country contributing a bond guarantee and a loan amounting in all to $76,658,000, and making an actual cash contribution of $13,413,750, and you have the Grand Trunk Railway Company contributing a bond guarantee, roughly speaking of $28,750,000.

Now, take the whole road. As far as the whole road is concerned its probable cost will be about $280,000,000. Of that this country provides in cash contributions or by bond guarantees about nine-tenths, as I estimated in 1903-4, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company contributes about one-tenth and that in the shape of a bond guarantee with no cash contribution. That, then, is the proposition which the government makes to us to-day.

Let us now look for a moment at one item in connection with the information that the hon. Minister of Finance has brought down. When the Prime Minister asked us in 1904 to depart from the terms of this contract as it had been agreed upon in 1903 by those representing the Grand Trunk Railway Company with respect to the stock issue, and when he asked us to permit the Grand Trunk Railway Company to dispose of the stock, what was the reason assigned? In case my right hon. friend has forgotten I will remind him of the view which he took at that time. I will read from his remarks at page 2483 of 'Hansard.' He said:

> The reason for inserting this condition of the contract last year was that we wished to prevent speculation in the stock. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Grand Trunk Railway Company must raise money to carry out this enterprise. They cannot build the section from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast simply upon the guarantee of the government, for that will cover only three-quarters of the cost of constructing this part of the road. And then the equipment of the road is also to be raised from the public, and there are only two manners in which that can be done, either by the issue of bonds, or raising money on their stock. The methods we have adopted will enable them to go into the money market and obtain some money with which to carry on the work.

To the same effect was the language which is to be found at page 3037 and 3038 of 'Hansard,' and which emanated from the then Minister of Justice, now Sir Charles Fitzpatrick. Speaking of the bond issues which the Grand Trunk Railway Company must guarantee he said:

> Can it be expected that it will realize more than 80? Where is the amount required to make it up to 100 to come from? It can come out of nothing but the company's capital. Where are they to obtain money to provide, for instance, for terminal facilities, and to provide the thousands of miles of branch lines which they have to construct? Where is that money to come from except from the $45,000,000 of capital ?

The Minister of Finance, although not in such explicit terms, presented the same view to this House, namely, that the Transcontinental Grand Trunk Railway Company must be permitted to depart from the contract of 1903 and be empowered to dispose of its stock in order that it might, by means of the sale of its stock, obtain the money to carry out its enterprise. The position to-day is exactly what we predicted in 1904, and every dollar of that $25,000,000 of common stock has been handed over to the Grand Trunk Railway Company for a purely nominal consideration. By the agreement submitted to us to-day the Grand Trunk Railway Company have become possessed as absolute holders of $25,000,000 of the common stock of the Grand Trunk Pa-

cific, and so far as cash is concerned they have given as consideration for it just about $200,000. And that is sought to be justified by the printed information which the Minister of Finance has brought down, and which at pages 14 and 15 recites the aid given by the Grand Trunk Railway Company to this enterprise, and provides as follows :

2. The Pacific company will forthwith issue, as paid up stock, shares of the common stock of the Pacific company of the par value of $23,908,000, making with the shares described in the schedule hereto a total of 249,000 shares of the par value of $24,900,000, and will allot and hand over the same to the Grand Trunk Company or their nominees, and that such issue and allotment of stock shall be binding upon the Pacific company and that such stock shall not be assessable for calls.

The position therefore is that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, providing $28,000,000 of the bond guarantee out of a total cost and expenditure of $280,000,000 which this road will entail, are to receive for that assistance so given $25,000,000 or thereabouts of the common stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and, the people of Canada providing the balance, or nine-tenths of the whole expenditure and guarantees are to receive absolutely no share whatever in the future profits which may result from this enterprise, when, the mere influx of population and the progress of the country shall have made this $25,000,000 of common stock worth 100 cents or perhaps 150 cents on the dollar.

Under these circumstances I conclude by saying to the Prime Minister and to his Minister of Finance: You have stated in considerable detail and with the utmost frankness what you propose to do for the Grand Trunk Railway Company which has assisted this enterprise to the extent I mentioned ; but will you tell us, having regard to the $250,000,000 or the $260,000,000, which the people of this country are putting into this enterprise either in cash or bond guarantee, what are you going to do for the people of Canada? Surely it is reasonable that we should know that. I say to the right hon. gentleman and to his Finance Minister: You have told us what you are going to do for the Grand Trunk Railway Company, will you please tell the House and the country what you propose to do for Canada?

Mr. FRED. F. PARDEE (West Lambton). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with attention to the pessimistic remarks of the leader of the opposition, but I am bound to say that I have not been able to discover whether he is in favour of the Grand Trunk Pacific enterprise or against it. I should rather think he is not in favour of it, although when in 1903 this project was first proposed to parliament the unanimous opinion was that another transcontinental line was necessary, the only difference being as to the question of the route, the government proposing one route and the opposition another. In view of the very vigorous policy of immigration which had been carried on, settlers were flocking into the western country at a rate greater than ever before, and in the year 1903 became an absolute necessity, as all conceded, that there should be another transcontinental railway. If such a railway was necessary in 1903, how much more necessary is it not in 1909, irrespective altogether of any question of cost. We hold out inducements in all parts of the world for immigrants to settle in the west, and we have rich and fertile lands to offer them. It is a mere axiom to say, that no country can be great without population, and having population it follows that you must give them ingress and egress to and from the country and that you must provide facilities for the transportation of their products to the market. What was the position in the Northwest in 1903? By reason of the insufficiency of the transportation facilities the crops were lying rotting in the fields.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. PARDEE. That is a positive fact. The crops were there, they could not be moved to the market and as a corollary the stores of the merchants were empty because the crops being unsold they could get no money from the farmers to enable them to purchase goods.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. PARDEE. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but the figures are at hand to prove my statement, and later on I will prove to hon. gentlemen opposite that even down to February of the year 1909, notwithstanding the increased facilities afforded in the interim, many million bushels of grain were not yet transported out of that country. That being the condition of affairs it was the bounden duty of a wise and progressive government to propose to parliament a transcontinental railway project, even if it were to do nothing more than to afford relief under these unfortunate conditions. In 1904 the government of Canada appealed to the country absolutely on the plank of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Were they or were they not upheld by the people of the country? They were upheld by a tremendous majority, and the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific proceeded. In 1908 another general election took place, and the slogan of the Liberal party throughout the length and breadth of this land, under which the Premier appealed to the country, was: 'Let Laurier finish his work,' namely, the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific

Railway. The hon. leader of the opposition has given us an array of figures which undoubtedly, in his own mind, and in the minds of his followers, are condemnatory of the whole proposition. I can only say that these same figures were given prior to the 26th of October, and so far as the people of this country are concerned, their one mandate then, as before, was: You have undertaken this great work, it is an absolute necessity to the well-being of the Dominion of Canada, and we wish you to complete it irrespective of cost. That is the position we find ourselves in to-day. So far as I am personally concerned were the loan twice or thrice the size it is, the purposes for which it is required, the objects which it is intended to carry out, are so immeasurably great, that the consideration of the mere sum of money that is lent, provided you have a fair security and a fair chance of repayment, is to be absolutely brushed aside, and the work carried to completion irrespective of cost. I have sufficient faith in this country to say that, and I sincerely hope that every man in this House has the same faith. If the conditions surrounding the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in 1903 warranted this government in going to the country with that as the main plank of their platform—in saying, we as a party are committed to this project, and we ask your endorsation because it is an absolute necessity—I wish to show by a few statistics that it is much more necessary in 1908. Since 1902-3 the Department of the Interior has expended on immigration $6,823,744. We know that as a result there has been a great influx of people into the country. Nearly 200,000 homesteads have been granted since 1903; the population of Canada has increased by over 1,000,000 since 1903; the total trade of Canada is $178,000,000 greater than it was in 1903; the revenue of Canada is $30,000,000 greater than it was in 1903, the receipts from sales of Dominion lands are nearly $500,000 greater than they were in 1903; the receipts from the sale of school lands are nearly $500,000 greater than they were in 1903; the Hudson Bay Company has sold nearly 1,000,000 acres of land for the sum of $6,500,000 since 1903; and Canadian railways have sold nearly 10,000,000 acres of land for the sum of $45,800,000 since 1903. These are a few of the evidences of growth which are submitted as sufficient justification for this resolution. Then, let me give the House the following figures of the production of crops in 1903 and 1908, respectively:

Manitoba.

		1903.	1908.
Wheat	Bush.	40,116,878	50,269,000
Oats	"	33,035,774	44,711,000
Barley	"	8,707,252	17,093,000
Totals	"	81,859,904	112,073,000

Saskatchewan.

Wheat	Bush.	15,121,015	34,742,000
Oats	"	9,164,007	29,205,000
Barley	"	665,593	1,952,000
Totals	"	24,950,615	65,899,000

Alberta.

Wheat	Bush.	1,200,259	6,842,000
Oats	"	5,187,511	22,802,000
Barley	"	1,077,274	3,881,000
Totals	"	7,465,383	33,525,000

The total production of these crops for the three provinces amounted to 114,275,902 bushels in 1903 and 211,497,000 bushels in 1908, an increase of 97,221,098 bushels. Then, let us take what to my mind is an extremely important consideration. I do not attempt to put forth the argument that because our population has increased since 1903 all the increase must necessarily have gone to the west; but I wish to show the number of homesteads that have been taken up in the west since 1903:

1902-3	31,383
1903-4	26,073
1904-5	30,819
1905-6	41,869
1906-7	21,647
1907-8	30,424
Total homesteads since 1903.	182,215

As indicating the increase in population, the following have arrived in the country since 1902-3:

1902-3	128,364
1903-4	130,331
1904-5	146,266
1905-6	124,667
1906-7 (9 months)	124,667
1907-8	262,469
1908-9 (11 months)	130,444
Total since 1903	1,111,605

That only goes to show that even supposing they all did not go to the west, those people have come to this country and the majority of them have stayed here, and it is absolutely necessary that easy methods of transportation, of moving to and fro, must be supplied or these new comers will not remain in the country. As regards our total trade in 1903, it was as follows:

Imports	$241,214,961
Exports	233,790,516
Total	$475,005,477

Our total trade in 1908 was as follows:

Imports	$370,786,525
Exports	280,006,606
Total	$650,793,131

Or our total trade in 1908 exceeded that of 1903 by $175,787,650. Our revenue for 1908 was $96,000,000, as against $66,000,000 in 1903, and I wish to point this out that in 1903 the crops, although cut, could not be

harvested, and consequently lay on the ground and came to no good. But at the end of February, 1909, the crops in the hands of the farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta were as follows:

Wheat, 17,391,000 bush., or a percentage of 18·93
Oats, 44,425,016 bush., or a percentage of 45·93
Barley, 7,722,000 bush., or a percentage of 33·68

Could anything more than that set of figures emphasize the fact, that in so far as this country is concerned, transportation is an absolute necessity?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that grain was in the hands of the western farmers on that date in February, because there were not transportation facilities to get it out?

Mr. PARDEE. Very largely.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The hon. gentleman is absolutely mistaken.

Mr. PARDEE. Well, I am not in accord with my hon. friend. A very great portion of that amount would have been marketed had there been transportation facilities to carry it out. There is just one more set of figures I desire to give the House, and that is the acres under cultivation in the prairie provinces in 1903 as compared with 1908. In 1903 there were under cultivation 4,576,200 acres and in 1908, 10,000,000, or more than double. These figures show that although hon. gentlemen opposite argue, as the hon. the leader of the opposition has done, that this great national work was conceived in haste and carried out for political purposes, there is not one iota of evidence to substantiate that argument. Instead of being conceived in haste this enterprise was fully considered by the government and its pros and cons gone into on every side. How hon. gentlemen opposite can claim it has been made a political factor, is something I cannot understand. Why should it be a political factor, except in this sense that the people are willing to give credit to any government which will show sufficient courage to carry out a great national undertaking irrespective of the carping of a few? The people appreciate what the National Transcontinental Railway may accomplish, provided it be given a fair chance and not be hampered at the outset. Take that section which runs through the northern portion of Quebec and Ontario. Has any one so absolutely little faith, after what we know that northern country has produced, as to say that when the northern portion of the province of Quebec has been exploited, when it has a population which can develop its minerals and forests, when it has populous centres this railway will not be a benefit to the whole community? We can only test these matters by comparison. We know that a few years ago the little province of Ontario projected the railway known as the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway. What was the stand taken by the doubting Thomases of the opposition party in the Ontario House at that time? Did they approve of the work? Did they say go and develop this unknown country? Were they satisfied with the surveys? No, they said that the railway ought not to be built. But the government of that day, under the hon. Geo. W. Ross, had the courage and patriotism to build it. That railway, built for 250 miles, has cost the people of Ontario $15,000,000. But just consider what it has done for that northern country. It has opened up a mineral country the greatest in the known world. Is there any one who will say that the people of Ontario made an unwise expenditure when they built this road? Or will hon. gentlemen opposite be strong enough to say that they were wrong and that we were right? Probably the same coniditions prevail with regard to our National Transcontinental line. Take that line from Lake Abitibi right across to the eastern boundary of Manitoba, and what do you find?

We know, from the surveys that were made for the purpose of affording information to the Ontario government, that practically along the whole line that railway skirts a mineral ridge. Who can tell what that may contain? That great north country was not put there for nothing. It is found that, in so far as men have exploited it, it has yielded us more riches than any other portion of the country has yielded in the same time. Why should not the same thing take place here? This railway skirts the sixteen million acre belt of clay that is as good land as lies out of doors. And, if you take this land even as worth only $1 an acre, in its raw state and without any of the advantages of civilization, are you not well repaid? But there is one thing we have not taken into consideration in regard to this line and in regard to that portion of the country through which it runs from Abitibi to the eastern boundary of Manitoba, and that is that along that line there are pulpwood forests estimated to contain 300,000,000 cords of wood. Take that even at the low rate of $2 a cord, and how much have you done to open up a vast field of profit for the whole Dominion and especially for the province of Ontario? So, I submit, as I said in starting, you must not consider one portion of this line alone, but must remember that every portion is indissolubly linked with the others, that the work is in every sense a national undertaking and benefits one portion of Canada as much as another. Even if you take the line in the older portions of Ontario and Quebec, you find that it opens up trade, that is

bound to go to manufacturing centres and must inure to the great benefit of the manufacturers of the whole Dominion. So, with the figures we have showing the tremendous increase in every way that has taken place in the Dominion of Canada, the government of the Dominion was absolutely justified in projecting the National Transcontinental Railway; they are justified in every possible way in giving it such aid as is necessary for its completion. They are not only justified on the figures, but they have received two absolute mandates from the people of Canada, which they are bound to carry out.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CEDARS RAPIDS MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 94) respecting the Cedars Rapids Manufacturing Company.—Mr. Boyer.

On section 1:

Mr. PUGSLEY moved that the word 'fourteen' be struck out and the word 'eleven' substituted, so as to make the extension to 1911 instead of to 1914.

Motion agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

KOOTENAY AND ARROWHEAD RAILWAY COMPANY

House in committee on Bill (No. 80) respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—Mr. Geo. Taylor.

Mr. GOODEVE moved that section 1 be omitted and the following be substituted therefor:

The Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company shall, within two years after the passing of this Act, construct 15 per cent of the mileage of the unconstructed portion of the railways which it was authorized by section 7, of chapter 70, of the statutes of 1901, to construct and shall complete the said railways and put them in operation within five years, and if the said fifteen per cent of mileage is not so constructed, and if the said railways are not so completed and put in operation within the said periods respectively, the powers of construction conferred upon the said company by parliament shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said railways as then remain uncompleted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the difference between the amendment and the section in the Bill?

Mr. GOODEVE. This amendment is the usual clause adopted by the Railway Committee, but instead of putting 15 per cent of the capital it inserts 15 per cent of the mileage. The reason for that in this particular Bill is that a portion of the road has already been constructed.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC LOAN.

House resumed consideration of the proposed resolution of Mr. Fielding with respect to a certain loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. PARDEE. When the House rose I was endeavouring to point out the great resources of the northern portions of Ontario and Quebec and to show by figures that there were such resources there as would warrant any railway company being projected through that portion of the country and I pointed out further that owing to the fact of the Temiskaming & Northern Ontario Railway having been built great mineral resources had been opened up and that it was impossible to predict whether that with the construction of the National Transcontinental Railway through the northern portions of these two provinces many Cobalts and many Gowgandas would not be discovered.

If this should be so, and no one can deny the fact, surely this country could not have been placed there for no possible good whatever, surely there must be mineral resources hidden in other portions of it, and if these mineral resources are hidden they ought to come out. They will only come out when a railway is put through there, because, as we know, civilization follows the railway and we have to-day, as hon. members of this House are aware, in the Railway Committee, a Bill in which a charter is asked for a railway from a place called Ville Marie, on the border between Ontario and Quebec, northward to connect with the Grand Trunk Pacific. It is only an evidence that people of these northern portions are opening up that country and are willing to go on and invest their capital to build railways and there is no reason why, if that portion of the country turns out to be as highly mineralized as other portions have been found to be there should not be as many railways as there are in the older portions of Ontario and Quebec. These are things that we have to look at. We have to take into consideration the resources of the country and we have to take into consideration the opening up and laying bare of these resources. I just wish

to say, along these lines, in recalling a precedent in this country of some years ago, undoubtedly within the recollection of many hon. members sitting in this House, that the Canadian Pacific Railway was projected by a corporation which is now perhaps the greatest corporation in the civilized world. It had its conception and birth in this House of Commons. At the time it was projected and at the time it was partially put through, what happened in so far as what was given to that railway was concerned? There was given to that railway $25,000,000 in cash and millions of acres of land. I have endeavoured to show by figures that in 1903 the resources and production of this country were vastly different from what they were in 1908. How much different were they when the Canadian Pacific Railway was first projected? Then it was that the west was absolutely or practically unknown; then it was that we knew not what we had west of Lake Superior; then it was that west of Lake Superior we had from 20,000 to 30,000 of a population, and then it was that in British Columbia we had a population of whites numbering about 10,000 souls. I pay this tribute to him when I say as a Canadian that Sir John Macdonald was the very personification of that Canadianism that was in him when he stood behind that project. Although it was objected to, not wisely objected to as we know by after events, he stood behind that project, he showed the faith that was in him and the Canadian Pacific Railway has gone on until it has become the very greatest corporation on earth. I say to this country and to the House of Commons, that there is no reason why, with the development that is taking place in that western country and in those portions of the Dominion that have not yet been exploited, the Grand Trunk Pacific should not be just as great a corporation and should not enure just as much to the benefit of Canadians as the Canadian Pacific Railway. That, to my mind, is the way that this project should be looked at. Twenty-five millions in cash and millions of acres of land were given to that great corporation. The Canadian Pacific Railway started and the Canadian Pacific Railway met the same fate as every enormous undertaking must and will meet, I venture to say, for many years to come; aye, practically for all time to come. Estimates were made, estimates were brought down, work went on but the estimates were not complete and what happened?—simply what is happening to-day in the case of the National Transcontinental Railway, although not to such a great extent. The Canadian Pacific Railway found that obstacles, arose; that their estimates had not been sufficient; that they could not complete their work without aid from the Dominion of Canada and they came to this parliament and asked for a loan of $30,000,000. That was in 1885, and again I say the conditions then, proportionately speaking, were absolutely not to be compared with the conditions that at present exist and have existed for some years past in the Dominion of Canada. Yet, there was no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House that did not rise in his place and say that in so far as that $30,000,000 loan went it should absolutely be given to that railway for the purpose of carrying it to completion. They gave good and cogent reasons for it. They said that the $30,000,000 should be granted, and the $30,000,000 was granted with the result that the great Canadian Pacific Railway was completed and it stands to-day a monument to Canada. What did Sir Charles Tupper, a gentleman whom hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House revere and honour, have to say in so far as the Canadian Pacific loan of $30,000,000 was concerned? Speaking in 1884, as reported in 'Hansard' of that year, vol. 1, page 105, he made these remarks:

> But while they do not ask the House to give them a single additional dollar, they ask us to use the credit of this country, to obtain the means of accomplishing this great national work by the end of 1885, and that without imposing the slightest shadow of a shade of additional burden upon the government, or upon the country for the repayment of every dollar by the time the contract was to be completed, 1st May, 1891. I say that this is the position in which they are—honourable gentlemen opposite will not controvert the soundness of that position, we should not hesitate a single moment in giving that measure our support.

That is what Sir Charles Tupper said. Then let us see what was said by an hon. gentleman who now sits in this House and who represents the constituency of North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and let me say that the conditions are absolutely on all fours to-day with those which existed in 1884. As reported in 'Hansard,' vol. 1, 1884, page 242, that hon. gentleman said:

> Let us suppose that the hon. gentleman who sits in his seat before me, smiling so complacently, should engage a contractor to build his house, that the contractor had started upon the house, that he had made his plans and calculations for raising money, but found when the house was three-fourths completed, that his plans had some how or other not turned out as he anticipated—suppose he came to the hon. gentleman and said, Sir, you see the amount of material I have, the amount of property I possess, I want an advance of money from you, of a loan of so many thousand dollars. I have property good and realizable to the extent of five times the amount, and, if you will give me that loan, I will finish the contract in two months instead of eight, and I will pay you a percentage on your money as large as you can get elsewhere—would the hon. gentleman be justified in stating to his neighbour that this contrac-

tor was down on his knees before him asking for money? I think not, and I take it that this is an exactly similar or nearly similar case in point.

There we are. We are asked here, as I submit, for a loan on sufficient security. The policy of the government was submitted to the people, the people said build the road as quickly as possible, and, in order to carry out that mandate, this loan is being asked for. The cases are identical. Then again what did the hon. member for North Toronto say, as reported at page 243 of 'Hansard,' 1884, vol. 1:

What he meant to say was this, that the Conservative party in this railway policy had a record which had gone before the country, and that record should not be falsified by their not carrying out, to the very letter, the idea with which they started, and with which they went before the people. What was that policy? The policy of the Liberal Conservative party has been: a railway—a railway on Canadian territory—a railway completed just as quickly as it possibly can be completed.

Again I say the cases are absolutely on all fours, and we are simply, if it can be put in that way, proving our case out of the hon. gentleman's own mouth.

Mr. GEO TAYLOR. Would the hon gentleman kindly read what his leader said in reply?

Mr. PARDEE. I am not particularly anxious about that. The hon gentleman had better take his medicine as it comes ; it will do him good.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I was in the House then and I took my medicine.

Mr. PARDEE. That is all right; you are an ornament to the House; you voted for the $30,000,000.

Mr GEORGE TAYLOR. And your leader voted against it.

Mr. PARDEE. Further on the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said:

I say we have an honourable and honest right to state that the Conservative party has a policy and a record in this respect, a policy in favour of building this Transcontinental Railway as soon as it possibly can be built, and that the Conservative party by the vast majority by which it was returned in 1882 has been sent here commissioned to carry out that idea, and that they would fail in their duty to this House and to the people who sent them here by such a majority, if they did not carry out that idea with all the speed and promptness compatible with safety and security.

Let me quote further from his remarks along the same line because I think they are worthy of being known to the House at this juncture. Speaking of the fact that the proposed legislation to give a loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway had been before the country for a month or so, the hon. member for North Toronto said: ('Hansard' page 243, 1884):

For nearly two weeks that idea has been before the country.

So has this idea been before the country and for more than two weeks.

For nearly two weeks that idea has been before the country,—and yet I challenge the hon. gentleman to point to the record of a single public meeting which has been called to protest against the proposed action of this government. I say that is proof conclusive that the public mind has settled down to acquiescence in these proposals. Before his argument can have a feather's weight with the country or this House, the hon. gentleman will have to get up an agitation outside the party press, and show a spontaneous uprising of the people here and there throughout the country in protest against these terms.

And this resolution which to-day has been introduced by the Minister of Finance has been before the country for many days, the terms of it have been perfectly well known, there has been no uprising by the people in any section of the country against it; on the contrary there has been acquiescence in this proposal because the people think to-day as they did on the 26th day of October last when they gave a mandate to the government to carry the Grand Trunk Pacific to completion. Again, speaking at page 247 'Hansard,' the hon. member for North Toronto said :

Then there was a hostile spirit. It was expressed in what way? It was exhibited by hostile combinations of rival roads in the great stock markets of the world. It was shown in hostile articles which were written from this country to American papers, and in telegrams sent from this country to American papers, and in cablegrams sent to the old country. In these and a hundred different ways, the fact is as clear as the sun at noonday that there were hostile combinations, that there was hostility both at home and abroad, and that this hostility must have had, and did have, an effect on the securities and assets of the company. Sir, is the second contention a reasonable one—that there was a shrinkage of values generally throughout the country, and a demoralization and fall in the value of stocks. Looking at these points, I say it is a reasonable contention on the part of the company that they were prevented from realizing many of these assets by the demoralization of the stock market, and shrinkage of values.

Sir, the argument advanced by the member for Toronto then is equally applicable to the conditions to-day. Who will deny that during the past year there has not been shrinkage of values; who will deny there has not been a falling off in the values of stock; who will deny that the English market is not glutted with securities, and who will deny, say, that many hostile influences have not been exercised against the Grand Trunk Pacific. These are things that should be and must be

taken into consideration, and I believe the people will weigh them carefully and endorse the policy of the government as now presented to parliament. Exactly the same arguments can be advanced in favour of this ten million loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific as our Conservative friends advanced in support of the thirty million dollar loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and further, Canada is to-day a thousand-fold better able to stand a ten million dollar loan than in those other days she was able to afford a thirty million dollar loan. In view of all this there ought to be no hesitancy whatever on the part of members on both sides of the House in declaring: Here is a great national undertaking; here is an undertaking which, if we are to take the precedent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is bound to enure to the benefit of the whole people of Canada; let us carry it to completion, let us crown this great undertaking with success. In view of the surprising growth and the great prosperity of this country there ought to be no caviling at the proposition which the government makes. Here is Canada on the northern half of the North American continent with 50,000 more square miles of territory than the United States possesses, with an energetic and industrious people and a fertile soil, and why need we fear? One hundred years ago the United States of America had about the same population and about the same per capita indebtedness as we have to-day. They had faith in their country; they kept pace with the march of events, and to-day the United States has a population of 80,000,000 and is one of the richest countries on the face of the earth. The people of the United States had faith in their future, and Sir, if we have confidence in our destiny I have not the slightest doubt but that long before the century closes Canada will have 80,000,000 people tilling her fertile soil and developing her unlimited resources. We Canadians are a hardy race, we are a vigorous, intellectual people, why should we fear comparison with the people to the south. I say in all sincerity and earnestness that in our broad Dominion we have everything which is calculated to contribute to greatness in a nation, and why then should we retard our progress, why hang back when every interest calls on us to take a leading rank amongst the greatest nations of the world. Is a paltry ten million dollars distributed over the whole Dominion of Canada to make us wince?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. PARDEE. Hon. gentlemen opposite may jeer if they wish, but in a few short years their minds will expand and they will then realize the fallacy of their policy of to-day. The west calls for development; the west demands that the men of the east should have confidence in its future, and this government is ready to respond to that demand. Not so long since I heard an hon. gentleman who is now sitting not far from me, say that Canada had pushed herself forward into the front rank of nations, that never had a country a better stage setting than ours, that we were actors upon that stage, and that our country called on us to play our part well. And if we lift the curtain of the stage on which we are playing we can see the illimitable resources we have in this country, and to what large extent their development depends upon the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

You start in the province of New Brunswick; you come up through those magnificent stretches of northern Quebec which may hold untold millions; you go through the northern portion of the province of Ontario, half way to James bay, where you bring into mercantile use those marvellous resources with which Ontario is known to be endowed; you go on to the great province of Manitoba and through to the wheat and cattle country of the western provinces, and on into British Columbia with its magnificent timber, minerals and fisheries. There you have an all-British railway from coast to coast, opening up perhaps things we know not of; and if we show the people of the old world just what we have in the way of rich resources, we may be sure that millions will teem to our shores. Then we shall in very truth be a nation. But I wish to say this, and say it emphatically, that if we would populate this country with millions, we must show to the world at large that we are fit to be nation builders by carrying on great national works such as the one under consideration to-night.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, as I intend to take a somewhat different line from that followed by the hon. gentleman who has just preceded me, I will not take up his argument other than to compliment him on the vigour of his speech and the patriotism of it in some respects. But I wish for a few moments to call the attention of the House to one or two important thoughts that have come to me in connection with this proposition. In the first place, after having listened to the able statement of the hon. leader of the opposition this afternoon, I am forced to the conclusion that his speech leads to a declaration in favour of public ownership; for he showed that this country is committed to nine-tenths of what the Grand Trunk Pacific will cost, the other one-tenth being supplied by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, or its ally, the old Grand Trunk Railway Company. If that is the case, and I believe it is, then I go further and say that the peo-

ple of this country would support a movement—and I believe it is the wish of the people of this country to-day—that Canada should take over the whole proposition and own it for the people of Canada. Otherwise, according to the confession of Mr. Hays in his letter, disaster awaits this great proposition. We also heard this afternoon that the great American republic was building the Panama canal as a public undertaking which it decided to do after long and careful consideration. The work was not even passed over to government contractors, but is being built by a government commission. So that it is essentially a national work, owned and controlled by the American people, and to-day it is the pride of the republic. I wish to speak from the point of view of the wider and broader outlook of the people of Canada referred to by the hon. gentleman who has just preceded me. The day has come for a greater national policy for this country, from the outlook of the great Canadian prairies, and still more from the outlook of that greater Canada on the Pacific coast known as British Columbia. I wish to see not only the prairie section finished—and it must be finished, we cannot halt now in the work—but the railway pushed on to the Pacific. The outcome of all this is that the only way to attain that and to secure Canada in her investment is to take over the proposition. If we do not do this now, I wish to tell this House and the people of Canada what their great danger is in regard to this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. It was pointed out this afternoon, as appears from the document laid on the table of the House by the Minister of Finance, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the parent company, to-day controls absolutely the Grand Trunk Pacific. That is a great fact which I wish this House and the people of this country to be seized of—that by the document laid on the table of this House to-day, and contrary to what we were told a few sessions ago would happen, the Grand Trunk Railway Company controls within a few shares the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. And who controls the Grand Trunk Railway Company? The capitalization of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, so far as the common stock is concerned, and perhaps all the control is in that common stock, is about $100,000,000; and this common stock is to-day being kicked about the London stock market by brokers and others, and is only held by a certain clique of men for purposes of manipulation and for the purpose of controlling the old Grand Trunk. I venture again to indulge in prophecy—and I am not a false prophet on the floor of this House, though I do have to say it myself: either the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern, when it becomes strong enough, will try to absorb the common stock of the Grand Trunk in the London market, and when it does this, it will control this great transcontinental system which we are now building. I do not wish to see that. Inasmuch as disaster is confessed by Mr. Hays in his letter, I would like to see Canada step in and save the situation and keep this great transcontinental road for itself; and I intend to move an amendment in that direction. My amendment may be out of order, because it may involve a money vote; but perhaps the Prime Minister will accept it, and in that way accomplish the public ownership of this great proposition. I would like to discuss some other questions in this connection, but I will do so later on. Inasmuch as the Grand Trunk Company is to-day a suppliant here, I hold that it ought to give certain concessions to the people in regard to freight and passenger rates; but I will reserve that for a later stage in this discussion. The point I wish to make to-night is that inasmuch as the control of the Grand Trunk Pacific is to-day in the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and inasmuch as the control of the Grand Trunk Railway Company is kicked about on the London Stock Exchange, there is no security for Canada in regard to her commitments in connection with this road; and that if we desire to have a great transcontinental road that will appeal to the Canadian west and to that newer and greater Canada on the Pacific, there is no way in which we can do that except by adopting the principle of public ownership; and my amendment, which I trust the Prime Minister will accept, is in this direction. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Russell——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals may jeer and laugh, but I know Mr. Russell, and there is no better citizen or a man more in touch with the people of Canada than Mr. Joe Russell of East Toronto. I beg to move in amendment:

That the said resolutions be amended by the addition of the following:—

And be it further resolved that in order to have still further security for its commitments, and to absolutely control and own a national transcontinental railway system, parliament is hereby authorized to purchase the controlling share of the Grand Trunk Company's common stock.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think this should be moved in committee.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. In that case it can stand. I want to give the Prime Minister the opportunity of considering whether he will accept it or not.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). I had no intention, Mr. Speaker, of taking part in this debate when it began, and my only reason for doing so now, is the extraordinary statement made by the hon. the

Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) this afternoon, in proposing this loan of $10,000,000, that Canada already had a first mortgage on the property of the Grand Trunk Pacific. When he made that statement I felt it was due to myself and this House to call attention to the danger we are under of making most extraordinary and improvident loans when a gentleman, occupying the responsible position of Minister of Finance is so little acquainted with the nature of the securities given in return as the hon. minister evidently appears to be. The honesty of the Minister of Finance nobody on this side questions and his sincerity in this matter I do not for a moment doubt, but this statement of his is only an additional proof of the extraordinary amount of misconception, misunderstanding, ignorance or something worse which has been developed from the mountains of information that the right hon. the Prime Minister promised us. From the inception of this scheme down to the present, it has been impossible to find any minister who appears to have had the faintest conception, when addressing this House, of the nature of the transaction he asked us to ratify. When the Bill was first introduced, the Prime Minister took occasion to criticise a remark of Mr. Andrew Carnegie, and gave as one of the reasons for building the road his desire to refute Mr. Carnegie's assertion that Canada was ice-bound because her harbours were sealed during five months of the year. That, said the right hon. gentleman, is not the case, that is not the difficulty, but the trouble is we have no railways to reach our harbours. Ordinary mortals were under the impression that we had a railway running to Halifax and to St. John, and that these were winter ports, yet the right hon. gentleman gave as a reason for our undertaking this extraordinary project, the alleged fact that we had no railways to our harbours in the winter season and that therefore we had to build a railway from the Pacific coast to the town of Moncton. No one had before heard Moncton described as a harbour. Shortly afterwards when we were discussing the various schemes for raising the money required, the then Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Fitzpatrick), one of the ablest men in Canada, pointed out that, in addition to the moneys required to be raised for ordinary purposes, we would have to borrow money for certain other things and among them the building of the telegraph system for the Grand Trunk Pacific. But one had only to turn over the page to see that the statute provides that in the list of expenditures, allowed as construction expenditure, was the building of telegraph lines, so that the minister's whole argument to justify the raising the large amount required dissolved into thin air. Without enumerating other instances—and many might be given—I am justified in saying this afternoon that when my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, told us that Canada has a first mortgage on the Grand Trunk Pacific as security for our guarantee of its bonds, we are justified in saying that there does not seem to be any great improvement, in one respect at least, in 1909 over the surprising state of affairs that existed on the opposite side in this House in 1903 and 1904.

I suppose there can be no difference of opinion as to what a first mortgage and a second mortgage mean. I take it for granted that every one understands the difference between the two. If one gentleman here had a first mortgage and another had a second on a piece of property and the property was insufficient in value to pay the two, there would be no doubt in the mind of the holder of the second mortgage as to the difference between his security and the other. In ordinary business transactions, a first mortgage has rights paramount to the second. Its holder is at liberty to sell out the property regardless of the interests of the second mortgage and is entitled to be paid a hundred cents on the dollar before the second mortgage can get anything. Is that the case with the security which the Grand Trunk gave the government? When the statute was passed in 1903, it was provided that a first mortgage should be given the government, and I take it for granted that the government received the first mortgage and the Grand Trunk Railway the second. I take it for granted that the government received a first mortgage for the 75 per cent it guaranteed and that the Grand Trunk Railway received a second mortgage for the 25 per cent which it guaranteed. But although that is what was done in 1903, that, and a good many other things, did not stand in 1904. When in 1903, in the debate on the agreement then submitted to the House, point after point was urged against it, which hon. gentlemen opposite were unable to answer, they sheltered themselves behind the statement that the agreement had been duly signed, sealed and delivered and consequently it could not be changed. That answer was taken by hon. gentlemen opposite as a justification for voting down every suggestion made from this side even when they had to admit that it was made in the public interest. But when another session came around, it turned out that although the people of this country were bound by the original agreement, the Grand Trunk Railway were not. They refused to accept this agreement so solemnly made and executed and came back and demanded its revision. And in compliance with their demand, the statute of 1904 was passed, entirely revolutionizing the position of both parties under the agreement of 1903. It would be well, therefore,

for hon. gentlemen opposite to further study the Act of 1904 and see how far the engagements made in the statute of the previous year were altered by it. The first change made in 1904 was a change providing that the government, instead of guaranteeing 75 per cent, were to guarantee sufficient bonds to realize 75 per cent. Then a change was made in the mountain section; and although we are only discussing the prairie section, it is necessary to refer to the change made in the mountain section, because by one clause of the Act, the mountain section is so incorporated with the prairie section as to make them for certain purposes one and the same. By clause 32 of the statute of 1903, the government was to pay the interest on the mountain section of the bonds to the extent of 75 per cent for seven years. The next three years the company was to pay the interest; but if it was unable, it could, at the end of the ten years, capitalize the interest and give bonds for the amount running over forty years. Then after this period of ten years the company was to begin to pay interest. When this Act was passed in 1903, the government had the first mortgage and the Grand Trunk Railway the second. But when we look to the Act of 1904, we find these extraordinary provisions:

Notwithstanding anything in the said contract contained, the government shall not exercise any rights in respect of possession, foreclosure, or sale by reason of non-payment of interest by the company under the thirty-first——

that is one that relates to the prairie section.

thirty-second——

that is one that relates to the mountain section.

or thirty-third——

that is one that deals with the bonds after the expiry of ten years.

paragraphs of the said contract or under all or any of them, unless and until there shall be such default to the extent in the whole sum equal to five years of such interest, as the company is not relieved from payment of or permitted to defer or capitalize by the provisions of the said paragraphs.

So, we find that, for the first seven years, they are not bound to pay the interest; for the next three years they can pay or capitalize as they choose; at the end of ten years, the payment of interest is to begin. But the government is not allowed to take a single step to enforce the payment of interest until after five years more have elapsed. So, here you have two mortgages, a first and a second. But the rights of the first mortgagee are held up for fifteen years, during which time he is absolutely helpless, while the second mortgagee has the right to exercise any powers he enjoys under his mortgage. Will any man tell me that if one person holds a first mortgage and another holds a second mortgage, and the one holding the the first mortgage has no standing for the enforcement of his claim until after the end of fifteen years while the second mortgagee can sue or put in a receiver, the first mortgage is better than the second? But that is not all, for, when the government can at last move, after the expiry of fifteen years, what can they do? Clause 7 provides for this. Let us see what they can do:

In case of such default being made by the company in respect of the interest of the said bonds so guaranteed by the government as would, under the provisions of the said contract as amended hereby, entitle the government to take possession of the said western division, or to foreclose or sell the same, the remedy of the government shall, notwithstanding anything in the said contract contained, be the taking possession thereof by and through an agent or manager to be appointed as hereinafter provided, whose powers and duties shall be to manage and operate the said western division, to receive all the tolls and revenues thereof, to pay thereout working expenses as defined by the Railway Act, 1903, including the expenses of such management or agency, and to distribute the surplus tolls and revenues, after payment of such working expenditures, pari passu between the government or other holders of the bonds secured as provided by paragraph 35 (a) of the said contract and guaranteed by the government and the holder of the bonds secured as provided by paragraph 35 (b) of the said contract and guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in the proportion of seventy-five per centum of such surplus tolls or revenues to the holders of the former issue of bonds and twenty-five per centum to the holders of the latter issue.

And though the government had guaranteed 75 per cent and the Grand Trunk 25 per cent, it has to wait fifteen years before it can claim this right of sharing pari passu with the other. Now, would any business man, except the Minister of Finance, ever dream for a moment of saying that that was, in fact or in law, a first mortgage? The holder of this so-called first mortgage is tied hand and foot, while not the slightest obstacle is placed in the way of the second mortgagee. So there is nothing to prevent the agent operating the Grand Trunk Pacific —and it would not be too much to assume that he would not be painfully hostile to the Grand Trunk—paying every dollar he could rake and scrape on the bonds guaranteed by the Grand Trunk. It may be that the Grand Trunk Pacific will have paid off seventy-five or ninety per cent of the bonds due to the Grand Trunk, then, when the receiver came in and paid these pari passu with those of the government, in a year or two all the Grand Trunk bondholders would have received all their money and the government bondholders practically nothing. Therefore, it is not accurate to say that the

government of Canada holds a first mortgage to secure the seventy-five per cent that we are bound here to guarantee.

A great deal has been said, and especially by the last speaker, concerning the loan made by this country to the Canadian Pacific Railway years ago, and an effort is made to withdraw a similitude between that case and this as proving the propriety of this transaction. Before I go into that to show the nature of the Canadian Pacific Railway transaction, let me show what the Grand Trunk Pacific offers to-day. It comes to this House and to the people of this country, through the government, and asks for a loan of $10,000,000. It does not ask this as a right. True, it is sometimes said that the faith of Canada is pledged to this contract, and where the faith of Canada is pledged we must make good—no man on the other side of the House will subscribe to that view more readily than I. But is the faith of Canada pledged? We know that the government not only declined to increase the amount, but they limited it to $13,000 on the prairie section and to a certain other amount on the mountain section. They have carried out their part of the contract. The Grand Trunk Pacific come now and ask for a loan of $10,000,000. On what security? They offer their own bond. From the statement placed in our hands by the Minister of Finance I gather that they have $5,200 altogether paid for stock. My hon. leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) said it was $200,000. But, looking at page 16 of the statement brought down by the Minister of Finance, taking this list of subscribers, the largest of them $400, and I make out that $5,200 in cash has been contributed by the owners of this great company to build a transcontinental line. With that cash capital at their back, the Grand Trunk Pacific comes and asks for a loan on their own bonds. But something more—they offer the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. As my leader pointed out, we heard a great deal five years ago about the marvellous advantage to this country of having the Grand Trunk in and over, through, under and around this great undertaking. And now it all comes down to this—that they will give their guarantee to back the guarantee of the road which, as I understand, has $5,200 of stock paid up. What is the position of the Grand Trunk? I see by the statement of the Minister of Finance that it has advanced $7,000,000 to this company. If the Grand Trunk has advanced $7,000,000 and we are to pay it back, consider the impudence of the Grand Trunk Pacific, egged on and led on by the Grand Trunk, asking us to advance $10,000,000 more, in order to give the Grand Trunk which owes us between $30,000,000 and $40,000,000, a return of this sum of $7,000,000. Is there any greater height of impudence than this? If the Grand Trunk ever had $7,000,000—and I hope I may be excused for being somewhat sceptical on that point—why does not the government take steps to collect some of this $30,000,000 or $40,000,000? Why not begin, for instance, by collecting the paltry $21,000 owed by the Grand Trunk in relation to a railway in my own riding to which I called attention a year or two ago? The government, knowing perfectly well that the Grand Trunk Railway improperly, dishonestly, obtained $21,000 of the money of the people of this country, in a position to sue and make them refund the money, sat there and did nothing. Even since the knowledge came to them that the Grand Trunk had $7,000,000 in its coffers to lend to other corporations the government have done nothing. What are we to expect of this government, if it should be in power a couple of years hence, if default is made on this $10,000,000. How can they be expected to collect $10,000,000 from their lord and master when they will not even collect $21,000? I do not know the facts, but I saw a statement in the press that the Canadian Pacific Railway had lent the government $5,000,000, that is that they had bought debentures to that amount. If that be true it is certainly extraordinary that our government, who we know have not $10,000,000 in their strong box, should go to the Canadian Pacific Railway and borrow $5,000,000 in order that they might give it to their old friend the Grand Trunk Railway.

As I said, comparisons have been drawn between the bargain made by a former government with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the bargain now proposed to be made by this government with the Grand Trunk Pacific. What did the old Conservative government get as security for their loan? They had a railway to which they had given an immense amount of constructed railroad costing some $30,000,000, they had given 25,000,000 acres of land, and $25,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway and a railway over 1,100 miles in length was in operation. The Canadian Pacific Railway came to the government and asked for a loan of $30,000,000. They offered—

> As security for the repayment of the said loan, with interest as aforesaid, and as additional security for the payment of the said sum of seven million three hundred and eighty thousand nine hundred and twelve dollars and interest falling due on the seventh day of November, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-eight, the government shall have a first lien and charge,——

that is what the Conservative government got in those days——

upon the entire property of the company, real and personal, now owned or hereafter to be acquired or owned by them,——

Every dollar's worth of property to be acquired by the expenditure of the $30,000,000 to be borrowed was to become the property of the government by way of security—

including their main line of railway, the extensions thereof, their branch lines of railway, the whole of their equipment, rolling stock and plant and all their steamers and vessels, and also upon the land grant of the company, earned and to be hereafter earned; saving always, however, the rights of the holders of the existing mortgages on the extensions of the line of the railway from Callander to Brockville and Montreal.

With these exceptions everything the Canadian Pacific Railway had and were thereafter to acquire would, if the country would put up the $25,000,000, be given as security to the government. But more than that let us turn to clause 8:

Until the payment in full of the indebtedness of the company to the government with interest, all moneys earned and to be earned by the company as postal subsidy and for transport service shall be retained by the government and shall be applied first on account of the interest to become due from time to time upon the indebtedness aforesaid hereby authorized, and then to the payment of the principal.

Thus it will be seen that at that time ample security was given by the Canadian Pacific Railway when it asked for a loan of $30,000,000.

An hon. MEMBER. And the directors gave security.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I have heard it stated that the directors gave a personal guarantee but I have no knowledge of that and do not wish to speak of anything which I cannot affirm with a fair degree of accuracy.

In view of this difference in the position of the two companies it seems to me that we ought to lay aside all this high fallutin' comparison between things that in no way resemble each other and try to get down to business. What is the use of telling us that the crops in the west require to be moved, that they are rotting on the ground, and will be lost if this railway is not completed very shortly, when we all know the reason for the non-completion of the railway before this time was that the government interfered and would not allow the Grand Trunk to build the road where they wished to! If there is to be any blame, if there has been any suffering, any loss to the country through the crops not being moved, let the supporters of the government lay the blame where it rightly rests, on the government who, when the Grand Trunk Railway Company applied for a charter to build from North Bay to the Pacific coast, compelled them to change the eastern terminus. I was rather amused when the last speaker, after quoting the Canadian Pacific Railway loan as a parallel instance and an unanswerable argument in favour of this loan, referred to the Temiskaming & Northern Ontario Railway which he claimed to be another parallel case. What are the facts in regard to the Temiskaming Railway? It is rather odd but the Temiskaming & Northern Ontario Railway starts from North Bay where the Grand Trunk wanted to start the Grand Trunk Pacific, and to have the cases parallel the Grand Trunk Pacific should have been built from North Bay on to the Pacific coast and should not have been diverted to Quebec.

Mr. TALBOT. Were they not relieved of that obligation to build from North Bay to Winnipeg?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Certainly, to their great regret and to the loss of the country, at the request of my hon. friends opposite. If the Ontario government had followed the plan of this administration in the construction of the Temiskaming & Northern Ontario Railway, they would have started to build it from Toronto. They would have built it through the constituencies at any cost. But no, they started to build from North Bay, going only where they had a reason for going. Had they any reason for going where they did? The last gentleman who spoke (Mr. Pardee) said that Mr. Ross never signed a contract until the surveys had been made. When the surveys had been made and the wealth of minerals and timber had become known to every member of the legislature, and with the full understanding that the objective point was James bay to give an outlet to Hudson bay, picking up enough timber and minerals in the intervening country to make the road pay, and after ample surveys, the government stepped in and constructed the road. No one can compare that with the hop, skip and jump course of this government in 1903. We all remember that we came here led by the advertisement in the 'Canada Gazette' to believe that we were to be asked to give assent to the construction of a road from North Bay to the Pacific ocean. When that application came before the committee, it was changed, at some one's request, to an application to build to Quebec. We all remember Sir Charles Rivers Wilson and Mr. Hays appearing before that committee with the government supporting them in the desire to build a great trunk line of railway from Quebec to Winnipeg,—and the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) was one of the most obstinate opponents of the original suggestion to build from North Bay to the west.

Mr. CONMEE. Does the hon. member now argue that it would have been better

in the interests of this country if that road was built from North Bay instead of where it is to be built?

Mr. NORTHRUP. My hon. friend has a perfect right to ask questions and I will answer him to this extent, that it is beyond all peradventure—and the application for $10,000,000 in addition to the indebtedness and liabilities we have incurred is a proof—that it would have been far better for this country if the government had held its hand and allowed the Grand Trunk to build the road as they wished, from North Bay through to the Pacific Coast, so that long ere this the crops would have been hauled out of the great Northwest over that road. If my hon. friend knew as he should have known, that all the government was asked to give was the ordinary bonus of perhaps some $13,000,000 or $14,000,000, and that in consideration thereof the Grand Trunk Pacific had offered to hand over every pound of freight from the west to the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal, then I think my hon. friend will admit it would have been better for the country had the project been accepted. The more closely we look into the comparison made by hon. gentlemen between this scheme and the Canadian Pacific Railway project, the more remote the two schemes seem to be from any resemblance or propinquity to one another. The Minister of Finance says that the government in this case is acting as a banker. If he means they are acting as the manager of a bank would act, I agree, but if he means as a banker in the sense of putting up the cash I would be inclined to say that the railway is coming to the people of Canada and not to the government for this loan. This is a pure business proposition. It is impossible perhaps to discuss such a question entirely without party sentiment, but I regret that that is the case if it is the case, as this is an important national question, and we ought at least to try to discuss it on its merits.

If any hon. gentleman opposite really believes it is in the interest of the country, after weighing the facts and arguments, he has a perfect right to support the resolution. But if, on the other hand, any hon. member of this House, I care not on which side he sits, honestly believes that it is not a business proposition—and that is the ground upon which the hon. Finance Minister laid it down before the House— if any hon. gentleman opposite says that this is not such a proposition as a banker should accept, then, I do not think he is doing his duty to himself, and he is certainly not doing his duty to this country, if he votes for that loan believing it to be wrong. Supposing now that we were to put ourselves in the position of bankers for a moment—and it would be rather a pleasant supposition for each of us to think of a needy mendicant coming to us and asking for a loan of

$10,000,000—let us see what inquiries we would make before we advanced this amount of money. Supposing the railways came to the people of Canada and asked for a loan of $10,000,000; would it be untrue if the people said: 'We are very sorry but we have not $10,000,000 to loan?' It is customary for bankers, when they have not the money, to go out and borrow it at a higher rate of interest to loan it to another man? Is that the custom? If this is a Conservative attack on a government scheme, I would ask calmly, is that the custom of bankers and would bankers say that it is good business? If a person came with ample security and said that he wished to borrow $10,000,000, if the bank had not $10,000,000 and if the banker had been trying to borrow many millions of dollars in the past year and was only able to borrow forty per cent of what he wanted in the markets of the world, does it strike any one as a business proposition that the banker would entertain any such project? We will suppose that the banker was good natured and, like some other bankers, wished to do business regardless of whether the business was profitable or not, and he undertook to raise $10,000,000 and to lend it to you at four per cent; would that be considered a business transaction? What is your security? First the security of the Grand Trunk Pacific and then the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway Company which owes the country millions and millions of dollars, which has not paid a cent which it does not have to, and which has not paid its preference bonds. Would not Miss Canada be apt to say to the members of the government who have been introducing this deputation: 'You have been here before with these same gentlemen; I will just look up my notebook and see what you told me upon the other occasions when you were here and see if you knew then what you were talking about.' Supposing that Miss Canada turned up 'Hansard' and saw what these gentlemen had told her when they came to her in 1903. Every supporter of the government must believe that if Miss Canada were acting intelligently, if she knew nothing about this transaction except that the members of the government had come and asked for a loan, and if she wanted to see what was their business capacity she would say to them: 'We will see how your promises in the past have been fulfilled.' It is only fair to say that the fulfilment of these promises would justify their loan. Miss Canada would say: 'It is true you gave us a lot of promises in 1903, but I will look at the statute-book and see what I have of them there.' She looks at the statute-book and finds that what was pledged to Canada in the form of contracts and in other ways was, in 1904, blotted out of the statute-book of Canada. Would not Miss Canada be likely to receive with suspicion a proposition from gentlemen who came so

accredited? But the Minister of Finance, in laying that proposition before her says: 'Oh, Miss Canada, you should not be afraid of us; look carefully into the section and you will see that you have your first mortgage on this great system of railway.' And then, when Miss Canada looked in and saw that she did not have a first mortgage, that she had not a first class mortgage, that she did not have a mortgage that any lawyer in Canada would take for any client, except the Laurier government, would she not be justified in declining with thanks to enter into such a bargain? But then, the Minister of Finance may say that they have a statement showing the large amount of money that has been spent by this virtuous corporation. They show that $8,000,000 has been put into rolling stock. Would it strike Miss Canada as being any certificate of business integrity, of business ability on the part of this insolvent corporation, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, which seeks to borrow $10,000,000, that it had put $8,000,000 into rolling stock for a road that had not been opened? Does it strike one as a business transaction? When we find that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, which has no money, which is getting all it can get out of the Grand Trunk, has spent $8,000,000 on rolling stock and loaned that rolling stock to the Grand Trunk Railway Company at 4 per cent, when we remember that the lifetime of rolling stock would not at the most be more than fifteen or twenty years, and when we find this insolvent corporation paying its debt back to its friends the rich no less poor corporation in this way, we can judge whether it is a transaction that would appeal to any business man in this country. Do you think Miss Canada would be inclined to treat with such a company as that? Miss Canada might well say: 'I wonder if everything has been honest and square about this road from the beginning to the end? You gentlemen are coming here for $10,000,000, and it is a case of your honesty or nothing.' This corporation is honest or dishonest. It is not for me to say which. No honest man objects to letting his books be looked at. No honest man who wants to borrow money is ashamed to show where the money that he has already borrowed went.

Will the right hon. Prime Minister say that the Grand Trunk Pacific are so secure in their honesty, so proud of their expenditure that they are willing to allow their books to be looked into? Many hon. gentlemen in this House remember that when we took evidence before the Public Accounts Committee we found that it cost a Grand Trunk official thousands of dollars to come from Montreal to Ottawa although he travelled in his private car and probably lunched at the Rideau club and paid his bill at the end of the month? We remember how thousands were paid to lawyers in the city of Ottawa, we remember how $150,000 were spent before the charter was granted and although the evidence before the committee showed that the Grand Trunk had charged this amount against the Grand Trunk Pacific, and that when they were asked for the vouchers they preferred to allow such items as $30,000 or $35,000 to go by the board rather than show the vouchers in reference to them. In addition we remember the fact that supporters of the government refused to allow gentlemen on this side of the House to probe these accounts in order to find where this $150,000 went. If any men or any company were to come and ask for a loan and knowing that they had made charges in their books, that they had rendered their accounts, that these had been submitted to an auditor and that when the auditor had asked for vouchers they had voluntarily withdrawn thousands and thousands of dollars rather than show their vouchers. I would like to ask the Premier himself if he would not insist upon a proper audit of their books before he advanced any money? We have had rumours throughout the country. My attention has just been called to the fact that after they had withdrawn the vouchers the evidence before the Public Accounts Committee showed that they had carefully burned them. At all events, these vouchers were recalled, the Grand Trunk Pacific were willing to forego the payment of their accounts, the vouchers were destroyed by the order of an officer of the company and when the Public Accounts Committee tried to secure the presence of an officer of the Grand Trunk Railway Company who could have told us about these matters he started for the Mediterranean on the first train and the man they sent up knew nothing at all about them. I think that the right hon. gentleman, if he himself were aware of such facts, would be inclined to be sceptical about advancing any more money if it is a business transaction as the Finance Minister says it is, and we are looking at it as bankers and asking ourselves if we can in justice to the country make such a loan. There have been rumours in the country and there has been evidence given in the Public Accounts and other committees which would lead people to think that neither on the government division nor on the western division has the road been economically constructed. Is there a single man in this House that believes that the building of a prairie road would cost $36,000 a mile. Why, Mr. Hays ought to be flayed alive; the government ought certainly to discipline him for daring to taunt them as he did when he writes about the

improved character of the road, when we remember that the justification given by the government originally for the high estimate of cost was that they were going to build a road equal to the Grand Trunk between Montreal and Toronto which is universally admitted to be one of the finest pieces of railroad on the American continent. There cannot be any improvement on the character of the road which was guaranteed when the original money was advanced, and therefore I call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that Charles M. Hays when he gives that as a reason is telling something he knows is not true, just as well as he knows of the burning of the vouchers and the refusal to show the accounts.

There is another feature in this: The Grand Trunk is mainly owned, I believe, in the old country. I am sorry, and every Canadian must be sorry, that the investment of the original Grand Trunk shareholders has turned out so badly. But does the government think it has any right to run the risk of making the position of the shareholders more desperate than it is, by lending money to a company that has so thrown away money in construction that when it comes to begin operations there will be such a burden of interest that the rates they will have to charge for transportation of freight and passengers will put them out of business in competition with other better managed railroads? Will not the last end of the English investors be worse than the first? Could anything be more calculated to injure the credit of Canada in the old country than to have our government hand and glove with a corporation that has not kept its word, that is so grasping that it wants everything in sight, that is so determined to make something out of nothing that without having put up anything themselves, they have walked off with twenty-five million dollars of the common stock of this railway? That stock is worth something or it is worth nothing; if it is worth nothing what are we to think of these gentlemen who perpetrate what I might call petty larceny in taking a worthless stock, and, if it is worth something, why should not the country have control of it in view of this advance of ten million dollars. It has been said that this road has gone so far that it must be completed. What has that got to do with the question now before the House. Here is a railroad which made certain promises in 1903 and which broke these promises one after another in 1904, and we paid the bill. Here is a road that made certain other promises in 1904 and which has been breaking them religiously, consistently, and persistently ever since, and which now comes and asks for ten million dollars, the first of probably half a dozen more ten millions for all we can tell. What guarantee can we have that a corporation that has deceived us every time up to date is suddenly going to reform and lead another and a better, and to us, a more satisfactory life. It seems to me, Sir, that after all the proposition is a simple one. We on this side of the House wish to preserve the credit of Canada, to do everything that is proper to attain that end, but when an insolvent company comes to us and says: 'If you don't advance us ten million dollars the work will fail,' I would answer: 'Are you the only company in the world; are you the only people who can build a railway; are we absolutely dependent on the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk that we must put our necks under their heels and let them crush us into the ground? No, if you cannot build it somebody else can.' Sir, there is nobody in this country so poor or so simple or so ignorant that if you give him one hundred per cent of the cost of a railway he cannot build that railway. And when you think of a company which has been given one hundred per cent of the cost of construction, and then think of its magnates cooly and deliberately buying the town sites all along the line at $3 per acre, and when you think of them holding up municipality after municipality and saying they won't put their yards or their tracks here or there until blackmail is paid, when you find all this on top of the 100 per cent of the cost of the road we have given to them, are we to be blamed if we are a little suspicious of the honesty or the business capacity of the company that in face of all that comes and asks us as a first instalment for ten million dollars more?

Now, Sir, if on the prairie section, which every one will admit should be enormously less expensive than the mountain section, calculations were so far astray that they were ten million dollars out, who will dare to say they can build the mountain section for the sum they promised. Is it not a moral certainty that this is but the beginning of the end; is it not certain that this government will find they have an old man of the sea on their shoulders who every year will be here kicking for another ten millions or twenty millions? Why the day may not be far distant when we shall be thankful that the Grand Trunk Pacific will let us off for ten millions a year when they reach the mountain section. If that is to be, why should we not as a business transaction apart from all sentimental feeling, say to this company: 'There are other companies that can build this road; you have

had the grandest opportunity any company ever had in this world, first to build the road and next to make a fortune for everybody in connection with it; you failed utterly in the first, though rumour says you succeeded admirably in the second, after all the advantages you have had.' Then, would it not be the common sense view, would it not be the view of the man who has confidence in Canada and Canadians to say: 'If you, mainly foreigners. have fallen down, we have have good native Canadians who have the brains and the brawn to build that road and we will see it is built whether the Grand Trunk Pacific Company turns another sod or not.'

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of attention to the speeches delivered by the leader of the opposition and by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), but I have failed to discover whether these gentlemen are in favour of this loan or opposed to it. The fact is, Sir, that the interests of all Canada and the interests of western Canada in particular demand that this loan shall be granted by the government to the Grand Trunk Pacific in order, if possible, to complete the prairie section from Winnipeg to Wolf creek before the end of the present year. The transportation problem is the most important we have to deal with in Canada to-day, and it is of supreme importance to the west. There are settlers in that country cultivating land who live as far as 100 miles from a railway, and these men for whom we should have consideration cannot possibly make the profit out of their industry which they should. The hon. member for East Hastings stated that there have been some discreditable disclosures before the Public Accounts Committee, and although I was not here last year I presume that statement is on a par with the statements made throughout the length and breadth of Canada by hon. gentlemen opposite during the last campaign. I presume it is about as true as the statement of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) who went throughout the country telling what was absolutely untrue with regard to our western timber lands, and carrying with him his little magic lantern, taking upon himself to teach the people of the west what they should do with respect to their resources. If I remember correctly, the hon. leader of the opposition made a statement that the building of this road had been conceived in haste. I want to say that the people of western Canada are of the opinion that the building of the road was not conceived hastily enough. We think it ought to have been conceived three or four years sooner than it was; and if hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to inquire in western Canada, to read the papers there, and even to read 'Hansard' of those days, they will find that the opinion was unanimously expressed throughout that country that there was absolute need for another transcontinental railway. I have here copies of two or three resolutions which were passed in western Canada in the years 1901, 1902, and 1903; and I want to call the attention of this House to these resolutions to show the incorrectness of the statement of he hon. leader of the opposition, that the building of this road had been conceived in haste. The 'Regina Leader' in 1903 said:

> For many weeks past first one merchant and then another has in vigorous language, drawn the attention of the 'Leader' to the fact that the condition of railway traffic in the west is continually getting worse. The situation last year was bad enough, when for days and sometimes weeks, merchants were completely out of certain lines of goods because the railway could not get them in. This year it was infinitely worse, for many business houses have been completely sold out of certain lines for weeks and months, notwithstanding the fact that their orders were placed in plenty of time and the goods promptly shipped by wholesalers in the east.

If that was the condition of affairs in 1902, it was equally so in 1903; and I speak from personal knowledge when I say that it was equally so during the years that succeeded. The legislature of the Northwest Territories in the fall of 1902 passed the following resolution, which I believe was forwarded to the Governor in Council at Ottawa:

> The prospective increase in the volume of traffic, which largely increased cultivation and settlement of lands in these territories will gradually create, will further tend to congest traffic between these territories and the provinces to the east, and unless it is held desirable to divert part of the traffic through foreign channels, adequate facilities for transportation must be immediately provided. That this assembly does therefore humbly pray that Your Excellency may be pleased to take such action as may be necessary or expedient to insure that the people of these territories are provided with an efficient transportation system as contemplated by the contract made between the people of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

With respect to the question whether or not cattle and grain produced on the western prairies were being diverted through American channels, I may say that I know of my own personal knowledge that cattle have been driven by farmers in Saskatchewan across the boundary line into the states of Montana and Dakota to be shipped on American trains; and thousands of bushels of wheat have been drawn during the past year by farmers in the southern portion of the province of Manitoba across the boundary and shipped by American

lines. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) informs me that 150,000 bushels of grain from the southern part of his own constituency were drawn across the boundary and shipped by American lines during the past year. I could give you other expressions of opinion in regard to the need of more railway facilities in the northwest prior to the time of the making of the contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific. Here is a statement made by Mr. Wm. Whyte, the present vice-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, made in 1903, when the Grand Trunk Pacific contract was under discussion:

There is lots of room for the Grand-Trunk Railway in the Northwest. I am glad to hear they are coming. You must remember that the Grand Trunk Railway is a national road and it is far better to have it than an American road. If the people of the east had any idea of the rapidity with which the country is settling out there, they would not be surprised to hear me say: 'There is room for the Grand Trunk Railway and others as well.' The conditions of affairs has completely changed even since a year ago. The traffic is not only abnormal east-bound but also west bound. It is this fact which has simply rendered it impossible to handle the crop with the despatch which was necessary.

I could give you statements to the same effect from other western papers. The Winnipeg 'Telegram' and the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' agreed that another transcontinental railway was necessary. In the face of these facts, I was somewhat surprised, as a resident of the western provinces, to read at that time statements by prominent members of the Conservative party in this House that they were absolutely opposed to a third continental railway project.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. If hon. gentlemen will permit me, I will quote from 'Hansard' statements made by prominent members of the Conservative party to that effect. I must say that it did occasion a good deal of surprise to residents of the vicinity in which I reside to find that there were men in the House of Commons so absolutely ignorant of western conditions as not to know that we were so hampered for the lack of transportation facilities that every farmer lost possibly an average of 10 cents a bushel on his grain because of that lack, as he is doing at the present time and will continue to do, so long as adequate transportation facilities are lacking.

Mr. WRIGHT. May I ask the hon. gentleman this question: when he speaks of farmers drawing their grain across the boundary, does he mean to give this House to understand that they will now draw it up to the Transcontinental Railway?

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. If my hon. friend knows anything about railway transportation in the western provinces, he knows that every railway built must necessarily relieve the tension that exists.

Mr. WRIGHT. I know that the building of the Transcontinental Railway will not cure the difficulty he refers to.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman will have plenty of time to reply in a few moments. I want to refer, for instance, to what was said by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who I am sorry is not in his seat at the present time. Referring to 'Hansard' of 1903, vol. 4, at page 8761, that hon. gentleman spoke as follows:

Let us examine for a short time the reasons they give to justify this undertaking. The first is the urgent need of the west for increased facilities to handle its grain. Now, this brings up the question whether such urgent need in the west exists to-day. Where is the urgent need for this new railway in the west, a need so urgent, as the Premier says, we cannot wait another day, another hour, we cannot put it off till to-morrow, we have not a moment to spare; and he expressed the hope that we had not waited too long already. Now this suggests the question, how are the products of that country handled to-day? Is there such urgent need at the present time? I do not think so. If we look into it carefully, I am sure we will not come to that conclusion.

That surely is a definite enough statement in opposition to the main project of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Another statement made by the same hon. gentleman, in the same volume of 'Hansard', at page 8770, was as follows:

I have said that the sentiment of the country, in Ontario at least, is against the subsidizing of railways largely in the future. Has the government had any mandate from the people to put through this project? No. I challenge the Prime Minister to-day to dissolve this House and go to the country upon this scheme. Dare he risk it? If he should do it, and if the people should return him to power, then he may carry out his scheme and I shall not offer any objection.

At page 8775 of the same volume, the same hon. gentleman denounced the project in the following very strong terms:

Let them ask themselves whether they will be justified in endorsing that undertaking, that baby policy, that monstrosity of politics, that has been launched upon the world in connection with this scheme. When the people of Canada have digested this policy properly I am quite sure what the result will be. Sir, once more I dare the government to dissolve this House and appeal to the country to-day. Dare they ask a mandate from the electorate for this heavy undertaking? They dare not do it, I challenge them to do it.

As far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned, the main issue discussed in the election campaign of 1904 was the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Did the

people endorse that scheme? There can be but one answer to that question. One of the main issues discussed by the people during the election campaign of 1908 was the Grand Trunk Pacific project. Did the people endorse it in 1908? I venture to say that there were two Liberal votes cast in that province endorsing the Grand Trunk Pacific for every vote cast against it.

Let me refer to what was said by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) in the session of 1903. I am quoting from 'Hansard,' page 8810. He said:

> Go where you will, and the preponderating voice, the overwhelming voice will be, when the scheme is fully understood, an absolute condemnation of this measure.

Well, since this statement was made, I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite speaking in western Canada on political subjects, and I never heard one of them condemn the Grand Trunk Pacific project. The reason is obvious. They knew they were in a country where the people were all in favour of building the road and recognized it as an absolute necessity. I challenge any Conservative member from the west in this House to say he is against the loan of $10,000,000 to pay for the completion of the prairie section. I challenge the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) to say that he is adverse to that loan for the completion of the prairie section of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I challenge any Conservative member from Manitoba to say that he is adverse to that loan. They dare not oppose it. There would not be a Conservative returned in Manitoba at the next election if they took that position.

I do not intend to take up any time of the House discussing the securities which are being obtained by the government from the Grand Trunk Pacific. The majority of members from the west have sufficient confidence in the growth of Canada in the next few years to believe that the Grand Trunk Pacific will be a huge success and be able to pay back all money borrowed by it from the government.

The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) drew some comparisons. He called the Grand Trunk Pacific an insolvent road, and contrasted the securities got from that road with those we got from the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, all the security which the Canadian Pacific Railway could give to this country was the land and the money and the six hundred miles of railway given to that company by the Conservative party. This government took certain precautions before deciding to grant this loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific. As appears by the papers laid on the table, a request was made for the loan by Mr. Chas. M. Hays on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific. At that particular time, Mr. Hays submitted a statement showing the actual cost of the western section and the amount of money put into it up to the present. The government took the trouble to have their own engineer, Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, go carefully over the figures and report as to whether this statement of Mr. Hays was correct or not. He reported that it was. As regards the security, I am content to leave that matter in the hands of the government. Any man who has any confidence in the growth of Canada cannot fail to admit that we are bound to grow to such an extent in the next few years, that the Grand Trunk Pacific cannot help but be a success and pay back any amount borrowed by it from the government to build the prairie section.

Look at the position which the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta occupy as contrasted with other grain producing countries. Every one admits that Canada is bound to become possibly the greatest wheat producing country in the world. One of our greatest competitors is the Argentine republic. How does the Argentine republic compare with Canada in the matter of transportation facilities? The republic has something like 240,000 square miles of area and 8,000 miles of railway. It is said that the average Argentina farmer is 10 miles distant from a railway. In Saskatchewan and Alberta, the total area is 300,000 square miles, and we have 2,800 miles of railway. And the average distance of the average farmer from the railway is much greater than 10 miles. It costs the average Argentina farmer two cents or three cents a bushel to get his grain to the initial shipping point and it costs the average farmer in Saskatchewan six cents or seven cents a bushel. It costs the Argentina farmer 16 or 17 cents a bushel to get his grain from the initial shipping point to the Liverpool markets, and it costs the Saskatchewan farmer 30 cents a bushel. How can the farmers of our country compete in the European market when they have to pay rates of that description? The only solution of the difficulties under which the producers of the west labour is to get railways into that country. Every railway must necessarily relieve a certain amount of traffic handling by other companies and assist more and more our farmers each year in getting their crops promptly to market and obtaining the best market prices.

One more point, and this is a matter which affects particularly the western grain producer. According to the best authorities I have been able to consult, one of the difficulties our farmers have to contend with, in shipping their grain, is the spread between the track price and the street price on the western wheat market. Take the markets in any locality, as soon as a farmer has his grain loaded on a car, he gets what is known as a track price.

But if he has to put his grain into an elevator, he gets the street price, and the difference between the two is something like 10 cents a bushel. Let me point to the evidence taken before the Grain Commission last year and Sir Richard Cartwright. You will find that the farmers who appeared before Sir Richard Cartwright said that in some instances they knew the spread to be as high as 30 cents a bushel. What is the cause of this spread. The late Mr. Drinkwater said it was the difficulty in getting cars.

If I wished to take the time I could read extracts from the statements made; but the consensus of opinion was that this difference in price, which is a total loss to the western farmer, was caused by the difficulty of getting cars. And railway men and elevator men went so far as to say: Give us cars and we will reduce the spread to three cents a bushel. Take a production of 100,000,000 bushels of grain, and suppose you save seven cents a bushel to the western farmer, you have there a saving of $7,000,000 per annum; save ten cents a bushel and you have a saving of $10,000,000. I do not mean to say that the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific will do away with all the difficulty, but I do say that the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the building of branch lines by the Grand Trunk Pacific and the other railways will alleviate the conditions to a very great extent.

I might go on and give reasons why I approve the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific through western Canada, and to point out many provisions in the contract which are decidedly in favour of the people of Canada and of the west in particular, when you compare them with those of the contract for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway with its iniquitous tax exemption on land, rolling stock and roadbed placed, as a burden, upon that western country by the late Conservative government. I do not intend to take up time to deal with these questions, but I may say a word with regard to what has been said concerning the Temiskaming & Northern Ontario Railway. I am informed on good authority that the riches of the Cobalt district were only discovered through the actual construction of the Temiskaming & Northern Ontario Railway, that before the railway was constructed the mineral wealth was not known. That being the case, it is not unreasonable for us to believe that the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific will open up new wealth yet undreamed of. In the great northland we believe that there is territory which, when opened up, will yield great wealth. If the Temiskaming & Northern Ontario Railway has opened up so rich a new territory for this province, we are justified in believing that the National Transcontinental will open up northern Ontario and the northern parts of the west as well.

I approve of a loan being made to the Grand Trunk Pacific to aid them in the completion of the line, because it means railway competition in the west in a measure we have not at the present time. It means increased railway transportation facilities. It means reduction of freight rates—where there is competition we must have reduction. It must assist in placing Canada in a favourable position in the European market. It means the completion of a great national undertaking tending to promote national development, national expansion and national solidarity.

Mr. J. W. MADDIN (Cape Breton South). The resolution before the House has for its object the handing over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company of a sum of $10,000,000 for the purpose of completing the prairie section of the transcontinental line. The object sought is, in effect, to make the government of this country bankers for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to the extent of this sum. It is a unique position in this country; there is only one partial parallel to it in our history, and that was when the government of this country granted assistance in a somewhat similar manner to the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1884. Some hon. members have suggested that hon. members on this side were opposed to the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. I submit that hon. members on this side of the House will be found as faithful to their obligations in respect of public contracts as hon. members on the government side. There is no member on this side who does not feel that the people of Canada are bound by this contract and wedded to it, and they will favour the carrying out of the contract in full. There is no member on this side who is opposed to carry to its fullest completion the building of this railway. There may be a difference in method, but there is no member on this side of the House who has offered any suggestion that will delay the completion of this road for a fraction of a day.

The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) in his remarks this afternoon pointed out, as a precedent for this position—and so did the mover of this resolution—that in 1884 the Liberal-Conservative government had advanced the sum of $30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The member for West Lambton said that the resolution now before the House was 'on all fours'—to use his own words—with the resolution brought down by Sir Charles Tupper in 1884. I take issue with the hon. member when he makes that statement. There is little or no similarity in the circumstances of 1884 and those of 1909 with regard to these railway lines. Let us look at the preamble of the Act of 1881 by virtue

of which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was incorporated:

Whereas by the terms and conditions of the admission of British Columbia into union with the Dominion of Canada, the government of the Dominion has asssumed the obligation of causing a railway to be constructed, connecting the sea-board of British Columbia with the railway system of Canada.

Until British Columbia entered confederation, we had no outlet on the Pacific seaboard. The American boundary line came down from Alaska, running along a great part of the Pacific coast, and there was only, proportionately, a small strip of the Pacific coast on British soil. It was necessary, in order to reach British dominions beyond the Pacific that British Columbia should be induced to enter Canada. And one of the inducements offered was that a railway would be built from ocean to ocean. As one hon. member pointed out, there was then a population of less than 20,000 white people between Lake Superior and the Rocky mountains, and less than 11,000 beyond the Rocky mountains in British Columbia. The hon. member (Mr. Pardee) asks us to have faith in our country and in the resources and wealth of our country. I may tell my hon. friend that there were found among the pioneers of this confederation in 1881 men who, under circumstances that called for deep faith, undertook the building of a railway of greater magnitude than that which is sought to be built at the present time.

The leaders of the old Conservative party were never lacking in faith in their country and the hon. member failed utterly in his attempt to draw a parallel between the resolution of 1884 and the resolution now before us. I have spoken of the population of the Northwest in 1881 when the Canadian Pacific Railway was being built. At that time the Liberal leaders then in opposition in this House said it was folly to undertake to build a railway through that country, that it contained nothing but buffaloes and wild Indians, and that a railway through it would not pay for its axle grease. The Canadian Pacific Railway commenced the work of construction. The government built the eastern part of the road at a cost of $28,000,000 and gave it to the Canadian Pacific Railway, they gave them a grant of $25,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres of land. The railway was to be finished by May 1, 1891. In 1884, Sir Charles Tupper moved a resolution in the House to grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway a loan aggregating practically $30,000,000. What were the circumstances? The promoters and stockholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway had then spent $10,000,000 of their own money. Of their $100,000,000 of capital stock they had sold $65,000,000 and had thus raised $63,000,000, every cent of which had been spent in the work of construction. They had then used the subsidies and had sold more than three million acres of the land grant given to them by the government. They had left on their hands stock to the value of $35,000,000 and more than 21,000,000 acres of their land grant in the west. Sir Charles Tupper in moving the resolution in 1884, submitted to the House a statement prepared by the Canadian Pacific Railway setting forth the amount of money expended, the amount of railway completed, and showing resources from which this money was derived, demonstrating to the satisfaction of the House that the moneys which had been raised from the sale of the stock of the company had been used in the construction of the road. As a matter of fact they had then not less than 1,370 miles of road completed and actually running, notwithstanding that it was only three years from the time they had entered into the undertaking. They were not obliged under their contract to finish the railway until May 1, 1891. Before submitting that statement to parliament, Sir Charles Tupper sent two auditors to Montreal, Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, now chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and Mr. E. Miall, to make an examination of the books and vouchers of the Canadian Pacific Railway in order to satisfy themselves that the report submitted by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Minister of Railways was a true and correct report. The minister instructed these gentlemen to make such a close and accurate examination of the accounts as a business or banking concern would require before advancing or loaning money or entering into a partnership with a reliable business firm. The books of the company and the company's auditor and his staff were placed at the disposal of these two auditors. After a careful examination they certified the statement submitted to the minister to be correct.

Then it was shown that with the depression existing at that time, the railway presumably having no great future before it, the prospects not being very bright that the railway would ever be a paying concern and that the railway had received financially a black eye in the English money markets, that cablegrams and letters had been sent to the English money markets which affected the credit of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It must be remembered that the Canadian Pacific Railway did not have freight lying at the side of the track with which to begin earning dividends when the road was completed. You will see the vast difference between it and the Grand Trunk Pacific to-day. The Prime Minister in proposing the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific urged

that whilst Canada had a sufficient number of open harbours, it had not enough railways to carry the freight to those harbours, and so it was proposed to build this great national highway. This railway was designed to go from coast to coast. It was submitted by the Liberal party in 1903 that the Grand Trunk Pacific would follow along the coast of Lake Superior and would seek a northerly route from that point, thereby opening up a new and heretofore untouched portion of Canada. What do we find in fact? From Port Arthur to Winnipeg the Grand Trunk Pacific practically parallels the Canadian Pacific Railway. From Winnipeg to the Rocky mountains it is at no time more than 100 or 150 miles distant and for much of that distance it is only from two to four miles distant from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. To the north of it lies the Canadian Northern Railway which was built through the industry and business capacity of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, with merely the government subsidies. To the south of it lies the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the day the Grand Trunk Pacific is completed the freight is there for it to move. In 1884, when Sir Charles Tupper's resolution was before the House, the condition confronting the Canadian Pacific Railway was that when they completed their line their first freights out into that country were to be the immigrants and farming materials for the breaking of the soil to commence to raise the first crops to be moved. No such condition obtains with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Their routed freight is lying there.

When the Prime Minister spoke of having this railway reach more of our seaports did he forget that before the Grand Trunk Pacific was undertaken we had a railway running into Vancouver, and into Quebec and Montreal on the St. Lawrence, that we had the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway running into St. John, that we had the Intercolonial Railway running into Halifax and Sydney, and that with railway connection via the Intercolonial Railway between Louisburg and Halifax on the Atlantic, and Vancouver on the Pacific, we had outlets all the year round with the existing railways.

But, what is proposed to be done by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company? They wish to have the building and owning of this railway out to the Pacific coast in order to have a feeder from the west and from the prairie provinces for the eastern section of their road. They have an object in view. They have as their Atlantic seaports the towns of New London in Connecticut and Portland on the Atlantic seaboard and the object in view of this railway company is to run in between the Canadian Northern on the north and the Canadian Pacific Railway on the south, grasp the freight that is routed by these two lines and which would carry it to a Canadian seaport and translate it to the American seaports of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. If that be the object of the Grand Trunk Pacific it is nothing short of treason to this country that our own seaports should be robbed of the freight from the prairie provinces. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company had exhausted their resources, they had spent $10,000,000 of their own money, they had spent the proceeds of the sale of $65,000,000 of their stock, they had spent the money derived from the sale of over 3,000,000 acres of land, and every dollar was invested in the road and they had 1,370 miles in actual running order. There was a depression in the money markets of the world. The depression was not, however, even in the minds of the people at that time, of such a character as to seriously interfere with the Canadian Pacific Railway living up to their actual original contract. There was nothing apprehended at that time that would interfere with the Canadian Pacific Railway completing their road on the 1st May, 1891. But, rather than go into the money market with their bonds at that time they proposed to surrender to the government the stock which they held and that portion of the railway that was completed, upon which there had been expended $63,000,000 from stock as well as the government subsidies paid up to that time. This was offered as a guarantee for the repayment of the sum which was asked to be loaned. One of the strongest considerations that moved the Liberal-Conservative party in 1884 to grant $30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway was that the railway would be completed in 1886, five years earlier than the contract called for. This railway was actually completed in 1886. What do we find in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific? They were to have had their road completed by the 1st of December, 1908. Up to the present time we find, by looking at the returns handed down the other day by the Minister of Finance, that the amount of railway completed at present is 667 miles from Winnipeg to Wainwright and it is completed and working under construction, not absolutely completed but working under construction. After over five years of operation by this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company they have not one single mile of that railway completed and passed by the government engineers. They are operating, it is true, 667 miles under construction, but they have not one single mile of that road completed, whereas the Canadian Pacific had 1,370 miles of railway completed be-

sides 239 miles of branches and 160 miles north of Lake Superior, which was very heavy work, was almost completed. The result was that the road was absolutely completed in 1886. In 1884 the Canadian Pacific Railway came to the government not pretending to be in the embarrassed condition that the Grand Trunk Pacific is in. All they said was that if they could get an advance of this money they would complete the road five years sooner than they had promised to do it. Bear in mind that time was an essential element entering into the contract at that time. When the people of Canada undertook to build the Canadian Pacific Railway the American transcontinental railway companies looked upon the undertaking as a huge joke. They did not think it would be possible for the people of Canada to finance and build a railway across the continent, but as time rolled on and and they saw that the work was being carried on they began to be apprehensive that they would have an active competitor in the Canadian Pacific Railway and it was they who were principally responsible for stampeding the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway and making it hard for them to sell the last $35,000,000 of it. The railways of the western states thought that the Canadian Pacific Railway would be an important competitor of theirs and the Union Pacific sent out agents to canvass the country and get pledges of freight from Canadian territory for the American railway lines. It was of paramount importance that this railway should be finished five years earlier than the time specified in the contract in order to get Canadian freight routed over the Canadian route and brought eastward to the Atlantic sea-board. As a security for this loan in 1884 the Canadian Pacific Railway handing over absolutely all they were owners of in the world. I quote from the remarks of Sir Charles Tupper at this time. He said:

> If there is default in payment of interest or principal, if by the 1st of May, 1892, every dollar of interest and every dollar of principal is not refunded to the government of this advance, they (Canadian Pacific Railway Company) propose that we shall become at once the possessors of the entire property of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

I ask hon. members of this House to compare the conditions that obtained in 1884 with the conditions that obtain in this year—1909. As my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) has pointed out this evening this government is not in a position to become bankers for the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific are so wedded together financially, by contract and otherwise, that they are, for the purposes of this resolution, inseparable, and I submit that our relations in the past with the Grand Trunk Pacific have been of such a character that we cannot accept from them in good faith the representations which they have submitted to this House at the present time. As far as has been made known to this House no steps have been taken by the mover of this resolution or any one upon the government side to verify the statements submitted by the Grand Trunk Railway. These two companies are practically inseparable and the people of this country should not undertake to be their bankers on such poor security as is being offered at the present time. Since this House opened on the 20th January last it has been a common thing, when estimates were being put through, to be met by minister after minister from the different departments with the complaint that the finances of the country were in such a condition that much needed as many public works were they were unable to undertake them at the present time. In New Brunswick and Nova Scotia important railway undertakings have been laid over by the government on the pretense that the country has no money. And if we cannot afford to spend a few hundred thousand dollars on important public works, what grave reasons are there why we should place ourselves under an obligation to plunge into the money markets of the world for ten million dollars to tide the Grand Trunk Pacific Company over their financial difficulties. The financial statistics of Canada show that there are $400,000,000 belonging to the depositors of Canada in the various banking institutions of the Dominion, and I would like the Minister of Finance to tell me if any financial concern in Canada would advance one million cents on the security offered by the Grand Trunk to the government. I think not. We have been told by gentlemen opposite that the country endorsed the policy of the government in 1904. It is true that while approving in a general way of the construction of the Transcontinental Railway the Conservative party took issue with the government as to the best means to accomplish that end, and in a sense that became the main issue before the people. But the right hon. the Prime Minister on every platform assured the people solemnly that it would not cost them one dollar more than $13,000,000 to build the transcontinental railway from ocean to ocean, and the people took him at his word and endorsed his administration. But now these same people realize to their great discomforture that the road is to cost $250,000,000. So long as Canada remains a borrowing country she must live religiously up to her public contracts, but every contract we have made with the Grand Trunk Pacific from 1903 down to the present moment has been flagrantly broken by that company. It was

improvident on the part of the government to enter into the contract of 1903; it was improvident on the part of the government to have changed that contract from time to time; it is improvident on the part of the government to do what they now propose. The contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company was conceived in unwisdom, conducted with unparalleled extravagance and improvidence, and we are now reaping as we have sown. The government has pledged the credit of Canada to relieve the broken fortunes of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company until we have now invested in this concern not less than $200,000,000.

We are meeting with the fate of the gambler who foolishly only buys stock on margin and who must buy out the stock if he is not to be ruined. Why not let Canada buy out the stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company without risking any more margins on it? I say, Sir, that we can consistently live up to our obligations with the people of the west and the people of the east by saying to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company: 'Every contract we have made with you, you have flagrantly broken; your contractual obligations with us are at an end, give us your vouchers for the money expended by you and we will pay you every dollar you have put into the enterprise, hand us over the railway and we will build it ourselves.' Anyway, if the country is to pay nine-tenths of the cost of construction, why should not that railroad become a national asset of the people? I would go further and say, that after we have completed the railroad, if need be we could hand it back to the company to operate, always providing certain restrictions with regard to the routing of the freight in order to preserve our Canadian seaports. In view of the disclosures made in the Public Accounts Committee with regard to the item of $162,000, and as to which the vouchers were subsequently burned, the government and the people of Canada should hesitate before advancing ten million dollars more to such a company. In the estimates brought down by the Minister of Finance it is shown that a further sum of forty-eight millions will be required, ten millions of which are being asked now. Why does not the Minister of Finance muster up courage enough to ask parliament for the full sum at once? Is it pretended that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company can raise the forty million dollars more which is required to complete this road; is it not common sense to suppose that if they were financially in a position to do that they would not now be knocking at the door of the government asking for this money? I regret to have to think that this is not the last ten millions that will be demanded. What guarantee have we that the Grand Trunk Pacific can finance the other forty millions estimated as required to complete the mountain section? Failing to get a satisfactory answer to that question, we discharge them from any further obligations with respect to this road, and assume the obligation of finishing it, and do it promptly, for the people of Canada. Let us lease it to these people, but let us build and own it ourselves.

The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) said that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was wont to say that a great stage had been prepared for Canada and that we were the actors upon it; and he went on to ask, shall we raise the curtain and proceed to act, or shall we halt for a paltry $10,000,000? I would say, Mr. Speaker, that he might raise the curtain and show us vouchers for the expenditure of all the moneys that have been raised by the sale of stock, or all that have been paid by this government by way of subsidy. He might show to the satisfaction of this House that these moneys have been spent legitimately for the purchase of right of way, for railway material or railway construction, and that there are no vouchers that they will be ashamed to show or be obliged to go and burn.

In conclusion I have only this to urge. Hon. members on this side of the House are as anxious for the hasty completion of this road as hon. members on the government side of the House; and it is, as I conceive, the duty of this government to cut loose from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, that company having violated every contract that it has entered into up to the present time, and take possession of the road, reimburse those people for every dollar they have spent on it, with interest up to date, and complete the road ourselves and own it as a national asset for the people of Canada in the future

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, as this is a matter that affects to a very large extent the province from which I come, I would like to take ten or fifteen minutes to express to this House and the First Minister my complete sympathy with the action that the government is taking at the present time. I do not think it is worth while to spend half an hour or an hour, as some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have done, in discussing the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We all know that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was a necessity, and we all recognize—I believe every member on the other side of the House just as much as members on this side—that the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific is just as much a necessity to-day, and was when it was undertaken, as the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was at the time it was

undertaken. If that is the case, why waste time discussing the advisability of the construction of these roads? What we have to deal with to-night is the motion before the House—the advisability of making a loan of $10,000,000 to enable the Grand Trunk Pacific to complete the prairie section of the road in a better manner and with less strain on their credit and with more credit to the Dominion of Canada than it could be completed in any other way. That is the point we have to deal with, and I would ask if any hon. member on the other side of the House would say that that money should not be advanced to the company to enable them to complete the road? I do not believe, when it comes down to the fine thing, that any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House will take the position that we should not make the loan to enable the company to complete the prairie section, and to complete it before the end of the current year. What does that mean? It means that if the prairie section of the road is completed during the present year, the section between Fort William and Winnipeg will be completed also, so that by the time the next crop is ripe, we shall have a third outlet for the season's crop to the lakes. It was pointed out by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) what a great advance had taken place in the country during the last five years, since the inception of the Grand Trunk Pacific. If that line was a necessity then, and no one will deny it, it is doubly a necessity at the present time. It is all very well for gentlemen who live in the east to criticise the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific; but we who come from the west and who represent men living thirty or fourty miles from a railway, know that the advent of another railway in the country means an increase of transportation facilities, because the construction of the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific means the construction of feeders through all parts of the grain-growing districts of the prairie provinces, and every one of these branch lines will bring railway facilities to hundreds of men who haven't them now.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the hon. member please give the House the names of a few points east of Edmonton that are even twenty miles, much less thirty miles, from a railway?

Mr. TURRIFF. I would like to inform the hon. gentleman that the whole country does not lie east of Edmonton. There are parts of the country a thousand miles from Edmonton which are in dire need of railway facilities at the present time.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the hon. gentleman name a point west of Edmonton that is going to be touched by this railway that is not now within ten miles of a railway?

Mr. TURRIFF. There is a great stretch of prairie country between Winnipeg and Edmonton, 800 or 900 miles in length and 300 miles in breadth, that is greatly in need of railway facilities. Fifty or 100 miles west of Edmonton you get into a different kind of country. You are in the foothills of the mountains, but it is a different country from the country to the south, where the Canadian Pacific Railway passes through the mountains. You are in a country where the mountain ranges are lower and the valleys wider, and where there are hundreds of settlers on farming lands to one along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. So that in running the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific through that country, you are running it through a country that will yield largely of farm produce, as well as of timber, minerals and fruit.

The Grand Trunk Pacific is a necessity, and a great necessity. I am not going to take up time considering the securities that we are going to get for this loan. All I need to do is to point to what the hon. leader of the opposition said this afternoon. He spent some time criticising the securities the government were getting for the advance of this $10,000,000, and how did he wind up? By saying that the common stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific was worth from 100 to 150. If the common stock is worth 50 per cent above par, there is not much danger of our not getting the interest on the bonds for the money advanced to help to complete the construction. Is there any man in this House or out of it, who has knowledge of that western country, who will say that a road built over the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific, with all its branches in that country, the greatest wheat producing country in the world, and in the great farming valleys of British Columbia, with their vast timber and mineral resources, will not earn interest on the cost of construction? When the road is built through British Columbia, through the great farming valleys and vast timber resources of that province, will any man in this House say that it will not earn interest on its cost?

Hon. gentlemen opposite have criticised this road from the point of view of its cost. Let me say that if a mistake was made some years ago, when the government made an estimate of its cost, I am very glad that mistake was discovered and rectified before the road was built and that a road is being built which, when completed, will be the finest on the continent, and not such a road as the Canadian Pacific Railway constructed, when they built their main line, and as the Canadian Northern is constructing. We are having a road built which will stand for hundreds of years. Look at what is taking place to-day both on the

Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern. We were told in the Railway Committee this morning that the Canadian Pacific is spending $18,000,000 on its road. But the great bulk of that is being spent on the main line in cutting down grades and straightening out curves. Why is this expenditure being made? Because the company was in such a position that it could not haul freight cheaply. Every one knows that in building a road now, great attention is paid to the road bed and the grades. The Grand Trunk Pacific are constructing a road superior to any transcontinental line that has yet been built and are getting a maximum grade of four-tenths of one per cent. What does that mean? I have here a comparison of what that grade, which the Grand Trunk Pacific will have from Edmonton to Prince Rupert, will enable one engine to do compared with what is being done by one engine on other transcontinental roads. I saw the complete figures given by Mr. Hays in one of the newspapers, but in that paper, which was friendly to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway figures were left out, so that I cannot give an exact comparison. Here is what an engine will haul on the Grand Trunk Pacific when completed. It will be able to haul over the worst grade between Edmonton and Prince Rupert 2,041 tons. What is done on transcontinental roads in the United States? An engine on the Great Northern hauls 572 tons, on the Northern Pacific 572 tons, also on the Union Pacific, and on the Santa Fee Railway 376 tons. With the grades existing on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway up to a year ago, the amount that an engine could haul was less than 200 tons. So that it is advisable, when making a road bed, to get the grades right and spend whatever money is necessary, rather than have to change your grades, location and curves after the road is built. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about what the Canadian Pacific Railway has cost. There is no man living who can tell what that road cost. You cannot tell what we have paid, and no one can tell what we will pay, because we are paying to-day for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway and will continue to pay for many years to come. What about the exemptions from taxes for all time to come on their lines? What about the 10,000,000 acres of land which they hold at present, the patents for which are in their pockets and on which they are not paying a cent of taxes? That is what we are paying to-day and what we will continue to pay so that we cannot compute what the Canadian Pacific Railway has cost us. And while the Canadian Pacific Railway got millions of dollars and millions of acres of land, the Grand Trunk Pacific do not get any bonus or subsidy except the interest on the cost of capital during construction. Whatever else is advanced they have to pay interest on. I thought myself that the government had driven too hard a bargain with the Grand Trunk Pacific especially when we consider that it will have to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was practically built by the government, and with the Canadian Northern which has been built by subsidies from both the federal and local governments. The Grand Trunk Pacific has not been treated nearly as favourably as either of the other transcontinental roads.

I do not think that our hon. friends opposite need be in the least degree afraid of the Grand Trunk Pacific not being able to pay back this money. Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan said some years ago that anybody who took the bear side on the United States market would eventually go broke. Well, anybody who takes the bear side on the market against Canada will meet with the same fate. No one can tell what the future of our western and our eastern country is going to be. The Dominion is just beginning to grow. A moment ago we heard an hon. gentleman talk about the Grand Trunk Pacific borrowing $10,000,000 from the Dominion of Canada just when we are in an impoverished condition, and in the very next breath he told us that there are $400,000,000 on deposit in the banks of the people of Canada. Does that look as if the country was impoverished? Not at all. The country was never in better shape than it has been for a number of years past.

As to the necessity for this road, I might point out that in all parts of the country every year there are freight blockades. Two years ago we could not get cars to haul coal and wheat. A friend of mine in Medicine Hat had a lot of cattle to ship and he drove in two hundred or three hundred head, and kept them around Medicine Hat two months without being able to get any cars to ship them in. He had to take them back to his ranch and during the hard winter he lost three or four thousand dollars worth. In the face of that condition of things, will any one say that this road is not a necessity? The question is, as I said before: What is the best way? I claim that the government has taken the proper course in lending the money. We lend it for a period not exceeding ten years; we shall get as much interest as it costs us; and we shall get our money back. Something was said by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) about the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk being bankrupt. Where would the Canadian Pacific Railway have been in 1884, when Sir

Charles Tupper came to this House for a loan of $30,000,000 if that sum had not been advanced?

Mr. AMES. They gave security.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, they gave simply what the government had given them, the completed road, and 25,000,000 acres of land. Will any hon. member point out what else they gave? Hon. gentlemen opposite need not be a bit alarmed about the Grand Trunk Pacific being able to pay back this money and pay it back before the ten years' term is up. At the present time, the Grand Trunk Pacific have 670 miles in operation. This road may not have been finally accepted by the government, but for months the Grand Trunk Pacific has been running trains over that line from Winnipeg to Drinkwater. The Grand Trunk Pacific has a much greater mileage in proportion to the amount it is borrowing than the Canadian Pacific Railway had in proportion to the amount it borrowed. If the Grand Trunk Pacific does cost a considerable sum of money, we will get the interest of the money, and as we only guarantee the bonds on three-quarters of it, the country is absolutely safe.

Representing, as I do, a western constituency, I want to say to the House and to the government, that the west at all events, is right behind the government in this matter. The people of the country endorsed the leader of this government on this question in 1904 and again in 1908, and I want to tell my hon. friends opposite that they will endorse him when he goes to the country again either on this or any other question.

Mr. H. B. AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What business does the leader of the House intend to take up to-morrow? Second, are we to expect the Budget before the Easter holidays? And third, when will the holidays commence and end?

Mr. FIELDING. As to the business for to-morrow, as we are on the eve of a new fiscal year, it is very important that we should facilitate the voting of such supplies as are needed at the beginning of the year. We propose, therefore, to take up to-morrow a number of items in the main estimates and ask the approval of the House, first, probably some items of the Civil Service, but there are a number of services for which appropriations are needed at the beginning of the year. We shall endeavour to select these items, and give precedence to them to-morrow, and, if necessary, on Friday. As soon as a number of these items have been passed in Supply, we shall take concurrence and ask the House to pass a Supply Bill.

As regards the budget speech, it was contemplated to bring it on before the recess, but as this debate has intervened, and as it is desirable to close it up, the budget speech will have to stand over until after the holiday.

As to the third point referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. George Taylor), I think the intention is to ask the House to adjourn on Wednesday. As to the date when it will resume, I would prefer to ask the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to-morrow. I think, probably, the adjournment will be moved on Wednesday.

Mr. AMES. Will the Bill with reference to the Grand Trunk Pacific immediately follow on adoption of the resolution?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, and, if it will facilitate the discussion, the House might pass the resolution in committee and leave the further discussion to take place on the Bill. However, in that respect, we are in the hands of the House. For the present, we shall proceed along the lines of to-day.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 31, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS— PURCHASE OF MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table a copy of the notice sent to all the officers of the Department of Public Works charged with the purchase of materials and supplies and the certifying of accounts for the same, under the different branches of the chief architect, the chief engineer and the superintendent of telegraphs. One of these notices was sent to the chief engineer's staff on September 16, 1908, one to the chief architect's staff on December 18, and one to the superintendent of telegraphs' staff on December 18. As the notices are all in the same language, I need read only one:

Sir,—I am directed by the hon. the Minister of Public Works to call your attention in a special manner to the question of purchase

of materials and supplies required for the use of the Department of Public Works, and which are obtained either by yourself personally or under your supervision, and to impress upon you the necessity of exercising the greatest care and caution in obtaining same at the very best possible prices, and that the most careful scrutiny should be given to all accounts before certification.

I am also to caution you emphatically regarding the acceptance of any gifts or favours of any kind at the hands of contractors or merchants with whom you may have dealings on behalf of the department and, further, if any such transaction should come to your knowledge, that it is your duty as an official of the department to report same at once to the minister or deputy minister, in order that such investigation may be made and action taken as may be deemed proper.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

NAP. TESSIER,

Secretary.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 114) to incorporate the British Colonial Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 115) for the relief of Victor Eccles Blackhall.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 116) for the relief of Annie Louisa Coltman.—Mr. Turriff.

QUESTIONS.

GRAND TRUNK STOCK.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO asked:

1. What is the present amount of Grand Trunk consolidated debenture stock now outstanding?

2. What is the present amount of Grand Trunk 4 per cent guaranteed stock outstanding?

3. What is the amount of Grand Trunk first preferred stock, second preferred stock, third preferred stock, and ordinary stock, respectively, now outstanding?

4. Which of the above stock is a charge or lien on the property of the Grand Trunk Railway, and which will have precedence, or will rank as a prior lien or charge on the road over the proposed guarantee by the Grand Trunk Railway of the proposed loan by the government of ten million dollars to the Grand Trunk Pacific?

5. What are the total liabilities or obligations of the Grand Trunk Railway, and what amount of such will be a prior lien or charge on the assets of the said company over the liability of the Grand Trunk Railway in respect of said proposed guarantee?

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

1. £22,825,297. In addition, there are outstanding bond issues of £1,488,500, making a total of debenture stocks and bonds of £24,313,797.

2. £9,840,010.

3. (a) First preferred stock, £3,420,000; (b) Second preferred stock, £2,530,000; (c) Third preferred stock, £7,168,055; (d) Ordinary stock, £22,475,984.

4. The debenture stocks and bonds above mentioned amounting to £24,313,797 constitute a charge and lien upon the property of the Grand Trunk Company, and will rank as a prior lien or charge over the proposed guaranty.

5. It would be impossible, the company state, to say what the total liabilities or obligations of the Grand Trunk Railway Company amount to, as they vary from day to day. Some are fixed, others are contingent.

Prior liens or charges on the revenues of the company over the liability of the Grand Trunk Company in respect of the proposed guaranty are—

Debenture stock	£22,825,297
Bonds	1,488,500
Total	£24,313,797

The annual charge in respect of these obligations is £1,064,217-19s.-10d.

The company state that, under the earlier legislation of the company, rentals of certain leased lines, amounting half yearly to £77,603, 'would probably be regarded as working expenses,' and hence a prior charge to this guaranty. In the statement which follows this deduction has been made.

After deducting the net revenue charges of the company, including the rentals above referred to, the surplus for each half of the following years, compiled from the accounts of the half yearly meetings of the company as reported in the 'Economist,' is as follows :

1904 1st half surplus	£124,610
1904 2nd half surplus	£432,103
1905 1st half surplus	£285,033
1905 2nd half surplus	£428,778
1906 1st half surplus	£309,861
1906 2nd half surplus	£523,465
1907 1st half surplus	£315,319
1907 2nd half surplus	£527,175
1908 1st half surplus	£180,494

The full statement for the 2nd half of the year 1908 is not available in the usual course until April, 1909.

These respective sums, if the proposed guaranty had been then outstanding and a liability, would have been available to meet the interest charges upon the sum so guaranteed.

RAILWAY MAIL CARS.

Mr. SPROULE asked:

1. Is the government aware of the great variety and unsuitability of the railway mail coaches now in use on Canadian railways, and the consequent danger, inconvenience and hardships suffered by railway mail clerks in the performance of their duty, and of the recommendation of the Royal Commission to the effect that the Railway Commission be

authorized and requested to have plans prepared for proper standard mail cars, to be placed on the several lines of railway carrying or to carry His Majesty's mails?

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to carry out the Royal Commission recommendation at an early date?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The attention of the department has been directed to the varying standards of cars used for the conveyance of mails, and the matter is now the subject of consideration.

NIPIGON RIVER DREDGING.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. What amounts were paid by the government during the year 1908 for dredging at the mouth of the Nipigon river and Nipigon bay, in Lake Superior?

2. To whom were such amounts paid, and what was the date of the contract under which the same were paid?

3. When was the work in respect of which such amounts were paid, commenced, and when and by whom were representations made as to the necessity for the same?

4. What were the rates, according to classification, paid by the government for this dredging?

5. Were tenders invited for the work? If so, how many tenders were received, who was the successful tenderer, and was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer?

6. What is the estimated cost of completion of the work?

7. What were the names of the dredges employed, and who were appointed as inspectors or superintendents by the government?

8. What other work, if any, was done during the year 1908 by the government on the Nipigon river, or its approaches, what was the nature and cost of the work, and to whom were the moneys paid in respect to the same?

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

1. 238,826 cubic yards were excavated during the season of 1908; the sum of $57,459.45 was paid in 1908, leaving a balance for work done in that year, but still unpaid, of $50,012.25.

2. The Great Lakes Dredging Company, Limited, under contract dated 9th October, 1908.

3. (a) Work commenced 8th September, 1908; (b) Petition from residents of Nipigon dated 30th April, 1908; petition from vesselmen of Thunder bay sent in May, 1908.

4. Price per cubic yard, scow measurement, rock, $3; other materials, 45 cents. Material cast over, rock $3; other materials, 45 cents.

5. (a) Yes. (b) One. (c) The Great Lakes Dredging Company, Limited. (d) Yes.

6. $15,750.

7. (a) Dredge 'No. 6.' (b) W. Stuart McKirdy.

8. Nothing by this department.

TERCENTENARY POSTAGE STAMPS.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

1. What was the total amount received by the Post Office Department from the sale of the special Tercentenary stamps?

2. What part of this sum would probably have been received as ordinary revenue if there had been no special issue of stamps?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The following was the issue to postmasters of the tercentenary postage stamps:

Denominations.	Quantities.	Value.
½ cent..	2,000,000	$ 10,000 00
1 "	22,530,000	225,300 00
2 "	35,100,000	702,000 00
5 "	1,200,000	60,000 00
7 "	700,000	49,000 00
10 "	500,000	50,000 00
15 "	300,000	45,000 00
20 "	304,200	60,840 00
Totals..	62,634,200	$1,202,140 00

The department has no knowledge whether the stamps in question have all been sold, as during their issue the ordinary postage stamps were also on sale, both issues being in use as preferred by the public. The proceeds derived from the sale of stamps of the two issues were not kept separately, but treated as arising from a common source. It is, therefore, impossible to state to what extent the issue of the Tercentenary postage stamps may have affected the ordinary revenue. At the ordinary period fixed by the department for squaring these accounts, we may be able to give the approximate value.

GOVERNMENT LOANS.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

What are the amounts and dates of the loans falling due prior to December 31, 1913?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The information is all contained in the Public Accounts, but if the hon. gentleman will permit the question to stand I will give in in the form of an answer later on.

Question stands.

4 PER CENT LOAN OF 1874.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

1. On what date in 1904 was the first public notice given of the terms of the proposed extension of the 4 per cent loan of 1874?

2. At what rate did the notice offer to give 3 per cent inscribed stock in exchange for the 4 per cent debentures?

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

1. March 11, 1904.

2. £105 of three per cents for each £100 of four per cent 1874.

CUSTOMS STAFF AT DEBEC.

Mr. CROCKET asked:

1. When was Mathias Meagher appointed to the customs staff at Debec, New Brunswick, on whose recommendation was he appointed, what is his salary and what are his duties?

2. How many officers are employed at Debec?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. Mathias Meagher was employed as customs preventive officer under the sub-collector of customs at Debec, N. B., January 20, 1909. He was appointed by the Minister of Customs at a salary of $400 a year to prevent smuggling over the boundary line south of Debec.

2. There is a sub-collector of customs at Debec besides this preventive officer.

PUBLIC WORKS, SOUTH WELLINGTON.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM asked:

How much public money has the Dominion government expended on the construction of public works in the constituency of South Wellington during the past twenty years?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). $189,242.92.

BRIGHTON AND CAMPBELLFORD MAIL ROUTE.

Mr. OWEN. The contract price for carrying the mails between Brighton and Campbellford is this year $600, while last year it was $465, an increase of $235. What is the reason of that increase?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I cannot answer that question just now, but generally speaking there are complaints throughout the country that these prices are too low. We call for tenders and give the contract to the lowest tenderer. I will make inquiry and give the information later.

Mr. OWEN. Is the mail carrier on that route performing the rural mail delivery service?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The rural mail delivery service may account for the higher price. If the contractors do not accept the sum offered by the department we call for tenders and, generally speaking, the rate is higher.

INQUIRY FOR A RETURN.

Mr. BRADBURY. On the 7th of February an order of the House was passed for correspondence between F. W. Colclough and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and I would ask the minister when that will be brought down. I would like it as soon as possible, because the delay is keeping me back in my work.

Mr. FIELDING.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I find from the Votes and Proceedings of March 29, that apparently the return referred to has been brought down.

Mr. BRADBURY. I inquired at the office and was informed it had not been brought down.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Northwest Mounted Police, $750,000.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This includes $325,000, pay of the force, and $425,000 for subsistence. There is an increase of $25,000 for pay and a decrease of $25,000 for subsistence, leaving the appropriation the same as last year. This estimate is for a force of 700 men, 500 being in Alberta and Saskatchewan, 100 in the Yukon, and 100 in the Northwest Territories. We estimate that the cost per man in Alberta and Saskatchewan will be $900 per year and in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon $1,500 per year. The increase of $25,000 in the pay is due to the rapid settlement of the provinces, which affords so much employment for labour generally that it is difficult to get men to join the force. The pay is 50 cents per man per day with an increase of 5 cents each year to the maximum of one dollar per day. But if there is a disinclination on the part of the younger men to enlist, it has been found that there is, especially among the non-commissioned officers a disposition to re-enlist at the expiration of their term of five years. We have therefore a good many veterans in the force, so that the pay, which commences at 60 cents and goes to a maximum of $1 per day, is on the average 85 cents.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the disposition of the 500 men in the provinces?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall come to that presently. The force is composed of 700 men. We have one commissioner at $3,000, two assistant commissioners at $2,000 each, eleven superintendents at from $1,500 to $1,800 each, thirty-six inspectors at from $1,050 to $1,400 each, two surgeons, one at $1,700 and the other at $1,600; three assistant surgeons, two at $1,400 and one at $1,100. There is a special allowance to the fourteen officers serving in the Yukon and Hudson bay of $1.25 per day, and of $2 per day to the officer commanding in the Yukon. There are eleven sergeant-majors, ten at $1.75 per day and one at $2; thirty staff sergeants, five at $1.50, 22 at $1.75 and three at $2 per day; forty-six sergeants at $1.25 per day, sixty-five corporals at $1.10 per day, four hundred and ninety-three special constables and constables at 85 cents per day, and then there

is special allowance to officers and constables in the far north of $12,000. With regard to the subsistence, we distribute the item of $425,000 as follows: Subsistence of men and horses, $110,000. The details are as follows:

Pay of force			$325,000
Subsistence—men	$62,000		
" horses	48,000		
		$110,000	
Light and fuel	$50,000		
Clothing	48,000		
Repairs and renewals	50,000		
Horses, arms and ammunition, books and stationery, hospital	25,000		
Billeting and travelling	72,000		
Transport and freight	30,000		
Contingencies	20,000		
Buildings	20,000		
		315,000	
			425,000
			$750,000

We have in the two provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan 500 men, 100 in the Yukon and 100 in the Territory. We have 12 principal stations distributed in Alberta, Saskatchewan, the Territory and the Yukon. In each of these 12 stations is a district, at the head of which is an officer and a small staff, and each one of these stations has a certain number of detached stations. We have 150 subsidiary stations dependent upon these 12. In Alberta there are 63 such stations; in Saskatchewan, 70; in the Yukon, 10; in the Northwest Territories, 7. We propose to distribute them from the United States boundary line up to Whitehorse and Dawson in the Yukon, to the mouth of the Mackenzie river in the north and to the Hudson bay in the east.

Mr. FOSTER. How many men have you in Alberta?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Two hundred and fifty, and 250 in Saskatchewan, 100 in the Northwest Territories, and 100 in the Yukon. There are 12 posts where the men are distributed. My hon. friend is familiar with the duties of those men. They include not only the duties of police officers in the ordinary sense, but they are of great assistance to colonization and settlement. I may say that the force is all the time patrolling; the men are all the time on horseback, visiting every settlement and every settler, visiting the ranchmen, asking if there are any complaints, rectifying erroneous reports, and reporting anything out of the ordinary. I may say that though we ask for an appropriation of $750,000, the cost to the federal treasury is only $600,000, because we receive $75,000 each from the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. FOSTER. What rifles is the force armed with now?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Lee-Metford and the Winchester.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like a little more explanation as to the disposition of the men. Is it a part of the policy of the department gradually to withdraw the men from the more thickly settled portions of Alberta and Saskatchewan, the large towns for instance, the large villages along the line of railway, and distribute them to the outlying portions, where there is lesser civic authority, and influences that come from the more settled conditions, especially in view of the fact that the time is approaching when these provinces must, the same as British Columbia and Manitoba, look after their own civic affairs, in so far as this force takes the place of bailiffs and constables, and that kind of officer which, in other provinces, is provided by the provincial authority. So it is a matter of some importance to know whether the policy of the department is to withdraw from the older portions and gradually to distribute the force, send them into the outlying districts where the power of the civil authority is not so strong. There is another point which I would like to mention to the Prime Minister, and I will be frank about it: Does he allow local party interests to have any part or lot in this matter, or is he keeping this force in that respect on the high level of a military force? Is he sure that it is not used in any way to advance the interest of—we may be frank about it—the party, or the party representatives?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With regard to the first point, my hon. friend has anticipated the policy of the department; it is gradually to withdraw police protection from the larger and older sections of the community and give it to the new settlements. I am afraid that for some years to come we will be forced to keep a portion of the force on the frontier of the United States until settlement becomes thicker there. It is a matter of necessity for the protection of the revenue, and of the settler, and the preservation of peace, to keep a little closer watch on the line than in the interior. But gradually we are reducing the force in the larger towns, and extending it northward to the newer settlements. The day cannot be far distant when the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan can dispense with a large portion of the force; but I imagine that as long as immigration flows in at the rate it is doing now, it would be a mistake to withdraw the force altogether. The sight of the uniform is an encouragement to the settler, he feels more secure; especially those who come from the continent of Europe feel more safe when they know that the police constable is not far distant, and they can have recourse to

him, not only for the purpose of protection against violence, but for all sorts of needs. If the settler feels a difficulty about anything he goes to the police force, and that force is of great value to him in many ways. With regard to the second question of my hon. friend, I do not think that my hon. friend has received any complaint of the action of the police, I think it has been kept absolutely free from any partisan action. I have received complaints, perhaps on one or two occasions. The instructions are very severe to the officers that they should not interfere in politics in any way. But more than one or two complaints I have not received, and I do not think my hon. friend has received any either, or at most, very few.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman says there are a hundred men in the Yukon. Would he tell me how they are distributed in the Yukon?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have reduced the force there from 300 to 100. At present there are two chief stations in the Yukon, at Dawson and at Whitehorse. In the Dawson division there are substations at Town Station, Grand Forks, Selkirk, Quartz creek, Granville, Selkirk and Forty Miles. In the Whitehorse division there are substations at Carcross, Livingstone creek and Champagne's Landing. They are looking after the miners chiefly. Of course it is our intention to reduce the force and eventually to withdrraw it completely. The experiment was tried two years ago in Dawson of having their own police force, but it did not work and they had to fall back upon the Mounted Police.

Mr. FOSTER. As far as I am concerned, I agree entirely with the general idea of the Prime Minister that the force is of inestimable value to us and to the Northwest. The only points I think we ought to guard against, beside those I have mentioned, are that we do not give up its consummation, in the not very far distant future, of the idea that the provinces as they grow become densely populated and get their municipalities organized will ultimately have to look after their own police work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. There are two influences which, I suppose, the Prime Minister has constantly upon him. The local governments themselves, for various reasons, would be loath to see a single man of the Mounted Police disappear from either of the provinces and the localities seem to have a decided preference for the Mounted Police over a provincial constable or officer. These two influences would work towards the perpetuation of the force in all its fulness and it is against that that I think the Prime Minister is wise in having his policy definitely stated and currently carried out. The real need comes where settlement is more sparse. But, I think, that no one can question for a single moment that the force has been worth its cost a hundred times over in the development of the Northwest. It has not only been a credit to Canada but it has really been the backbone and support of the people of that country. It has kept order, maintained respect for the law and it has given to scattered families and homesteaders a real peace and comfort to know that the mounted policeman was within hail and made his occasional visit. Nothing could compensate for the loss of that, and I think the Dominon has done properly and rightly in keeping this force at its high level and distributing it through those portions of the Northwest. It is one thing, that, if it is kept out of party politics and kept up to its original excellence, there will never be much quarrel between the two sides of the House upon it.

Mr. SPROULE. The right hon. Prime Minister did not know what the force in the Yukon cost. There are a hundred men, I understand?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are one hundred men in the Yukon.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the cost?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We estimate that in the Yukon the cost per man is $1,500. We estimate that the cost per man in Alberta and Saskatchewan is $900.

Mr. LAKE. How much is contributed by the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta to the maintenance?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. $75,000 by each province, or $150,000 in all.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the cost of the force in the Yukon will be $150,000, I take it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the Prime Minister give us any information as to the population of the Yukon?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. About 10,000 I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. All told?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am afraid so

Mr. J. D. REID. Does this include the police along the Hudson bay?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In the Northwest Territory, which now extends from the boundary of British Columbia and Alberta to Hudson bay, we have 100 men scattered all the way from Athabaska Landing to Churchill on the Hudson bay and to the mouth of the Mackenzie river.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did the steamer 'Arctic' take up some supplies for the men on Hudson bay last year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not within my jurisdiction.

Mr. J. D. REID. It was the last time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is no more.

Mr. J. D. REID. The right hon. gentleman will remember when she made her first trip about half her cargo was supposed to be for the Mounted Police along the shore of Hudson bay.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. I thought probably that she had taken food up there for the men.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. She is now under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. FOSTER. The mention of the name calls up memories. Where is the vessel now? We have not heard of her lately. From the great prominence which the name gained in the country not very long ago it seems to have sunk into oblivion. Has the vessel gone down or what has happened to her?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. She has not gone down. She has gone up. She has gone up to the northern waters and at the present time Captain Bernier is seeing that the British flag is protected in every land that belongs to Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. How many flags did he take up?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Enough to cover the ground.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has he the wireless telegraph on board so that you can communicate with him occasionally?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware of that. I have told my hon. friend that the 'Arctic' is not under my jurisdiction now.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Prime Minister know what quantity of anchors and chains he took up to chain those islands that he discovered and put a flag on?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, he chained them to the north pole.

Mr. SPROULE. We have several times asked the question whether the government did not think, in view of the reducing population of the Yukon, that they could do with less men and less expense. It seems a pretty large item for policing that territory. If the population is about 10,000, it costs $10.50 a head for policing that country. When the police force was first sent there the population was very much larger than it is now and things were supposed to be not in as high a state of civilization as at the present time. Do the government think it necessary to keep up such a large force (100) to look after about 10,000 people, and do they think that the expense cannot be reduced materially in a part of the country where we are told that the streets of Dawson are just as quiet as the streets of Ottawa, and where there is no more lawlessness and no more disposition to lawlessness than in the older settled portions of the country? If that is a fact it seems to me that we should be able to make some reduction in the number of the force and in the expense that is incurred in maintaining it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it is quite true, and it is our boast that the streets of Dawson, Whitehorse and all the creeks in the Yukon are just as safe as are the streets of the city of Ottawa, but that is the result, I believe, of the presence of the police. If the police were not there I think the result would be very different and we could not hope that the streets of those places would be as secure as they are to-day. There are now 10,000 people in the Yukon, but it is a mining camp. Mining camps are not proverbially very orderly, and unless we have police the order may not be what it is to-day. At all events, that is our supposition and that is the representation which is made to us. We started in the Yukon with 300 men and we have reduced the force to 100 men. It is our intention to reduce it still further as we think we are justified in doing so. At the present time I do not know whether it would be justified or not. We have had no mail from the Yukon of late and we would not undertake to reduce the force unless we had had previous communication with the commissioner, Mr. Henderson. If we are advised that we can, with security to the territory, reduce the force it is our intention to do so. At the same time I would remind my hon. friend that I would doubt the wisdom of withdrawing the whole force at the present time. The Yukon is far away from communication. At one time we had information that there was a party of desperadoes in Skagway that wanted to raid the territory and that was the first reason that induced us to send in the force. If that was the case, and I think there was good reason for so believing, for self-protection it is advisable that we should not withdraw the force altogether at this moment but that we should reduce it as far as circumstances will allow.

Mr. SPROULE. While we may not take the force away entirely it does seem to me that it might be materially reduced without any great danger of a disturbance of the peace. The minister says that mining camps are proverbially turbu-

lent. We have two important mining camps in Ontario, Cobalt and Gowganda. The provincial constables look after the policing of those mining camps, and we do not hear of any outrages being committed there any more than in the Yukon. Yet there is not one constable there for every ten, perhaps every fifteen, that there is in the Yukon. With the reduced population, and with the turbulent element largely gone, if we can believe the information which we have received from year to year, it does seem to me that it ought to be part of the duty and of the desire of the government to get an annual report from their inspectors on that phase of the question. There is in the Yukon a quasi form of government that ought to do a great deal in the administration of justice to relieve us of the necessity of maintaining a police force there. It is true, we have reduced the force from 300 to 100, but still it seems to me that the 100 is a large number of men to look after 10,000 people, if there are that number—because we are sometimes told that there are only 5,000 or 6,000 in that country. Does the force do any other material work that could not be done by civil officials? They used to collect the customs revenues, I think; are they doing that work any more than they did, or are they simply performing the duties of police constables?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend will agree with me that there is no comparison whatever between the Yukon and Gowganda and Cobalt. The latter places are within easy reach of the forces of the government of Ontario in case a riot should break out. But if we had a riot at Dawson, unless we had a military force there, how could we assert the authority of the law? This consideration alone is, I think, sufficient to warrant us in maintaining the force there. We do not want to see a repetition there of the early days of California, when every man was his own constable. We must maintain law and order in the Yukon. I agree with my hon. friend that we should reduce the force when possible, and we are reducing it gradually. My hon. friend asks if the force continues to do the service it did at one time in collecting the revenue. We are gradually withdrawing it from that duty, and when we do that altogether, there will be less occasion for the number of men we have. I think we have reduced the force as rapidly as it has been possible to do it without jeopardizing the peace of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there any of the police force in Manitoba now?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, not at all.

Mr. SPROULE. There is none in British Columbia?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any in the unorganized territories?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. In all the Northwest Territories, including the Yukon, we have 150 stations and 700 men.

Mr. MAGRATH. Of all the great changes which have taken place in our great west, the one which causes the old timers the greatest regret is the passing away of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. For some time the withdrawal of the police from the centres has been going on, and we do not see them on our streets to-day as we did in former years. I personally endorse the policy the right hon. gentleman has followed, but I am sorry that we cannot see more of these men. They have done a great and valuable service in our country; they have served the country and served it well, and I am sorry that we cannot do more for these men than we have done. I am quite in accord with all the right hon. gentleman has done, and I support the vote.

Mr. CONGDON. I wish to point out a reason why the vote should be taken at the figure stated, even though later experience should show that the number of men mentioned in the vote is not required. In a country like the Yukon it is a very difficult thing to estimate a year beforehand what number of police may be required. At any time there may be a fresh discovery and an influx from the neighbouring portions of Alaska or from other places, of a population which would necessitate the presence of a large force of the police. I think in any case that when we are making an appropriation of this kind we should provide for a sufficient number of men to render the force capable of coping with any possible contingency that may arise.

Subsistence, forage, fuel and light, clothing, buildings, repairs and renewals, horses, dogs, arms and ammunition, medical stores, billeting, transport, water service, stationery and contingencies, $425,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand these supplies are almost entirely got by contract and tender?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Seventy-five per cent of them. I can give a list of the contracts if my hon. friend wants that.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

To compensate members of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police for injuries received while in the discharge of duty, $3,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was paid for compensation last year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. $2,343.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the nature of the compensation?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Some twenty men were disabled last year in the discharge of their duty and I think every one will agree that they should receive compensation.

Department of Public Works — salaries, $324,800.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The leader of the opposition asked that this item should stand until the classification of the staff was brought down. I went into the explanation quite fully when this appropriation was last under consideration by the House.

Mr. SPROULE. The trouble is that perhaps not one member out of twenty may have read the statement submitted to the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I supposed that hon. gentlemen would look at it. The reason for the large increase under civil government is that whereas formerly we had only 36 employees in the permanent inside service there were in the neighbourhood of 200 in the service in Ottawa who were paid from the outside service vote. The department was organized first when Sir Hector Langevin was minister and further under Mr. Hyman. Now under the provisions of the Civil Service Act instead of there being 36 in the inside service there will in future be 237. That accounts for the increase in this vote. If my hon. friend will turn to other items he will find there is a reduction corresponding to the increase under civil government.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the reduction in one case equal to the increase in the other?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, with the exception of some increases in salaries and in the staff.

Mr. SPROULE. How much additional cost is incurred by the transition of these 237 officials into the inside service?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The memorandum I have is that the present salaries amount to $237,387 to be increased to $263,175, or an increase of $25,787 under the new organization. Then there is one additional clerk in the third division sub-division A provided for. Then there are the statutory increases for 1909-10 to 196 employees, $5,262.52. Then we make provision for additional appointments or any other changes necessary in the departmental staff, $5,000. The balance, covering the difference between the annual increases in salaries authorized by the orders in council of 1908, and the portion of such annual increases actually paid to employees to be transferred to civil government during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1909, $8,958.81.

Mr. SPROULE. Would not that be part of the statutory increases already provided?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they were special increases by orders in council, and these are set forth in the orders in council which have been laid on the table. That makes a total of $25,728.98. In the memorandum from the Finance Department, on page 26, that amount is given just as I have given it here, as a footnote. The other increases are accounted for by the increases to those who were already members of the permanent staff. We have picked out all those who were in the inside temporary service and who have been brought, by virtue of the Civil Service Act, into the permanent staff, and we deduct their salaries from what had been hitherto provided for in these miscellaneous votes, and add them under the head of civil government.

Mr. SPROULE. Where the civil servants have received an additional amount over what they were receiving heretofore, for the purpose of putting them in a certain class under the new Act, do they receive this year the statutory increase?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They begin to earn their statutory increase, but do not get it until they have served a year.

Mr. SPROULE. Did they get it last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Those who were in the outside service did not receive statutory increases. Their increases had to be by order in council.

Mr. SPROULE. What has been done with that class who were induced to resign and go into the outside service for the purpose of getting in in a higher class at an increased salary?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was not one instance of that kind in my department.

Mr. SPROULE. I am credibly informed there were some in the other departments.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can only answer for my own.

Mr. FOSTER. The other night this point was raised. Take the order in council of May 5, 1908, which is in these words: 'That authority be granted for the continued employment of the undermentioned officers in one of the permanent branches of the Department of Public Works at the salaries hereinafter specified from July 1, 1908, to July 1, 1909.' The order in council is silent as to whether the salary set opposite the name of each one was the salary of the preceding year. As far as we can judge

from anything said in the order in council, each one may have had $150 or $500 added to his salary. Were these the same salaries that these employees were being paid the preceding year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In quite a number of cases there were slight increases in salary provided for by that order in council. Every year there must have been an order in council, for the continuance of those engaged in the outside staff. The appointments were for the year and were renewed by order in council and the salaries provided for.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me the order in council ought to state what is really being done or else council may be very easily misled. Of course the minister might have gone over it in detail with his colleagues and shown exactly what he did.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That information is given to the Treasury Board and that board has before it the salaries of the previous year in every case.

Mr. FOSTER. But the Treasury Board gets what comes before it second-hand. It is a subsidiary council of the council. Surely the minister does not reserve the question of increases for the Treasury Board alone? The increases in salary come first before council. If they go to the Treasury Board first, the report from that board must come back before the council. It is not the Treasury Board which can either give salaries or increase them; it is the council alone which can do that. The Treasury Board has other duties to perform; they have to see that the regulations and conditions are the proper ones as prescribed by law. That opens the whole question. The minister will remember that I stated in that general debate that in the orders in council which had been brought down later, a large number of these outside employees received special increases running from $50 up to $200 or $300, and I tried to calculate the total increase which had been, as I contended, given by the minister outside the spirit of the Act, to take effect on the 1st of September, as grading these into the service under the new Civil Service Act. The whole of it was not shown, unless we can find out what increases were given by this order in council, which purports, on the face of it, to provide simply for a continuance of office, and impliedly a continuance of salary. Now, the minister says that while it was a continuance in office it was in many cases an increase of salary. I do not want to take up too much time to find out just what increases were given, but in that large number of clerks, the minister will see there is room for a good deal to happen under that concealed order. It is rather blind, I think, to say the least of it. The minister is sending down an order in council with reference to employees that have been employed year after year, and asking that they be continued at the salaries placed opposite their names. I think the inference is that the salaries are simply continued salaries.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The usual course was followed in this case. The order in council of the previous year would show the salaries which were paid in that year, and, as is customary, and as I think my hon. friend will agree is a proper course in this case, this recommendation to council was referred to the Treasury Board. The Treasury Board then had before it the salaries of each of these officers had received the previous year, and saw what were the recommendations for increases; the Treasury Board then reported to council, and upon the report and recommendation of the Treasury Board the order was passed. I do not think my hon. friend is right in calling it a concealed order.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it is a blind order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all. The most my hon. friend can say is that it does not show what were the salaries these officers received in the previous year. Though I would be sorry to see the item delayed. I will be glad to lay on the table of the House a copy of the order in council of the previous year so that my hon. friend can compare the two.

Mr. FOSTER. That raises the question as to whether this was the custom in the other departments. We have found out so far in our investigation that some of the ministers in some of the departments carried out this whole business on a different plane from others, and it raises the question now as to whether the ministers generally, in reporting to council with reference to the vast outside body, gave increases then, upon which afterwards special increases, sometimes repeated, have been made. In the other case we saw what the special increases were; they could not be put in any other way but in the first continuing order. If all the reports had been the same as my hon. friend's, we do not know, by looking at it, how much the increase was given and in what cases. I would like to go into the new system and ascertain how each division of the service entered it; and if the minister will amend that report that he brought down with his order in council of the 5th May, 1908, by having one of his clerks put alongside the list that is here each case of increase, probably they were not all increases, that would lighten the labour somewhat. If he would do that, and have it ready before we get into the Civil Service discussion, I would be very glad.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will do that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I raised the question before by what authority it was that you come in along the last of August, and you make increases, and you date the increase back by the order in council, two months, may be, to the beginning of the then fiscal year. I cannot find any authority in the Civil Service for that. I do find that this has been done, that you come down to parliament and you ask that an increase be granted, and that the increase be voted to take effect at a certain time. But out of the vote that you can, on the 27th day of August, make an increase of salary of $100 or $200 to men in the service, and then say that it may be dated back to the 1st of April—I do not find any authority for that. Anyway, it seems to be a rather dangerous form of proceeding, you are doing what parliament has had no advisement of. That is altogether different from the case where you come down in an estimate and say: Here, I want $50, or $100, or $200 increase in this item for such a clerk, and I want to pay him from the first of the year, or from any particular month.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know whether that could be done in the case of one who was under the Civil Service Act, but I presume it could not be done. I would agree with my hon. friend in that respect. But with respect to those who are on the temporary, and what is known as the outside service, that authority has always been recognized, because the vote is for a lump sum, and when the question came up with regard to fixing the date from which the increase would take effect, my deputy informed me that it had been the practice ever since he had been in the department, and there seems to be no limitation under the Act with regard to that power. It occurred in two or three cases, I think that was done by the order of May. My hon. friend is aware that the order in council was not an order made under the old Civil Service Act, it was made before the new Act came into force—that was my information. The vote being a general one and these officers not being under the old Civil Service Act, the council, if they thought fit to do so, could fix a date anterior to the order from which the increase of salary would take effect. Now, with regard to making the increases themselves, I think we threshed that out pretty fully some time ago. But I think my hon. friend will realize that as there were a large number of officials who were going to be brought by force of law under the Civil Service Act and were to be placed side by side with those who were under the new Act, it was proper that the deputy minister of my department should have regard to the merits, so far as possible, of the different officers, to their length of service, the importance of the duties which they were discharging, and endeavour to do justice as between them all, and so start them upon the 1st of September upon a proper and justifiable basis, leaving their remuneration and their classification after that to be fixed from time to time under the provisions of the Civil Service Act. That is what he sought to do, and it is what I sought to assist him in doing so far as my knowledge would enable me.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not wish to go again over the discussion we had the other night, but I would point out to the minister that I do not think his ground is a good ground. He may say that he thought he had more liberty under the outside vote than he had under the appropriation for what we call the regular Civil Service. But in theory they are the same. You ask for your vote to pay for the services of your officers, and, when you get your vote you administer the fund under the authority given. The fact that these men were to be brought in on September 1, and up to that time had not been brought in, does not, I think, make against the argument that the spirit of the legislation of last year was to place the service on a permanent basis and on a basis of competition and merit in appointments, which, up to that time, had not been the case. As I said then, so I believe now, that the outside service should have been administered in the spirit of that Act. While I do not want to go over that discussion again, I find that there are new appointments, for which, as yet, I think we have no reasons. A draughtsman was appointed in the chief engineer's branch at $700, the appointment being made by order in council on August 6, 1908, and dated back to April 1, 1908.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was the beginning of the fiscal year.

Mr. FOSTER. But the appointment was not made at the beginning of the fiscal year, but was dated back. Now, the Civil Service Act provides, both with reference to the outside and the inside service, that no appointment shall be made until the office has been created, in the case of the regular Civil Service, and, in any case, until the amount has been voted by parliament. The whole spirit of the Act is against dating appointments back. Mr. F. O. Hamel was appointed at $700 in the chief architect's branch. What is the explanation of that appointment?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Hamel is a draughtsman, and the services of a draughtsman were required and accordingly he was appointed. That is all I can say.

Mr. FOSTER. That answer might be set up and stereotyped. Was the appointment so urgent that it could not be left over from August 6, when it was made, to September 1, when the machinery of the

Civil Service Act would be at the disposal of the minister for all appointments?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a good deal of work on hand last year, and the chief architect was very much in need of additional assistance. I was very desirous, as far as possible, to carry out the views expressed in the House that architectural work should be done in the department. So, it became absolutely essential to have additional help.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has not been very explicit as to what would have happened had he waited for twenty-five days later and made the appointment in the regular form.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Plans on important public works would have been delayed. This young man had been employed temporarily because the services of one of his profession were needed, so he was actually in the office before the order in council was passed, and I think probably had been working from about April 1.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose he must have been there, or the minister, surely, would not have paid him.

Mr. J. D. REID. There was an item relating to rents that stood over. Is it to come up this afternoon?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I tried to bring it forward two or three times before. I shall be glad to have it dealt with this afternoon.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. minister promised us some information on the subject. I do not wish the item to stand any longer than is necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a new appointment at $1,250, the appointee being Mr. Arthur Barsalou—made on the same date, 6th August. Apparently, the minister could not wait twenty-five days in this case either.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Unfortunately, his predecessor died unexpectedly, and we had to fill the office. Mr. Barsalou's salary was not dated back, was it ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, to April 1. The minister could not have had both the living and the dead on the salary list at the same time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My deputy tells me that Mr. Barsalou was in the department before that, perhaps performing the duties while his predecessor was ill.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, he was not appointed before the death of his predecessor ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was appointed because of his predecessor's death, but I fancy he was discharging the duties during his predecessor's illness.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will get the information to which I have referred ?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Contingencies, $15,000.

Mr. AMES. Does this cover printing and stationery ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. It is the same as last year.

Mr. AMES. I believe this covers the printing of the annual report of the Public Works Department. I desire to mention a matter which was called to my attention by a chemistry professor and a prominent paper manufacturer in Montreal recently. These gentlemen tell me that the report of the Public Works Department and other blue-books are printed upon paper which will not stand the test of time. Are steps taken to have a limited number of these reports printed upon paper of such a character that these books will be available twenty-five or fifty years from now ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not heard that question raised before. It concerns the Stationery Department rather than my own. I shall be glad to bring the matter to the attention of that department to see if there is anything in the point my hon. friend raises.

Mr. AMES. The point is this: If the paper on which the records of the Public Works Department and others are printed is of wood pulp or chemical pulp, in twenty-five or thirty years from now it will crumble away and the books made of it will be useless. I would ask the minister if he will have inquiries made whether the paper used is wood pulp or chemical pulp paper. If it is, it would be well that a limited number of copies of reports should be printed on better paper.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose my hon. friend would not suggest parchment——

Mr. AMES. No, but linen paper.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose there is a difference between ground pulp paper and chemical ?

Mr. PATERSON. The reports of the different departments are found in the bound sessional records. Whether that is the same kind of paper or not, I do not know.

Mr. AMES. I think the bound sessional records are simply the regular blue books. However, the matter is worth looking into, because these records should be preserved.

Rents, repairs, furniture, heating, &c.—Dominion buildings—rents, &c., $200,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Our time is somewhat limited. We shall probably not have much leisure left this week, and next week will be a busy one, according to the work arranged for. I understood the Minister of Finance was anxious to get a supply bill of the supplementary estimates and such

others as were neecssary. While we are willing to facilitate that, we do not propose to shove through all these items within the time proposed. So, I think, if the ministers want to get their original estimates through, they should give their time to the urgent portions of them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We might take some of the items under 'Public Works—Miscellaneous.' This includes salaries for a number of employees.

Mr. FOSTER. But they are salaries for next year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but standing in the same position as those under 'Civil Government' that we have just put through. And the money is needed.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a very inclusive item. I think you will see a lot of discussion on it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It relates altogether to my own department.

Mr. FOSTER. But you have here the Deep Waterways Commission and other important items. Of course, the minister can take up time on this if he likes. But my desire is to facilitate what seems to be a matter of some urgency. There are some votes in Civil Government left.

Civil Government—Department of Mines—salaries, $148,831.50.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to this department, I have been puzzled over it. It is difficult for me to find out how it came, and pretty nearly as difficult to find out ' whither it goeth.' The minister, it may be, will enlighten me. Under the Department of Mines, he has fifty of the old permanents, and thirty-eight whom he has taken in from outside. Where did he get the fifty permanents? What does the department in that respect include? Does it take in the whole of what was the old Geological Survey?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Mines). The permanent officials, according to my addition, number 46 not 50. However, these are the permanent members of the old Geological Survey, and also several permanent officers of the Mines Branch of the Department of the Interior. The Mines Department, as at present constituted, is made up of these two—the Geological Survey and the Mines Branch of the Department of the Interior, over which Dr. Haanel presided. I think I have not increased the number of officials—not very considerably at all events. That is whence the department came ; as to ' whither it goeth,' that remains to be seen It is going along very successfully, and doing, I think, very good work.

Mr. FOSTER. There are three permanents, a deputy minister, one in subdivision B of the 1st division, and one in the third division, subdivision A. Where did these three come from ? I suppose the deputy minister was Mr. Low, director of the Geological Survey.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes. When the department was organized, he occupied the position of director and deputy head of the Geological Survey and became deputy minister of the Department of Mines. Mr. Marshall was accountant of the Geological Survey and is now accountant of the Mines Department.

Mr. FOSTER. At the same salary?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes. His salary was $2,275. We are giving him an increase of $100.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the statutory increase?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, there is a third division clerk, sub-division 'A'. Who is that?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is Miss B. Urquhart, stenographer and she was in the geological survey.

Mr. FOSTER. Last year this clerk received $837.50 and the estimate this year is $937.50. How is it that she comes in with an increase of salary instead of being transferred at the same salary?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that this lady was a junior second-class clerk and the Act provided that she would go into a class with a minimum salary of $900.

Mr. FOSTER. Do the junior second-class clerks go into that division or into the $800 minimum division?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Into 'A' of the third division. She goes into the class from $900 to $1,200.

Mr. FOSTER. Well then $37.50 would be the statutory increase for her. Whether this is the place or not to raise the question, it comes in here. What is the basis, supposing they are getting $700, or whatever they are getting as junior second-class clerks, upon which you put these into the $900 to $1,200 division instead of the $800 to $1,600 division?

Mr. FISHER. That would depend entirely on the quality of the work that the clerk was doing. It is open to the minister to decide into which of these divisions the clerk would go. Wherever the salary was common to two divisions certain clerks, if they got so much salary, say $800, who were doing work that is of a quality that is intended for the third division would go

into that division, whereas, certain other clerks, who were getting $800 and who were doing work of a quality which is intended for the second division, would be put into 'B' of the second division instead of 'A' of the third division.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that left entirely for the minister to say?

Mr. FISHER. As far as those in the service, before 1st September, are concerned, the commissioners have nothing to do with it. In future it will depend upon examination. In future, applicants for entry into the service will go into 'B' of the third division or 'B' of the second division, according to the examination they pass.

Mr. FOSTER. But where there is a certain salary, such as that which has been mentioned, the discretion is entirely with the minister as to whether they shall go into the $800 to $1,600 division or the $900 to $1,200 division?

Mr. FISHER. If they were in the service, yes. In future that cannot occur.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there are five from the outside service in the first division. Was there any addition made to the salary of these five during the six months preceding the first of September, or during any part of the fiscal year?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not think there were any increases made. I am advised by the director that there were no increases made to bring any of these officials into other classes than those that the salaries which they were then receiving entitled them to.

Mr. FOSTER. There are 38 brought in from the outside service and, as I understand, the minister says there were no increases in the salaries of the 38 immediately prior to the 31st September and that they were transferred on the same salaries as those which they were receiving during the year?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Quite right.

Mr. FOSTER. So that in this case there was no boosting of salaries in order to give them a better position. Well, I commend the minister for the policy of his department. It is in strong contrast with the policy of some of the other departments, the head of one of which is sitting very close to us now.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister be good enough to give a general idea of what the extra clerks are doing? The Mines branch has only been organized two or three years but the increase in the number of clerks in the geological survey and the mines branch has been considerable. What is the cause of the increase and what is the great need of it?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is news to me to be told that there has been a considerable increase in the number of technical officers or clerks of any kind in the Department of Mines.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister give us the expenditure five years ago and the expenditure to-day?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have not the expenditure five years ago. The expenditure has increased somewhat in the last few years, but it has not increased very largely. The additions to the staff, speaking from recollection, have been those of technical officers. We have in the Mines Branch, several new technical men, mining engineers and others of that kind. But as to clerks, stenographers and other officials of that kind, there has been very little increase in the department. I am not speaking from notes or memoranda but I know the demands made upon me to increase the staff have not been met very largely because we could not find the men we desired to have in those positions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What was the expenditure in the mines branch and the geological survey branch during the last year?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The total vote for 1908-9 was, for the Mines branch, $100,000. This year the vote is $81,000. For the assay office in Vancouver the vote last year was $26,000 and this year it is $18,000, a decrease in both cases. There is an increase, which will probably equal the amount of that decrease, in the geological survey vote from $204,750 to $240,000. Therefore, I think, we are hardly open to criticism for having increased the expenditure.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am very glad to see that the minister is so well satisfied with the amount of work being done for that amount of money. If we will look back ten years we will see that the department got along with about $110,000. When the expenditure was increased from that to over $200,000, we would naturally expect that there would be some material benefits derived from it. Is the minister continuing the practice of allowing officers of the survey to work for private companies during the summer months and then to come back in the fall and step into the department, their salaries going on as usual?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I would prefer that the discussion on the work of the department should be on the main estimates when I shall have considerable information to give. The work that is being done to-day by the department in infinitely greater than it was ten years ago; whether it be

greater relatively to the increased expenditure I cannot for the moment say. The policy of the department is not to permit its officers to do private work. There have been one or two instances in which the officers of the department were needed by explorers, private companies if you will, for a season's work. They could not find experienced men along these special lines elsewhere in Canada and in one or two instances, only one instance this last year, an officer was permitted to leave the department, but without salary, and to return afterwards, giving to the department all the inforamtion he had obtained while working for the private company.

Mr. LANCASTER. He was of course well paid by the private company?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have no doubt he was probably paid more than he would be paid by the government, and right there you touch on a very important point. Our difficulty is to retain in the service of the government the best men. During the last few years two or three officers of the survey have left our employment simply because instead of being satisfied with $2,000 a year or so they have been able to receive $5,000 from private companies. In one or two cases the question for us was whether we should permit one of our best men to take service with a company exploring for coal for a few months, or lose his services altogether as his resignation was practically in our hands. If it were a general practice it perhaps might not be a good one. Of course while that officer is in the employ of the private company he is not paid by the government. There a few private geologists throughout the country, and many mining engineers, but we have in the survey most of the prominent geologists in Canada, and I believe it is desirable to occasionally permit them to leave the employment of the government in the summer months and do work for a private company, they giving to the government for publication in the reports the information they had obtained. There is another practice of the department somewhat similar. At present there is very great interest in the exploration of iron ore deposits throughout Canada, and within the last two or three weeks three applications have been made to me to permit one of the officers who is an expert in iron and the magnometric survey of iron deposits to make surveys of privately owned property. Some of these applications have come from within a short distance of Ottawa. We permit the officers to do the work, and I think it is conducive to the development of the iron industry. It does not cost the government very much, we simply loan the man for a few weeks. We are not interfering with the business of any outside geologists or mining engineers because there is a great dearth of specialists in Canada for this work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister has laid down a very dangerous proposition. He knows well that for five years one of the prominent men of the geological survey, in company with a number of employees of the government, located the best coal mines in the Northwest, and hardly had he handed over his report to the department, and before it could be circulated amongst the public generally, he went into the employment of a private company and started out west and located twenty-six of the best coal mines in that territory. A $6,000,000 company, controlled by a few men who are able to get this official away from the department, has been organized. If the minister will go back a few years he will see that other men have been doing the same thing, going out for members of parliament who were interested in these mines, spending their summers on the work and then stepping in to the department and getting their salaries during the winter months when they had nothing else to do. True, they may turn over the information to the government but it is after the companies have made all the use they could make of it. It is a very dangerous precedent for the minister to lay down.

Mr. LANCASTER. The remarks of the member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) are worthy of considerable attention. It is a vicious principle to lay down, that these men who are presumably acting for the country at large and who acquire experience in the discharge of their duties, should place their knowledge at the disposal of private persons or companies. To let these men go out and give the benefit of their information to private corporations for a few months in the year and then come back and spend the winter in the government service, dumped again on the people at a good salary, and go out again the next spring or summer to the private corporations, it seems to me is absolutely wrong in principle and in practice. We are told that the corporations need these men. If they do they should employ them for the year round and pay them substantial salaries. I must protest against this whole practice.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend is making a mountain out of a mole hill. The practice is in the interest of the mining industry of Canada, although I admit that it should be exercised with due caution. I understand that it is the practice of all geological surveys to do the very thing we are doing. Many years ago Dr. Barlow went to Sudbury and made a scientific survey of the nickel deposits in the interest of the nickel industry there, and his work is said to have resulted in very great benefit to the country. The department

lost nothing whatever by that; nor did it lose anything by permitting one of the geologists, who is an expert in coal, to go into the country west of Edmonton and assist in the exploration of an area of land in the mountains known to contain coal, and known long ago to contain coal. He did not lead the company to the coal field or give them any information as to the location of the coal deposits. We have known for many years that the coal existed in that northern country.

Mr. LANCASTER. Should not that information be kept for the benefit of the people and not used to enable private individuals to make money?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is published in the report of the Geological Survey.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then why did these people want the man?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Because they needed his services and paid for them. If we had not allowed him to go, he would have been in the employ of that company to-day, and we would have lost his services; there is the whole question. Until two years ago Dr. Barlow was in the service of the Geological Survey at a salary of between $2,000 and $3,000; he was one of the best men in the service, and was offered $5,000 a year by a German company operating in the west and having large investments in Canada, and he is with that company to-day and we have lost his services. Mr. McEvoy, who was a long time in the Survey, and was one of our best men, was until recently in the employ of the Crow's Nest Coal Company, receiving three times the salary we paid him.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is the minister aware that Mr. Dowling, after making his report, spent five years in this district with a number of employees, all of whom were paid by the government, and that he did not make his final report on these locations until last year?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend is not well informed. It is true Mr. Dowling worked in that part of the country for many years. He always returned to Ottawa in the fall, wrote his report, and it was published. The country at large has all the information collected by Mr. Dowling and has had it for years, so that any person could have gone to that country and staked out a coal location. If my hon. friend wants to stake out a coal location, he can do so, as there is plenty in British Columbia ; the whole country is full of coal. I think the practice is in the interest of the mining industry.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If Mr. Dowling made a report in regard to these mines, why was it not made in connection with these companies? Other companies who are anxious to operate in that country send out men themselves to locate the mines, but Mr. Dowling, having been there for years, knew exactly where he could go and locate them, which he did. I do not think it is fair to the people of the country generally to say that anybody is allowed to go and locate mines.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. In what year was Mr. Dowling in this district?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In 1906.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. When was his report published?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Every year.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. But all these reports are generally about two years late, and the department allows these men to go out and give information to private parties before it is given to the public. I think it is most reprehensible.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know whether or not my hon. friend has read the reports of the Geological Survey. The report in question, which my hon. friend criticises is found in the report of the Geological Survey of 1906.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. And what was the date of his exploration?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The same year. The report was laid on the table of the House in the session of 1907.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman must know that engineers of this character are employed in the provinces, especially in the province of Ontario. These men are drawing small salaries, and yet they have absolutely refused to join large corporations in the Cobalt district, where they could get five or six times their present salary, simply because they thought to do so would be an imputation on their honour. If this department is to be manned by that class of men, you will find you are simply sending men out who will examine areas and make valuable discoveries and then go outside the department and disclose what they have found for the benefit of private speculators. I have had occasion once or twice in this House already to reflect on the Mining Department. If there is one department in this government which is a sink-hole for public money and doing very little good for the people, it is that one. Its report is the laughing stock of every other geological department in the world. That report contains about 3,000 pages, comprising simply a recital of brick yards and oil companies and other things which any one could get in Bradstreet. You can get all that information in the reports of the Manufacturers Association. There is no one who could not in his own office compile just as much information as is given in that report. But the size of the volume is intended to im-

press every one with the fact that the department is doing enormous work. I find that the smallest reports are those of departments which do the most work. When I see the bulky volume and the enormous amount of words and figures given in it, I cannot help coming to the conclusion that there is not much doing in that department, and that this report is only issued as an excuse for three or four men to draw big salaries. The department has not issued a single really good geological map, but you will find in this report stories about its officers getting up at six in the morning and paddling down the river and meeting a flock of wild ducks and returning in the afternoon and such particulars which are no earthly use to any one. What the people want is a report in accord with the best practice of other geological departments. We ought to have a man at the head of this Geological Survey who knows his business and not simply one who wants to draw a big salary and do nothing. How many of these men have given us any information about the various provinces? We have hardly anything in the reports about the great province of Quebec, yet every one knows there must be a lot of mineral wealth lying along the route of the Transcontinental Railway where it runs through that province. The geology there is the same as in Ontario where the silver mines have been discovered. You never find anything of value in this report, but when any valuable mineral discovery is made, you do not get news of it in this report until a year later, and in the meantime private indivduals have gone to work and staked out valuable claims. I hope that the minister will become impressed with the idea that the class of men we want are mining engineers who think more of their honour and profession than of the money they may make.

Mr. SEALEY. While my personal knowledge of the subject would not warrant my expressing an opinion on this matter, I may say that I have had applications from engineers for copies of this report, and through the kindness of the minister I have received two copies more than my allowance, and I have letters certifying that the report is a most valuable one. It seems to me that this is strong evidence from practical men that the report does not deserve the criticism we have just heard.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Criticisms of the department such as we have just had from the hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) cannot, because of their exaggerated character, do any injury to the department in the opinion of the public. It is not correct to say that in the Bureau of Mines of Ontario the practice is not in vogue of occasionally permitting men on the staff of that bureau to work for private companies.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Will the hon. minister name one case? He has contradicted my statement and ought to give his authority.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I might say that Professor Miller, an eminent geologist and expert, one of the best men in Canada, was permitted by the Ontario government to do private work and did it for the Larose mine. There are other cases of a similar kind. I am not defending or condemning the practice. It was a great advantage to the Larose people to have Mr. Miller's opinion regarding the geology of that mining claim. The practice is probably not indulged in any more there than elsewhere. It is followed in Washington in the geological survey there, and I am advised that in Germany geologists in the employ of the government are from time to time used by private companies, and at such times of course do not draw pay from the government. The criticism of the hon. gentleman is so exaggerated and unfair and inaccurate that it cannot possibly be received seriously, especially by hon. gentlemen who are better informed of the work done and the personnel of the men at the head of the Geological Survey and the Mines branch than my hon. friend appears to be. It is not correct to say that the report of the Mines branch issued recently has not been well received. We have had from all over Canada, from mining engineers and others, numerous demands for copies of that volume, and we have received compliments from mining men every where as to its value. It is a large volume, and it costs a good deal of money, but to say that you could get the information it gives in Bradstreet's is simply absurd.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I might say to the hon. minister that Professor Miller was sent by the Ontario department to settle a dispute in which the Ontario government was interested and to make an investigation of the Larose mine when the charge was made that it was stealing government ore.

Mr. FOSTER. I find in the return brought down that Mr. Dickinson is represented as having had an increase of $200, on the 17th of June, 1908. Was he in the outside service ? If so, the minister was hardly correct in saying that no increases had been made. Mr. Matheson, field explorer, had an increase of $300 on June 17, 1908.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised by the director that these increases were made before the Civil Service Act was discussed.

Mr. FOSTER. It was before the Civil Service Act was passed, but not before it was discussed.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The director says that the recomendation for the increase was

made at a time when the department had no knowledge of the proposed Civil Service Bill. It had absolutely no connection with it.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be all right, but it modifies, to a certain extent, the statement made by the minister. However, it is not a very large one.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. When the items of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) were under discussion here, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) being in charge, the items were passed under the understanding that, when the other estimates of the minister were under discussion, any matter relating to the department could be taken up on any item. I think that you, Mr. Chairman, will bear me out in that. I desire to bring to the attention of the minister an important matter relating to a question of weights, concerning which a difference now exists between vessel owners and the railways. I would like to know the position the department is going to take in the matter. If it is desired that I should not discuss it upon this item, I will take it up under any other item that may be agreeable to the minister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It would not be applicable on this item.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. All the items were permitted to go through on the condition that we were to be allowed to discuss any subject on any item of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Are all the minister's main estimates through?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, all the estimates of the Inland Revenue Department. I was not present on the occasion referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. A. Currie), but I read 'Hansard' and, while I will not dispute the statement made by the hon. gentleman I am inclined to think that 'Hansard' does not report it that way.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE It ought to. If the minister has any objection——

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have no objection. But we are dealing with the Department of Mines, and that is hardly an occasion for discussing a matter of weight and measures.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Will there be any other opportunity to discuss the matter? If the minister will name an item under which the discussion can go on, I shall be pleased to postpone the discussion.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know that I can name an item.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Are there other estimates to come down?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No estimates in the Inland Revenue Department, so far as I know. But, if there is no other statement of that department, I submit that either the Minister of Finance or the Prime Minister is the person to suggest when the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. A. Currie) should discuss a matter of this kind. I would point out also that the deputy Minister of Inland Revenue is not here, nor is the inspector of weights and measures. The question is a technical one, and I am frank enough to admit that I must be coached by the inspector of weights and measures on a question of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. J. A. Currie) that, if there are other estimates of the minister to come down, the matter can be taken up then; if not, he can bring it up on going into Supply.

Mr. SPROULE. It is much more convenient to discuss these matters in Supply than on Concurrence. It is the right of the hon. member to proceed with the discussions on Concurrence, and, undoubtedly, he will avail himself of his privilege if opportunity is not given to him to go on with the discussion now. The convenience of the House as well as of the minister should be consulted, and the discussion should go on in Supply rather than when Concurrence is taken, and we are all in a hurry to get it through.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Foster) has indicated when the matter can be discussed.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Though I have been here but a few weeks, I know one or two of the rules of the House. The discussion of the matter I wish to bring to the attention of the minister should be, as far as possible, non-partisan. Moreover, it can be dealt with more readily and with greater freedom in Committee of Supply. In Supply, we are not narrowed down to the discussion of the exact terms of a resolution, and often we can have the minister give expression to views quite in line with the suggestion made from this side. But to bring forward such matter in the form of a want of confidence vote on going into Supply would be to give the discussion a partisan tone, which is not desirable. If the minister will name an item on which we can go on with this discussion, that will satisfy me completely. If the minister is going to bring down even one item of supplementary estimates——

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I cannot say that there will be even one item. I do not

know that there will be any supplementaries at all. Again, I do not want to make an agreement for the leader of the House as to the time when a discussion may take place.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE I am prepared to go on now.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. If it is a proper thing to bring on a discussion of a matter of weights and measures on an item relating to the Mines Department, it will be all right to have the discusion, but I do not think it is, and I do not think the Chairman will permit it. I may mention that the main estimates of the Department of Mines have yet to be considered.

Mr. FOSTER. Then what the minister has to do is to say that when that item comes up we can discuss weights and measures, or any other thing.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. If the chairman of the committee is willing. I have no right to lay down the rule that any hon. gentleman may discuss a question of weights and measures on an item relating to the Department of Mines; it is for the chairman to say whether that can be done. I would prefer not to discuss the question of weights and measures until I have the inspector of weights and measures here, to give me the information that I might require.

Mr. LANCASTER. If I recollect rightly, when the Minister of Public Works was passing Supply he could not give information about some of his items because they related to the Department of Inland Revenue, and as the Minister of Inland Revenue was absent it was understood that we would have plenty of opportunity to discuss these questions with regard to weights and measures when the Minister of Mines was passing his Supply. If the Minister of Inland Revenue has no other item for his department, it is up to him now to make good that understanding. When his colleague promised us that the Minister of Inland Revenue would give us certain information, it is up to the Minister of Inland Revenue to give us that information now, or else to tell us that he will do so on some other item of his department, if he has any other item. But it will not conduce to getting his items through the House for him to refuse now to carry out an understanding made between the Minister of Public Works and some opposition members.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. If the chairman would rule that the discussion might go on now I would have no objection to doing so, if my deputies were here. But they are not here. I have not the information at hand, and on that score I would object to the discussion taking place now.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then let the item stand.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The Minister of Public Works stated when we were discussing an item with reference to the astronomical building and asked us to let the item go through, that a full explanation would be given by the Minister of Inland Revenue when he appeared in his place. We treated the Minister of Inland Revenue with the utmost courtesy and passed every item in his department without question, on the understanding that when he came to take his seat in the House we would be permitted to open up the discussion and get some information from him, even if there were only one item to come up in his department. I understand that the main estimates are now going through, and that the minister wishes to pass the item so that he can get the money at the beginning of next month. Now, if there is no other item coming up under weights and measures, I hold that we are entitled to discuss this item now, or ask that the item stand.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister can get out of the difficulty by saying five words. The fact is that another minister was putting these estimates through for the hon. gentleman's department, and the other minister did not know a blamed thing about them. We kindly consented to let them go through, on the minister's explaining that on another item, or on any other item, when the Minister of Inland Revenue was present he would give us full explanation. Now the minister says that he is not the boss of the committee, that it is the chairman. Well, all the minister has to say is that he has other estimates coming down for mines, and that when these come for discussion he is willing to hear a discussion upon weights and measures, or any other thing which was delayed because of his absence, and in regard to which the Minister of Public Works became responsible for giving us an opportunity of making these criticisms.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have already said that I would be quite willing to do that. But the main estimates of this department have yet to be voted. The Minister of Public Works was putting through a vote for a building for the Mines Department, not for the Inland Revenue Department, and he said at that time that the Minister of Mines being absent, he could not give the information, but he held it over a day or two, and he read a long statement. But that was with reference to the Mines Department. However, whatever agreement was made by my colleague I am willing to carry out. The hon. member for North Toronto suggested that I might give the information when

some further estimates were being considered. I am quite willing to discuss weights and measures when I have my deputies here.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. gentleman said that a while ago we would not have lost so much time.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I did not say so, but I said that was a question for the chairman to determine, not for me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. While I do not want to draw the line too closely, yet when a discussion is evidently not relevant to the item, it will require the very apparent desire of the committee before I would feel at liberty to allow it. No doubt all understandings on which a previous item has gone through should be honoured. At the same time, the chairman finds it necessary that in all these cases where there should be some special item before him in order that he may be able to maintain the relevancy of debate. I think I should fairly point out that on the general question of the Mines Department it might be inconvenient to bring in the question of weights and measures, unless some items relating to that subject were before the committee, so that the committee could be held to relevancy and to that one subject.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I think no one questions your position; I think, however, it is not borne out by the authorities.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would prefer that there should be no discussion of my ruling in the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. We have always understood that an agreement of this kind by a minister of the Crown would be honourably carried out, because it was made for the convenience of the government, and it was expected as well that the chairman will concur in the arrangement which has been made by the minister. It is taken for granted that no objection will be raised in the way of applying the rules of debate which prohibit the discussion of a question when an arrangement of this kind is made as a matter of convenience to the government.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—salaries (including Prof. E. E. Prince at $4,000), $228,640.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). There were 77 permanent employees and 78 outside and temporary employees, making a total of 155. It is proposed to increase the number by 16. In the first division, subdivision 'A,' there is an amount of $4,000 which is asked for Professor Prince. That sum was voted the other day in the Supplementary estimates for the current year. We have to provide also for his salary next year. Professor Prince was receiving the salary of $2,500, and it is proposed to give him $4,000 and to put him in the first division, subdivision 'A.' Professor Prince has been appointed international commissioner under the fishery treaty, and I understand that the salary that was paid to the American commissioner is even higher than the one we are going to give Professor Prince. It is proposed that Professor Prince shall not only busy himself with this international commission, but also with other commissions which we may appoint in this country. He will remain the scientific expert of the Fisheries branch.

Mr. FOSTER. You have one extra there?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The minister gave us to understand the other day that such regulations as Professor Prince would make as an international commissioner would be laid before the department and parliament and would be liable to be changed by parliament. I think the minister was in error, and I want to call his attention to the fact that the treaty states that the finding of the commissioners is final and that the department and parliament has nothing to do with it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Except that there is a provision in the treaty to this effect:

Article III. The two governments engage to put into operation and to enforce by legislation and executive action, with as little delay as possible, the regulations, restrictions, and provisions with appropriate penalties for all breaches thereof.

So that when the regulations have been adopted by the two commissioners they are to be laid before the government and the government has to come before parliament for the purpose of securing the necessary legislation to enforce the regulations.

Mr. LANCASTER. But parliament would be obliged to pass them. They could not change the regulations or reprimand Professor Prince if he had done wrongly. Therefore, the minister will see that my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is quite right in saying that parliament has no control over the matter. The treaty is that the two governments engage to enforce by legislation what these two commissioners do.

Mr. BRODEUR. We will have to come to parliament for the purpose of having legislation passed to enforce these regulations.

Mr. LANCASTER. You bind yourself to adopt them.

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course, the government would have to take the responsibility

of these regulations and if they are not proper regulations the government would be liable to censure.

Mr. SPROULE. That does not appear to be the feature of it at all. We understood that whatever these regulations were parliament had to concur in them or otherwise they could not become law. Now, we find that we have to pass legislation affirming them but that does not mean that we can change them.

Mr. BRODEUR. Parliament would have to pass legislation to enforce these regulations, and if they did not meet with the approval of the House parliament would have the right to refuse the necessary sanction.

Mr. LANCASTER. No; the treaty says distinctly that the two parties bind themselves to carry into effect the regulations which may be made by these two commissioners.

Mr. BRODEUR. Suppose the government were not able to secure the passage of this legislation ?

Mr. LANCASTER. The argument could be made that you would be liable to get into a war with this other country for breaking the treaty if you failed to carry it out. Surely the British government, when it makes that treaty, expects to carry it out and engages to enforce the regulations that the two commissioners make in so far as they can be enforced by legislation. The hon. gentleman pre-supposes that parliament might not concur in them, but parliament would have to swallow them or else throw the British government into the most deplorable position of having broken a treaty made with another country and which might be a cause for war.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the same with all treaties made by Great Britain. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that treaties made by Great Britain are not submitted to or approved by parliament except in cases where an expenditure of money is involved. I think also there is an exception in the case of commercial treaties which require some amendment to the Customs Act. These are the only cases provided for by the constitution in which treaties are referred to parliament. In other cases a treaty, as passed by the Crown, becomes the law of the land.

Mr. CROCKET. Did not the French and Japanese treaties require the ratification of this parliament ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, because it was formally provided in these two treaties that they had to be approved by parliament. These two treaties fell within the category of the treaties which I have just mentioned; that is to say, they were treaties requiring a change in customs law. There is a principle in the British constitution to the effect that taxation cannot be imposed even by the King without the sanction of parliament. The King would have no right to make any treaty by which taxation would be levied or expenditure incurred without the consent of the parliament of Great Britain. Such a treaty affecting Canada would require to be submitted to the Canadian parliament by the representative of the King here. But, those treaties which are signed by the King or his representative have not to be approved by parliament, and this is a treaty made by the King with the president of the United States.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. It is an old established principle of international law that where there is constitutional government when a treaty is made affecting territory or property or money, that treaty must be laid before parliament.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not in the case of territory, I think.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Yes; if you have read the discussion on the Napoleonic Code you will know that.

Mr. BRODEUR. Under the British constitution a treaty made by the King is law without being submitted for the approbation of parliament. There are only two cases where such treaties have to be ratified by parliament. First, where they may levy taxation on the country and, second, where they may cause expenditure.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then these reasons apply in the case of this treaty, because those two commissioners are given power with regard to our fisheries that may result in more concern to the country than if they affected either territory or taxation. Upon the minister's own statement this parliament would be bound to ratify the regulations laid down by these two commissioners under that teraty. There is no use trying to hypnotize ourselves into any other belief, for we would have no power to change these regulations without putting Great Britain on the verge of war.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the same with any treaty which the King makes.

Mr. LANCASTER. If it is the same it is time Canada should raise her voice to stop it. I am not here to dictate what Great Britain should do, but if Great Britain says that we must approve of any regulations which these two men may make it seems to me it is practically unconstitutional. This country elects 220 members of parliament to deal with her affairs, and we should not be asked to leave it in the power of two men to dispose of our great assets in the fisheries for four years. If Great Britain has not said that these regulations shall be subject to the approval of the Canadian parliament, Great Britain ought

to have said it. Such a proceeding renders this parliament helpless and pledges us ahead of time to do what these commissioners may decide or else to place Great Britain in the position of breaking her contract with the United States. I am still of the opinion that we have no power whatever over these regulations once they are made.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. It has been one of the boasts of this government and of the Minister of Marine in particular that a new era had arrived and that Canada herself had now all to do with the making of treaties.

Mr. BRODEUR. Commercial treaties.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. But now the minister announces that these treaties are made by England and that we have nothing at all to say about them. How can he justify that statement with his declarations to the contrary all over the country?

Mr. BRODEUR. Formerly commercial treaties were made without the concurrence of the Canadian parliament or the consent of the Canadian government.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are they yet?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are many commercial treaties affecting Canada which have never been submitted to the Canadian parliament or to the Canadian government. In the case of Switzerland, a treaty is declared to include Canada, although Canada has absolutely nothing to do with the negotiation of that treaty in 1885. Later on when commercial treaties were being negotiated Great Britain began at first by giving us a plenipotentiary on the commission, and then she gave us the advantage of negotiating them absolutely ourselves. In some cases where negotiations had been carried out entirely by Great Britain there was a clause in the treaty providing that it would not affect Canada without her consent.

Mr. LANCASTER. Which class does this one belong to?

Mr. BRODEUR. This belongs to the class which is known as political treaties. I am afraid there may be some misapprehension with regard to this matter and so I may be permitted to explain. Mind you, we are living under the principles of the British constitution, and in Great Britain all treaties made by the King—with the exception of commercial treaties by which taxation may be levied or expense incurred —become law without the sanction of the British parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the King consent to give away colonial territory without the consent of the parliament of the colony?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether that would be done without submitting the question to the Canadian government, and I make a distinction between the Canadian government and the Canadian parliament. The point of the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) is that all these treaties should be submitted to the Canadian parliament before they are ratified, but I think he is going too far in that. I think we should be very well pleased that no treaty should be made affecting Canada without the consent of the Canadian government.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is this treaty one of these?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Canadian government consented?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then the Canadian government is to blame.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, if there is anything wrong in that treaty we are responsible for it just the same as the British government would be responsible for any similar treaties made in Great Britain. They are signed in the name of the King, and the British government is responsible for them. In the same way we assume the responsibility of this treaty. I do not know whether we get by it everything we asked, but I think we get almost everything. What my hon. friend suggests is that all treaties affecting Canada should be submitted to the Canadian parliament for its approval. Treaties made by the British government are not submitted to the British parliament for its approval, and can we ask the King to do for the Canadian parliament what he is not doing for the British parliament?

Mr. LANCASTER. If conditions exist which make it reasonable, why should we not?

Mr. BRODEUR. That has been the rule of the British constitution for centuries, and before we can get that changed for Canada, I suppose the British parliament will ask that it be changed for Great Britain.

Mr. LANCASTER. The British government has changed its habits with respect to consulting Canada with regard to treaties affecting this country. It is said that it will not make such treaties without the consent of the Canadian government. I do not see why it would not be proper to ask the British government to make such treaties subject to the approval of the parliament of Canada, to which that government is responsible.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are taking the constitution as it is. We have made a step

in the right direction, I think, because formerly these treaties were made without being submitted to the Canadian government. In England no treaty is made without the consent and concurrence of the British government, not the British parliament. The British parliament never interferes in the making of treaties except in cases where there is a question of taxation or expenditure. In no other case has the British parliament ever been called upon to approve of a treaty, though it might pass a vote of censure on the government for having agreed to it. The constitution is precisely the same in Canada. We are now in this position, that no treaty affecting Canada will be made without being submitted to the approval of the Canadian government. I think that is a step in the right direction. Perhaps changes may some time be made in England in the direction my hon. friend suggests; I would not object to that. But for the moment I suppose we must be satisfied that the parliament of Canada is treated in the same way as the parliament of Great Britain, because we are living under British institutions and under the rules of the British constitution.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the hon. minister say that the Canadian authorities could not have insisted on a provision in that treaty that it should be ratified by the Canadian parliament, just as the United States authorities insisted that it must obtain the ratification of the Senate of the United States?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am glad my hon. friend has brought up the question of the United States constitution. There is a great deal of misapprehension in this country on that subject. In the United States there is no responsible government. The President and his ministers are not responsible to parliament. The constitution of the United States provides that a treaty may not be made by the President and his ministers alone, but must be made with the advice and consent of the United States Senate—not Congress. The house of representatives is not called on to express any view of a treaty, unless, I suppose, it related to taxation or expenditure. But the United States Senate, under the constitution, participates in the making of treaties.

Mr. LANCASTER. And is responsible to the people.

Mr. BRODEUR. Senators are not elected directly by the people, but by the local legislatures. Some people in this country have thought it extraordinary that the United States Senate had something to do with the treaty recently made, and I am giving my hon. friend the reasons for that. We are not living under the United States constitution. I hope we shall never have a constitution like that of the United States. I do not want to make any comparisons, but I think our constitution is far superior to theirs. We are living under British constitutional principles, and according to those principles the King has the right to make treaties without submitting them to parliament.

Mr. LANCASTER. But if the government is responsible to the people, I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman objects to the government seeing that parliament shall approve of their action in the important matter of making treaties. What I want to protest against is that this government has consented to this clause, which gives this one man, representing the whole of Canada, the power to tie us up, without any changes or qualifications, for four years, to anything he chooses to do with regard to the fisheries of this country. No matter how bad it may be we cannot object to it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether it is necessary for me to say anything about Professor Prince. I think every member of this House will agree with me that he is well able to carry out the duty imposed upon him by that treaty. He has been in the service of the department for many years, and there is no man in Canada perhaps who knows more of our fisheries. He has been connected with all the investigations into the subject made during the years that he has been in the department, and has always given satisfaction and promoted the interest of the country. I am not going to-day to discuss the merits of that treaty; I hope we may have an opportunity to do so on another occasion. I will only say that I believe it will be found to be a treaty that will be to the advantage of our Canadian fisheries.

Mr. HENDERSON. I hope it will be to the advantage of our Canadian fisheries; but before we can discover whether it will be or not, it will be too late; the opportunity to make any protest will have gone. The discussion this afternoon has rather surprised me. I was not aware that the British government or the King would undertake to negotiate with the United States in a matter of such special interest to the people of this country, without being called on to do so by the Canadian government, or without having the subject matter of the treaty brought to their attention.

Surely the government must have taken the initiative and requested that a treaty be negotiated between Canada and the United States touching the important matter of our inland fisheries. It will be a surprise to those deeply interested in that industry to learn that their interests can be

dealt with in this manner. I am saying nothing about the qualifications of Professor Prince. I am confident that he will do his best in our interests, but he is only one and will be obliged to give way in certain matters if regulations are to be mutually agreed upon. While I have every confidence in Professor Prince, I regret that a treaty should have been negotiated in the manner in which this has been with regard to such an important interest. I assume that this government must have submitted the question to the King with the view of obtaining a treaty, and I regret that they did not insist so that it should not go into force before getting the assent of parliament.

Mr. BRODEUR. It has been submitted to the government.

Mr. HENDERSON. But the people are to have no opportunity of seeing it or saying a word about it until it comes into force. This is a very far reaching treaty, embracing interest of great importance to a large section of our people, and I can only express my surprise and regret that the government should have permitted a treaty to be negotiated under such conditions.

Mr. SPROULE. My understanding of several replies given with regard to that treaty was very different from what we are given to understand by the minister to-day. Several times the question has been brought to the attention of the House, and on each occasion the answer given created the impression on my mind that if there was anything in the treaty not satisfactory to parliament, parliament might not concur in it and it could not become law. The minister draws a distinction between government and parliament. Well, the government is the executive of parliament, and when the hon. minister was explaining the advantages accruing to our country from the wider rights secured by the present government, among these he put the right of Canada to concur in everything and negotiate everything affecting her interests before anything could be done. Now he says that the King makes the treaty and parliament has nothing to do with it at all. That does not leave parliament free to decide whether the treaty is good or bad.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the way it is done in England.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not what the minister this session led us to believe was the right his government has secured from the imperial parliament in the making of treaties.

Mr. BRODEUR. Commercial treaties.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman did not distinguish ? He says now that this is a political treaty and different from a commercial one. Well, it is a treaty in which we have an interest that may be represented by money. Was there not a provision in the Fisheries treaty of 1888 that it was to be submitted to parliament and approved by parliament ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. My hon. friend is referring to the Bayard-Chamberlain treaty. That was never approved by the United States Senate, and consequently never came into force.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there not a provision in the agreement that it should have the concurrence of the Canadian parliament before it became law ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The treaty was never submitted to our parliament. I am not sure whether there was such a clause or not, but at all events it was never put before parliament here. In fact the treaty was never made because by the United States constitution a treaty must receive the approval of the United States Senate, and this never got that approval.

Mr. FOSTER. The treaty was made just as much as the French treaty, which was negotiated by this government within the last year or two. So far as the two governments are concerned, their representatives discussed the whole question and signed the treaty.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Chamberlain-Bayard treaty never got the consent of the United States Senate.

Mr. FOSTER. Neither has the French treaty received the assent of the French Senate. The treaty was concluded and signed by the plenipotentiaries of both countries, then it went to the president of the United States and he approved it and sent it to the United States Senate, and that body smothered it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Under the British constitution a treaty is negotiated by the King or his plenipotentiaries with the advice and consent of his government. In the United States a treaty is negotiated by the plenipotentiaries, but before it is ratified it must have the assent of the United States Senate. In fact the United States Senate, in the negotiation of treaties, takes the same position as the British government.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the treaty making power.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would suggest that it would be well to let Professor Prince's duties be entirely devoted to international work. I know that the minister is very anxious to employ him, but he holds a very honourable position and I would like to make this suggestion.

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course, it might be very becoming to have Professor Prince devote all his time to this International Com-

mission. But he has been our scientist expert for many years and the chairman of many commissions. My hon. friend knows how competent he is on these questions. We cannot spare him from the department. We have men in the department who are qualifying themselves for these duties, and some day Professor Prince may be able to devote himself exclusively to the international commission. But, at present, the department cannot spare him.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister spoke of the differences between the American and the British constitution. I assume that all the members of this House were aware of the differences pointed out by the minister, but I do not think that anything the hon. gentleman said answered the suggestion I made that the British plenipotentiaries representing the British government on behalf of the Dominion of Canada might have proposed the insertion of a clause in this treaty requiring ratification by the parliament of Canada. I am satisfied that the British ministers would not have made any objection to such a course if it had been proposed by the Canadian government. There are several reasons why it seems to me ratification by the parliament of Canada should have been made a condition of this treaty. The province of New Brunswick is interested, not only with respect to the waters that form the international boundary line, but with respect to all of the waters of the St. John river, the principal waterway of the province, which is wholly controlled so far as its fisheries are concerned, by the provisions of this treaty. Formerly, the fisheries of the St. John, as all the fisheries of the Dominion, were under the control of the people through their representatives in the parliament of Canada. Now, this treaty has been negotiated——

Mr. BRODEUR. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) will permit me: This question has to be discussed in a few days on the motion of my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor). If it is possible I would like to have these estimates go through. The question of the St. John river is one on which there is much to be said, and on which I would like some time to answer. The matter is outside this vote——

Mr. CROCKET. I will not take much time. I was saying that, formerly, the fisheries of the St. John river, as the fisheries of all Canada, were under the control of the parliament of Canada. We had a fisheries law, passed by the people's representatives, regulating these fisheries. This treaty, as I understand it, has absolutely taken out of the control of parliament, and placed in the hands of a commission of two, one of whom is representative of a foreign government, the control of the waters of the St. John river, so far as fisheries are concerned,—not only where that river forms the international boundary, but down to the harbour of St. John.

Mr. BRODEUR. And also in the United States.

Mr. CROCKET. I am speaking of the effect on the Dominion of Canada. It seems to me most surprising that a government which professes to represent the Dominion of Canada should have placed in the hands of a commission of this kind such immense powers and that we can have no regulation of the fisheries, not only of the St. John but of its tributaries, without the consent of an appointee of the United States government. Nothing that the minister has said this afternoon justifies this treaty as it has been negotiated, and I think that the very fact that these fisheries are taken out of the control of the parliament of Canada and these large powers which were formerly vested in this parliament placed in the hands of a commission composed as I have indicated was good reason why there should have been inserted in that treaty a provision that it should not be effective without the consent of the representatives of the people in this parliament.

Now, one word—as I may not have an opportunity when the matter comes up—on the practical effect of what has been done. I would point out to the minister that great interest is taken in this matter by the people living along the St. John river. The minister knows that we had on the statute-book a law prohibiting salmon fisheries in the non-tidal waters of the St. John, and other rivers. But, for years, that law was a dead letter; so far as the St. John river was concerned, it was not observed, and the government did not attempt to enforce it. A few years ago, the government began the enforcement of the law in the non-tidal waters of the St. John river, with the result that such a furore was raised among the people, that the government were compelled last year to put through an order in council giving the people living along the St. John the right to fish for salmon with nets during every alternate fortnight during the open season. That concession has been done away with by the negotiation of this treaty, without reference to the wishes of the people or of their representatives, and without giving the people's representatives any chance to be heard with respect to the matter. For my part, I have not been able to see why the residents along the St. John river above Fredericton should not be entitled to the same privileges as those below Fredericton.

In the tidal waters, the people have the right to fish for salmon during the open season. Under the order in council passed last year, the people above Fredericton were limited to fishing during every alternate fortnight. This treaty has taken the question out of our hands, and I can say to the minister that the treaty will be most unpopular among the people living along that river, and he will find that the provision divesting this parliament of such powers will raise a pretty serious issue in the province of New Brunswick. I do not think that one word the minister has said this afternoon answers the objection I have made that there might have been inserted in this treaty a provision requiring ratification by this parliament before the treaty became effective.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will not discuss the question of the River St. John, because we will have an opportunity of dealing with it when the motion of my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) is made, and I understand that will be within a few days. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) says that this treaty does away with the present regulations. Let him wait until the regulations have been passed by the Commission, and he will find, probably, that the present regulations have not been done away with.

Mr. CROCKET. Does not the treaty give to the International Commission the right to make regulations?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. But that does not mean that the present regulations will necessarily be done away with. The hon. gentleman says the present regulations will disappear. But nothing has been done to justify him in saying that. As to the St. John river, of course the hon. gentleman confines himself to that part which is in Canadian territory. But the St. John river flows through a part of the state of Maine, and over that part the Canadian commissioner will have as much to say as the American commissioner will have to say with regard to the lower part of the river. The object is to protect the fisheries in both countries. My hon. friend is aware that one of the serious questions in relation to the St. John river is the throwing of sawdust into the river, and that difficulty arises principally in that part of the river which is in the United States. Suppose that some regulations are made by the commissioners under which this throwing of sawdust into the river will be done away with, does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) think that will greatly improve the situation? Does he not think it would be a great improvement upon the situation? Does he not think it would be worth while to have more investigation in such a case. I suppose he would agree with me. Well, these affairs which have been exclusively exercised by the state of Maine, are now going to be exercised by an independent commission. That is where I see some advantage.

Mr. CROCKET. It is quite true, as the minister states, that this treaty gives the International Commission control of the waters of the St. John river that are in the United States as well as of the waters that are in the Dominion of Canada. But I think the minister will see that that does not count for much in so far as the fisheries are concerned. The United States have practically no interest in the fisheries of the St. John river because Grand Falls is an absolute barrier to the progress of fish up the river; fish do not go further up the river than Grand Falls, and Grand Falls is a good many miles from the international boundary. So in that view it seems to me a most extraordinary thing to contemplate that a commission composed of two members, one of them an appointee of the United States government, a citizen of a foreign country, should have any voice in regulating the fisheries in all the waters of the St. John, even in the St. John harbour, and in every tributary of the St. John river. Now that the minister has admitted, as we were all well aware, that this government were responsible for negotiating this treaty, I am satisfied he will find before long that the treaty will not have done the government very much good, at least in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. BRODEUR. The statement just made by my hon. friend proves that the government was justified in putting the St. John river among the boundary waters, and the regulations regarding the fisheries in that river under the control of this commission. The hon. gentleman says that the fisheries exist in that part of the river which is wholly in Canadian territory.

Mr. CROCKET. And the United States has no interest in them. Why should it control them?

Mr. BRODEUR. Let us see what interest Canada has in it. Our fisheries are being depleted in the St. John river to-day by the dumping of sawdust in a part of the St. John river which is in American territory. From this cause our fisheries in Canadian territory were threatened with absolute destruction. Now when we get permission from the American authorities to appoint a commission with power to deal with this question of sawdust, I think we have done a great deal for the protection of our fisheries in the St. John river. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should find fault with this government, when he knows that the Americans are dumping sawdust in the St. John river and its tributaries, the result of which our fisheries from the bound-

ary to the sea were likely to be destroyed. Now, through this commission, we are going to have some jurisdiction over those waters, a jurisdiction that we had not before; therefore, instead of blaming this government for negotiating this treaty, I think this government is deserving of commendation for having included the St. John river among those over which the commission will have authority.

Mr. CROCKET. As to the regulation of salmon fishing in the non-tidal waters of the St. John, I understand the minister to say that there are no regulations promulgated as yet. Now if the minister has any control over this subject, I trust that he will see that the people living along the banks of the St. John in the non-tidal waters above Fredericton, will be put in the same position as those living below Fredericton. I trust that the minister will bear that representation in mind, if he has any voice in making these regulations.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister tell us what are Admiral Kingsmill's duties?

Mr. BRODEUR. Admiral Kingsmill has charge of the fisheries protection service; he discharges the same duties as were performed by Commander Spain.

Mr. FOSTER. He is discharging no other duties except those that come under the ordinary routine covered by Captain Spain?

Mr. BRODEUR. He has charge of the discipline and control of the fleet, if I may call it so; he has also to see that discipline is observed on the other boats engaged in buoying and lighting.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the line of service for which the government secured Admiral Kingsmill?

Mr. BRODEUR. We secured his services to take charge of our fisheries and protection service, and to develop the naval militia which was mentioned some time ago.

Mr. FOSTER. What has he done with reference to that matter?

Mr. BRODEUR. He has been instructed to look into the matter, and to prepare information for the government and the minister.

Mr. FOSTER Has he made any progress up to the present time?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not yet received any formal report.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to these 78 outside and temporary employees, were these all transferred into the service on the 1st of September at the same salaries with which they began the year, that is, April 1?

Mr. BRODEUR. They have all been transferred with the same salary, with some exceptions. My hon. friend wants to know the increases in salaries since the 1st of April to the 1st of September, because the other information is supplied in the report which has been brought before parliament. Out of the 78 there were Bourgeau, 400; Longtin, $350; Roy, $200; Hamel, $250; Boulay, $100.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—contingencies, $21,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister is making no reduction in his contingencies.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the vote is the same as last year.

Mr. FOSTER. And some of the clerical force has been put on the permanent list.

Mr. BRODEUR. There were no salaries under contingencies before; so I am informed by the acting deputy. We had a special vote for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is now the deputy minister ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no one. Mr. Desbarats is acting deputy.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is intended to be deputy minister ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not decided yet.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has not made up his mind ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not absolutely.

Mr. FOSTER. Now; now !

Mr. BRODEUR. I have an open mind.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand it, the old deputy is superannuated ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The superannuation has actually taken place ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it has not passed the Treasury Board. I understand that it has to go before the Treasury Board.

Mr. FOSTER. Until it passes the Treasury Board the minister has an open mind?

Mr. BRODEUR. An open mind as to the appointment of a new one.

Some resolutions reported.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Experimental Farm for the year 1908.—Mr. Fisher.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know if the hon. Minister of Agriculture intends to bring on the Civil Service resolution and Bill to be founded thereon before Easter ?

Mr. FISHER. I should be very glad to do so but I doubt if there will be an opportunity. We cannot proceed until the classifications of the House and of the Senate have been passed. The classification of the House has been before the House for some days in the name of the Prime Minister. That as well as the Senate classification will have to be adopted.

Mr. FOSTER. There is not much probability of it going on ?

Mr. FISHER. No I do not think so.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose we might say the same as to the Finance Minister's budget speech ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes; I contemplated that I would be able to proceed next Tuesday with the budget speech but it will have to go over until after the holidays.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister go into Supply immediately after the opening of the session to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. Not to-morrow. I understood that hon. gentlemen opposite desired to-morrow for another purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the motion for Supply be made ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. We desire afterwards to give priority to Supply.

At six o'clock House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 1, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank.—Mr. Talbot.

Bill (No. 119) respecting the Quinze and Blanche River Railway Company.—Mr. D. A. Gordon.

QUESTIONS.

GRAZING LEASES.

Mr. HERRON asked:

1. What are the total areas under lease for grazing purposes in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, respectively, distinguishing between irrevocable leases and leases with the two-year cancellation clause?

2. What is the annual rental payable thereon to the government, and how much was collected during the year ending 31st March, 1908?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior).

1. Saskatchewan. Area under open lease, 430,118 acres; area held under leases subject to cancellation on two years' notice, 77,449 acres; area held under irrevocable leases, nil acres. Total area under lease, 507,567 acres.

Alberta. Area under open lease, 345,116 acres; area held under leases subject to cancellation on two years' notice, 1,232,891 acres; area held under irrevocable leases, 359,232 acres. Total area under lease, 1,937,239 acres.

2. Saskatchewan. Present annual rental, $10,151.34; amount collected year ending March 31, 1908, $7,499.10.

Alberta. Present annual rental, $38,744.78; amount collected year ending March 31, 1908, $26,455.12.

GOVERNMENT LOANS.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

What are the amounts and dates of the loans falling due prior to December 31, 1913?

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

£1,763,678 4s. 10d., 1st May, 1911; £1,500,000 0s. 0d., 1st October, 1910; £1,700,000 0s. 0d., 1st October, 1913; £6,443,136 2s. 9d., 1st January, 1910; £1,380,900 0s. 0d., 1st October, 1912; £5,000,000 0s. 0d., 1st May, 1912.

In addition to the above there is a loan of £4,000,000 0s. 0d., which the government have the option of paying in 1910, or at any time thereafter, but which does not become due until 1935.

Of the above loans there is held in sinking funds and investment account, £3,207,774 2s. 5d.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY EXPENDITURE.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

1. What was the total amount expended to February 28, 1909, on the building and equipment of the National Transcontinental Railway, from Winnipeg to Moncton?

2. What is now the government estimate of the further amount required to finish it and put it in working order ready to hand over to the Grand Trunk Pacific?

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

1. $48,372,560.01.

2. $66,021,206.00 exclusive of Quebec bridge, Quebec terminals, and line thereto, Winnipeg terminals or large shops in that vicinity.

IMMIGRATION BONUSES.

Mr. VERVILLE asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to do away with the bounties on immigration?

2. If not, to what companies, individuals or associations will they be paid?

3. Does the government intend to have the restrictions on immigration observed? If so, in what manner?

4. Is the government informed of the methods of propaganda employed by the Salvation Army in England on the subject of immigration bounty?

5. If so, what attitude will the goverment take in this matter?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of Interior):

1. No.

2. Bonuses will be paid as at present to steamship booking agents, and money grants in aid of their immigration work will continue to be made to the societies &c., now receiving such grants year by year. Such as the Repatriation Society, of Montreal, the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, the Salvation Army, and the Western Canada Publicity office.

3. Yes, as at present.

4. Speaking generally.

5. The government will maintain its present attitude until reason for change is seen.

THE EASTER RECESS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday next, 7th April, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, the 13th April.

Motion agreed to.

THE LOBSTER FISHERIES.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a statement which I find in the St. John 'Standard' with regard to the violation of the Lobster Fishing Act. It is as follows:

It is reported that undersized lobsters are being caught and sold in enormous numbers along the western coast of Nova Scotia. A commercial traveller, whose business frequently takes him to that section of the maritime provinces informed the 'Standard' that the hotels and canneries in the vicinity of Digby and Yarmouth were buying wholesale quantities of undersized lobsters for three and three and a half cents each.

I wish to ask the minister if his attention has been brought to this statement, and if so, what he proposes to do in the matter.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). My attention has not been brought to that statement. I will make inquiries, however.

SUPPLY—THE CASSEL'S COMMISSION.

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

Mr. C. J. DOHERTY (St. Annes, Montreal). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to submit to the consideration of this House, and more particularly of the government, a matter which seems to me to be of grave importance to the people of this country, and one upon which I regret to say there is as yet no indication of an intention on the part of the government to take any steps in the direction in which it appears to me such steps are imperatively called for. As this House knows, in 1907 the Civil Service Commission, after making a more or less complete examination into the working of the different administrative departments of this government, submitted a report very severely condemning the workings of one department in particular. This was a department concerning which the commission had made a more careful investigation; but it criticised also other departments with regard to which it expresesd its regret that time had not allowed it the opportunity of making closer inquiry. Upon that report, the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries thought it desirable, in the exercise of the power conferred upon him by statute, to appoint a commission to inquire into the operations of his department. And he appointed the Hon. Mr. Justice Cassels as commissioner to elucidate the question whether or not its officials had so conducted themselves as to deserve the scathing condemnation pronounced by the Civil Service Commission.

In the month of January of this year, the commissioner appointed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made his report. That report has been in the possession of the government since some time in January and has also been in the possession of this House for some time; and early in this week we had laid upon the table an order in council in which was set forth the steps which this government had decided to take in consequence of the conclusions reached by the commissioner and set forth in his report.

It is not my purpose to deal in detail with the recommendations contained in that report. To my mind the report is more remarkable for what it ignores than for what it contains. It is more remarkable for what it declines to deal with than for what it has dealt with. While the government has seen proper to deal with some of the questions and with the cases of some individuals in particular condemned by the commissioner, it has kept an absolute silence on some things which are obviously the necessary consequence of the findings

of His Lordship Mr. Justice Cassels. Among those is one which, I think, completely overshadows all the others. If there be one thing that should have been brought clearly home to the minds of the government by the successive investigations and reports, that thing, it seems to me, was the need of immediate investigation into the other departments as well in order to determine whether practices similar to those found to exist in the Marine and Fisheries Department do not exist also in the others. One would have thought that the ministers in control of the other departments would not have waited for the report of Mr. Justice Cassels to see the duty incumbent upon them to look into their own respective departments and see to what extent these require to be set in order. While I said the Civil Service Commission in 1907 more specifically condemned the Marine and Fisheries Department, as showing lack of conscience, as conducted without regard to the principle that no man can serve two masters, as conducted in such a manner as to foster dishonesty among the employees and bring about loss to this government—while the Civil Service Commission has reported in this special manner with regard to this one particular department, their report is full of reflections on the other departments, not so detailed or specific, but which ought to have made perfectly clear to the government that the Marine and Fisheries Department is not the only one in which inquiry was called for. If you look at page 23 of their report, you will find that the commissioners tell us that:

In addition to the efficiency in the administration of the departments, a wider and broader question is raised, and that is how far the departments are efficient in looking after the best interests of the Dominion as respects the general expenditure.

And at page 24 they tell us—and they are not now talking of the particular Department of Marine and Fisheries, but of the departments generally:

Instances have been found of departments giving orders for stores and other services to be delivered within a year, in excess of the vote granted by parliament. Large amounts have been spent at different places in the Dominion for supplies bought from those enjoying political patronage at what may be called retail rates. Heavy expenditures have been incurred without the necessary consideration or supervision.

The Auditor General, in his examination on the question of stores, informed the commissioners that he really audited and took stock of only two public departments. He examines, through his officers, the accounts in connection with the Printing Bureau and also the stores in connection with the government railways, but not the stores of the militia or any other of the departments; and even if he did, while no doubt it might be found that in the great majority of the departments the stores would represent the balances as shown in the different stock books, neither the Auditor General nor his officers could certify as to the quality of the stores detailed in the several stock books, or whether the prices for which payment had been made were proper or excessive. Your commissioners are of opinion that in many instances stores are ordered unnecessarily, and it might be doubtful that a good quality is always delivered. Mr. Pottinger states in his evidence that it is his opinion that the amount paid by the Intercolonial Railway for coal was higher than it ought to be. In instances which have been brought to the notice of the commissioners, stores have been received which were not wanted and which it is difficult to get rid of. In fact, at different points stores have been shelved where in all probability they were unnecessary. The commissioners of 1892 dwelt on this matter and stated that they had had under consideration the question of having a director general of stores or a supply agent to purchase supplies for all services, but they had not had an opportunity of developing the subject. Your commissioners have come to the conclusion that the time has now arrived when it would be desirable in the public interests that purchasing agents, probably three, should be appointed at good salaries to make all purchases of goods required for the public service, and that all purchases required by the several departments should be procured by this means.

And they conclude—and this is a most remarkable statement, taken in connection with what precedes.

In this connection, your commissioners respectively beg to recommend that inquiry be made as to the working of the Prevention of Corruption Act of the imperial parliament passed in 1906, and in the bribery clause in connection therewith.

Could there be any more clear indication that in the minds and conviction of these commissioners there was work for a law of that kind to do in more than one department of the Civil Service? And then, after the scathing indictment which they laid against the officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department as having acted in a manner to indicate that they had discovered the secret of serving two masters, Scripture to the contrary notwithstanding, the commissioners go on to say—and I note that they make this observation apply to some of the other departments—and not to one department alone:

It seems amazing that this question has never been courageously faced and dealt with. There is evidently a power in the hands of responsible officers of some of the departments which they can exercise without the necessity of giving any account of it, and with the most demoralizing consequences all round. It is certain that under such a state of things it must be impossible to develop high character in the service, or rather to prevent the deterioration of what character there is.

And, finally, as showing that they felt that their work was not done, and that the investigation of other departments than

that of the Marine and Fisheries remained still to be done, we find them saying in conclusion:

> Your commissioners regret having been unable to investigate the condition of things in some of the other departments. But to do the work with any pretensions to thoroughness would take much more time than would probably be agreeable to the government.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if ever a government was put fairly in default by the trusted officers whom it had charged with the duty of looking into these affairs, to proceed to a second and thorough inquiry, an inquiry destined to ascertain to what extent there was going on in these different departments, operations which, in the opinion of these commisioners, would properly form a subject to be dealt with by the criminal law, this government was, by that report, put in that position. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries alone seems to have considered that there was any occasion for anything to be done. It is a case in which the Marine Department seems to have had a courage far in excess of that which characterized the other departments of the government. And I would have thought that my gallant and hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) would, under these circumstances have felt ashamed that his branch of the service should hold back when the marines were going to the front.

But, Mr. Speaker, it does not end there. The action of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries led to an inquiry, conducted as I have already said, and as this House knows, by his Lordship Justice Cassels. Much might be said with regard to the limitations imposed upon the scope of that inquiry. It is painful, as one goes through the volumes of evidence, to find the frequent occasions on which the learned and honourable judge conducting that inquiry felt himself constrained by the limited terms in which his powers were defined, to stop evidence at points where it had become, probably, of the greatest importance to the people of Canada that the evidence should proceed. I am saying not a word in criticism of the rulings of the honourable judge upon these questions. I think that every one who reads his commission and understands that his powers began and ended within the limits of the express terms of that commission will feel that he had no liberty to go any further, that he was strictly within his duties in insisting that the inquiry should be kept within the scope of the precise terms of the commission. But, at the same time, it will be difficult for any one reading that evidence and knowing the restrictions put upon it to avoid the inquiry. Why were these limitations inserted in the terms of the commission that appointed that man to inquire?—was there a real desire to know the truth and the whole truth and nothing but the truth about the administration of that department when the terms of that commission were settled and fixed? But, whatever may be said about the limitations imposed in that commission, from it did result some consequences, which, I venture to say, it has been of advantage to this country to have brought about. Facts were brought out into light concerning the department that I am sure it is a matter of regret for all of us, should ever have existed. No doubt it would have been a subject of greater gratification to the people of Canada had the result of that investigation been such as to show that the suspicions which floated over that department were without foundation. We would all have taken pride in the fact that this particular department had given no ground for serious suspicion in the minds of the Civil Service Commissioners, and as a matter of fact had been free from that lack of conscience with which it has been charged. But all have to recognize with regret that the department, as regards those of its officials into whose action the commissioner was permitted to inquire, has not come unscathed through the ordeal. Guilt was established. I am not going into the details, this House is as familiar with the report of the commissioners as I am. The government is, or should be, more familiar with that report than I am, and the government itself has taken action upon that report which indicates that, in some cases at all events, in its judgment, guilt was brought home to officials by that report. But the government's action has been as limited as the powers which they thought proper to confer upon the commissioner. There were many things which, under his commission, he was not allowed to see.

The order in council laid on the table of the House would seem to indicate that there are many things in the evidence before that commission and in that commissioner's report which the government will not see. And, first, we have it established by that report, that in one of the departments of this government it was possible for a system of bribery of officials to be carried on with the result that they had paid for different supplies required by the department very much more than could be called in any sense a reasonable price; that it was possible that a system of corruption should be established and carried on that tainted, in different cities of this Dominion, practically every one of the commercial transactions to which that department was a party and we must conclude further from the action of the government that with these facts before them, clearly resulting from the evidence before the commissioner and his report, they were convinced that that system could be established, maintained and carried on for years without the knowledge of the respon-

sible minister. Mr. Speaker, I am not here to make any attack upon the honour, nor do I propose to make any appreciation of the conduct of that hon. minister that might reflect upon him in any way. It seems to me that what his personal position in this matter may be is a question of minor import compared with the greater question to which I would call attention, and in regard to which I only wish it were possible for me to hope that I shall be able to induce action by this government. I take it, as I have said, from the action of the government that they cannot but know that the result of that investigation, the report made upon it, is to establish the possibility that I have indicated, that a permanently established system of corruption should have gone on without the knowledge of the responsible minister, and that in that particular case, it did go on without the knowledge of the responsible minister, and I am not here to question their conclusions in that matter at all.

I am free to say that, in so far as I am concerned in making this motion, I have not risen to make it because of any doubt in my own mind of the personal integrity of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. What may be his position upon the point of constitutional responsibility is quite another question, and one which, however, I do not propose to touch. But what I do desire to point out is that the action of the government, indicating as it does their belief that this system of corruption, not only could, but did go on without the knowledge of the minister responsible for the administration of that department, conclusively establishes that it is in their judgment possible in this country that such a system may be inaugurated and carried on year after year without the responsible minister having knowledge of it. If that is true, I would ask the ministers who preside over the other great spending departments of this government, and I would ask the right hon. the Prime Minister, who is responsible for all these ministers, and who presides over their operations, whether they are prepared to say that in these particular departments, which have gone uninvestigated, in the face of what has been pointed out by the Civil Service Commission, there is nothing to look into. If the ministers charged with these different departments take the position that under them nothing of this kind can happen without their knowledge, and if the right hon. the Prime Minister approves that position on their part, then I say that the government to-day is doing what I have declined to do, and making a direct and most condemnatory attack upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If all these other hon. ministers can sit back in the absolute consciousness that nothing can go wrong in their departments without their knowledge, it is because they have discovered the secret of watching and supervising all the details of administration. If they take the position that they have been able to do that, then I am at a loss to understand how it is that they condone—because from their point of view it must be something that requires to be condoned—the fact that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was not able to so control his department that things of that kind could not go on without his knowledge.

I am perhaps wasting the time of the House in discussing the question from that point of view. It is manifestly clear that the government recognize the possibility of this state of affairs prevailing in a department without the knowledge of a responsible minister, and as I have said I am not questioning the correctness of that proposition as a proposition of fact. Is it then that these hon. ministers feel that there is something connected with the peculiar operations of the Department of Marine and Fisheries that is of a nature to germinate this corruption and from which their own operations are absolutely free? Do they think that in their commercial transactions they are dealing with a quality of human nature with which the Department of Marine and Fisheries does not come into contact? What is the difference in the Department of Militia and Defence, what is different in the Department of Public Works that gives us any reason to suppose that there would not be the same temptation which we have seen to exist in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that there would not be the same human nature subject to those temptations, and that there would not be the same succumbing to those temptations that we have unfortunately seen to take place in the Department of Marine and Fisheries? The responsible ministers of those departments do not need to read between the lines of the report of the Civil Service Commission to see that in the judgment of those gentlemen the system that in their opinion calls for a careful investigation of the operation of a criminal law in England, existed in their (those minister's) departments as well as in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. They have no reason, I respectfully submit to suppose that in their operations they may expect any greater immunity from the spirit of graft than has been found in the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

But there is more than that. If you go through the evidence and the report of Mr. Justice Cassels you will find evidence that the same men who, in their dealings with the officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department, were guilty of bribery,

have been dealing with the other departments. Is it to be expected that the briber will change his character when he is dealing with one department from that which he has shown when dealing with another? If you consult the returns laid on the table at the instance of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sam. Sharpe), you will find the names of a number of people who were proven guilty of bribery in their dealings with the Marine Department figuring as having received large sums of money from each of the other spending departments within the last few years. Was there any reason to expect that the man who would bribe a Marine Department official would be above the idea of trying to cultivate, by irregular means, an official, say of the Department of Public Works or of the Department of Mititia and Defence? You will find in the very report of Mr. Justice Cassels and the evidence of Mr. Halliday, a gentleman who is shown by the report of the honourable judge to have in some very mysterious manner been enabled to be paid by the Department of Marine and Fisheries at the rate of $200 a day, less a rebate I believe of $20, for the use of a vessel which he had contracted to furnish at $125. You will find in that very evidence that, at the very same time, that gentleman was engaged in carrying on a contract for another department of the government of this country and yet that gentleman, as I have said, had managed to receive this extraordinary addition to his contract price from the Marine Department—and nobody can tell the reason why, at least that is the conclusion of the Hon. Mr. Justice Cassels, the commissioner in the matter. A suggestion was made as to the reason why, but the commissioners concluded that that suggestion, which afforded an explanation which would have involved a gentleman more highly placed than any official of the department, was not established. I hasten to say, bearing out what I said in the outset, that the gentleman more highly placed whom I desire to indicate is not the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). But the remarkable fact remains that that gentleman Mr. Halliday, was dealing at the same time with at least one other great spending department, and that his name will be found in the return to which I have referred as having received very considerable sums of money from the other departments of this government within the period of time covered by that investigation and even since then.

In the report itself you will find evidence as to the dealings of these gentlemen with other departments of this government, and names crop up which are quite familiar to us in connection with certain discreditable transactions that we have heard of in this House and out of the House. If, for instance, you accompany the commissioner to the city of St. John you will find figuring—not as deserving of words of praise from the commissioner—a name that perhaps might evoke some recollections in the mind of the Minister of Public Works, who, I am sorry to see is not present in the House just now, because these recollections might be most pleasant for him; you will find figuring among the men whose dealings with the Marine and Fisheries Department did not meet the approval of the commissioner, a gentleman who by the present Minister of Public Works during the reign of a preceding minister had been described as being a very nice person to be represented by at Ottawa; the result being that that recommendation and what came of it proved a very nice thing for the gentleman so recommended. And so I say that in the report itself you have intrinsic evidence that these bribers are, or rather have been, in business relations with the other departments of government. I said that the bribers 'are', but I corrected myself to say that the bribers 'have been' in business relations with the other departments of this government, because I could hardly invoke the evidence in the report as proof of what has been going on since it was presented. But, outside that report there is evidence which justifies us in concluding that the bribers still are dealing with other departments of this government, and that justification is to be found in 'Hansard' of March 22 last, in a reply of the Prime Minister to the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe). The hon. member asked:

> Has the Marine and Fisheries Department continued to buy supplies, or give contracts to the individuals, supply men, or companies on whose behalf commissions, gratuities or interest were paid to officials of the department, as found by the Cassels commission?
>
> If so, what are the names of such individuals, supply men and companies, and the amount paid or to be paid to them since the receipt of said report by the government?
>
> Have any other departments purchased supplies or given contracts to any such individuals, supply men or companies since the receipt of said report by the government? If so, what are the names and amounts thereof?

To these questions the right hon. the Prime Minister gave an answer. To the question whether the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or any other department of the government had been continuing to deal with the persons who were found guilty of bribery in the investigation before Mr. Justice Cassels, the answer of the Prime Minister was :

> There may be cases in which it will be in the public interest to do business with some of the parties referred to. Each case will have to be considered on its merits as it arises.

And then, to the question as to the names of these persons and the amount of the

transactions the government had with them, the Prime Minister gave the oracular reply:

If any particular name be mentioned the information will be given to the House.

Does not that answer come perilously near to saying: 'If you will just show us that you know all about it why then we will tell you all,' Mr. Speaker. I say that in these answers of the right hon. gentleman we have evidence that justifies us in the conclusion that the men who have been guilty of bribery and found to be so guilty by Mr. Justice Cassels are still considered a worthy class of men with whom, not one department of government in particular but different departments believe they should continue to transact business. The right hon. gentleman tells us that it may be in the interest of the country that the government should continue to give its patronage to the men who have been so convicted; men who have been proven out of their own mouths to have paid bribes to our servants, then added that bribe and Heaven knows what percentage in addition to the price charged to the people of this country, and then pocketed the whole thing to our detriment. And, the Prime Minister tells us in this answer that the attitude of the government towards those bribers remains a matter to be determined in each particular case. Why in England, a man who would be discovered giving a bribe to a public official, would, without any ceremony whatever disappear from the list of those from whom the British government would under any circumstances purchase supplies. I have before me the report of the Public Accounts Committee of the imperial parliament for the year 1907 and I find there two cases which are quite in point to this discussion. One of these cases occurred in the Admiralty Department, and I sincerely trust the inference will not be drawn that there is anything peculiar to Marine Departments or Admiralty Departments which provokes this kind of conduct. In the Admiralty Department it was shown that certain officers had received a commission of five per cent, and by the way I think five per cent was the amount of the commission that played such a large role in the dealings of the Marine Department in Quebec. These officers had received a commission of five per cent upon some clothing purchased by the Admiralty and which it was their duty to pass. And, when the British Admiralty had to deal with that matter they dealt not only with the officials who had received the commission, but they dealt and dealt immediately with the contractors who paid it, and these contractors were at once stricken from the list of persons from whom the government would purchase supplies of any kind. You will find that case referred to at page 4 of the report of the Public Accounts Committee, and you will find it more specifically dealt with in questions from 271 to 280 in the appendix which contains the report of the proceedings. Now, let me call the attention of the House to this, and let us contrast the practice of this government with the practice of the British government under similar conditions. When the question was asked of the responsible minister, if he had determined that the department should cease to purchase goods from the men found guilty of giving bribes, his answer was: 'certainly.' In the report to which I have referred you will find another case in point, and this time it is in the War Department, so that any possible suggestion that there is any particular connection between salt water and this sort of an offence disappears. There was a similar case in the War Department, and when the minister was asked what action he had taken his reply was: 'Why, automatically' — remark the word 'automatically' — 'automatically that man ceases to be a person with whom the government or any of its officials may in future have dealings.' It was not in England, a question of considering each particular case as it is with the right hon. the Prime Minister; it was not considered that it might be in the interests of the country to have dealings with these men; it was not a question of encouraging the man who had been guilty of this despicable crime of bribing his way into the pockets of the people of the country.

But we need not go to England to learn how men who do that ought to be treated, and whether it is a matter to be dealt with in each particular case. If you turn to our own Criminal Code and look at sections 158 and 159, you will find that every one of these bribers was guilty of a penal offence. We had it some time ago in this House from the lips of a much greater legal authority than I can pretend to be; and if you turn to section 159 of the Criminal Code, you will find that the law of this country has decreed that a portion of the proper penalty to be inflicted upon the man guilty of that offence is that he shall cease to be recognized as having a right to have any contract or any dealing with the government of this country. And yet in the eyes of this government it is a question to be dealt with in each particular case. I say that those answers, indicating as they do a line of conduct that looks upon the action of a briber as something to be leniently dealt with, notwithstanding the letter of the law combined with the terms of those answers, which refused to us in effect information which the hon. gentleman who asked for it and all the members of this House were entitled to

have at the hands of the government, justify us in concluding that to-day the departments of this government are still dealing with these bribers. If we are making any mistake in drawing that inference, I can only say that the responsibility for the mistake lies at the doors of those who refused to us, as they effectually do, this information properly asked for, and lies at the door, too, of the government that has laid on this table the report of what it has decided to do with regard to the report of Mr. Justice Cassels, and has confined itself to telling us simply what it has done or is going to do with regard to certain of its officials, and maintains an eloquent silence with regard to what is going to happen to those political friends, the bribers, whom the report of Mr. Justice Cassels declares to have been guilty, if not more guilty, than the officials who received their bribes. It was this action on the part of the government that led me to say, in opening these remarks, that I regretted that there was absolutely nothing to indicate that this government in the slightest degree contemplated taking steps to investigate the other departments. While in the eyes of this government the bribing of its officials calls for no action so far as the bribers are concerned, the law of this country says that those men should be prosecuted and convicted, and above all should not be dealt with thereafter by the government. I say in all earnestness that I would have welcomed, and would welcome still, from this government, any indication of intention on its part to push through to its proper conclusion this investigation which began with the Department of Marine and Fisheries—to push it through on broader lines, on lines that would indicate an intention on its part to hew to the line, let the chips fall where they may; and if anything that I say now, by way of emphasizing what I consider are the conclusions to be drawn from the inaction of the government, should look as though I were speaking with a desire simply to condemn, I desire to say that all my purpose is to try if I can to bring home to those who are responsible for the conscience of this country the position in which they stand and the responsibility which they are assuming, not by their action, but by their inaction, with regard to what has been established by this commission. Not only is the fact of what has gone on in the Department of Marine and Fisheries in itself sufficient to cause hon. ministers in control of other departments to inquire whether all is well within their households, but we have had the evidence, within the present session of this parliament, of this House putting itself on record as being of the opinion that this sort of iniquity, which we now know to have existed in at least one of the departments of the government, is so generally prevalent throughout the commercial life of this country, that it was necessary that we should enact a special criminal law to reach it. The government knows that; it knows how prevalent this offence is in the general business of the country; and the inaction of the government leads us to suppose that we are expected to believe that there is no suspicion in the minds of the men responsible for the spending departments of this government that any such thing exists in the course of the immense transactions which some of those departments carry on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it is necessary that I should dwell at any greater length upon considerations tending to demonstrate the truth of the proposition which I am free to confess seems to me so obviously true. I may say that it seemed to me so obviously true that I have sat in this House since the opening of the session waiting day by day to hear an announcement that this government of its own motion meant to carry the investigation, which had begun in this one department, through to its ultimate conclusion. I am not here to say that such an investigation will necessarily result in the discovery of regrettable facts similar to those which have been brought to light in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. But if such an investigation should demonstrate the entire absence, or even approximately the entire absence of any such corruption in the other departments, that investigation would be worth whatever money it may cost. The people are anxious that matters of this kind should be cleared up. They are interested not merely because of the heavy loss in money, which the prevalence of such a system as has been found to exist in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, must entail, but chiefly because of their desire to ascertain whether, from the highest to the lowest, those charged with the administration of public affairs are perfectly honest, and that the public service of the country may be taken as characteristic of the honesty of the people at large. The people expect our public service to be of such a character that we need not, when speaking of it, hide our heads in shame. In the report of the commissioner and in the evidence, there are weighty reasons why the government should proceed with such an investigation. Look at the conclusions of that report, and surely the government must pay some attention to the opinion of the distinguished judge whom they selected to make this investigation. What does he tell us is the remedy? You must, he says, rouse the public conscience. Mind you, not the conscience of the employees of the Marine and Fisheries Department, but the public conscience. Why? Because to every reasonable and reflecting man, the evidence leads inevitably to the conclusion that there has grown up among a certain class the belief that the government—not any one department in par-

ticular—but the government as a whole, is fair game and that a legitimate means of making money out of it is to bribe the servants of the country. Then, Mr. Justice Cassels goes on to suggest some other improvements with regard to the Marine and Fisheries Department, and he cannot restrain himself from asking: 'Are there not other departments in which this may be done?' His question implies the suggestion that the conditions in the other departments are similar to what they have been shown to be in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. That is the impression brought home to the public mind by this impartial investigator. I ask the government whether they have any confidence in the man they chose to make the recommendation? If they have, how can they flout his recommendation? Are they going to sit back and say: 'What is the public conscience to us? We sit in our seats, we hold the reins of power, we may do as we please at all events until another election—what care we for the public conscience? We will satisfy the public by passing a law to prevent the bribery of the servants of individuals, but we will not take any steps to see whether servants of the public are being bribed.' Sir, the government of this country is in a very special manner keeper of the public conscience. I ask you how it is possible to suppress bribery and corruption among our people when we find that those who hold in their hands, for the time being at all events, the control of the destinies of this country, declare that, so far as the departments for which they are responsible are concerned, so far as the business of the people which they are doing is concerned, it does not interest them in the slightest whether the corruption which has been demonstrated to exist in one of the departments does not also exist in the others. Rouse the public conscience, if you will, but our consciences are not to be aroused, would be a fair inference to draw from the inaction of the government.

I do not propose to extend my observations to any further length. The people of this country, I venture to say, look for a thorough investigation of the administrative departments of this government. Such an assertion may not be entitled to any weight coming from myself, and possibly might be questioned, as coming from the opposition benches, but I can support it by authorities which cannot be charged with political bias. Let me cite two quotations from newspapers which support the government and which appeared after the general elections had taken place. These newspapers have told the government in no uncertain tone what I have been trying to impress on the House this afternoon, namely that there is need for, and this country demands, a thorough investigation into all the spending departments, were it only as an earnest of the sincere intention of this government to give us an honest administration of the public business. I read from the Ottawa 'Free Press' of 22nd October, 1908:

Sir Wilfrid's individual strength is great; he has shown on many occasions that he cares for no man. There is an opportunity now for him to prove to the people that they have reason for confidence in him, that not only is he himself a man above suspicion, but that his whole administration is clean and beyond reproach.

The Liberals as a whole have been classed as a gang of looters.

I am not classing them; I am only reading.

Sir Wilfrid owes them a clearance certificate.

From what we know of the administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the last twelve years, we believe that it will bear the closest scrutiny; from our knowledge we have been able to characterize as a gross slander the wholesale charges that have been made against it; but there are those not as well informed who are not able to refute the accusations of their fellows, and it is in justice to these men that the most searching investigation should take place, as is now taking place in the Marine Department.

The other I propose to recite is from a newspaper published in the city of Montreal, a newspaper whose devotion—and effective devotion—to the right hon. prime minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and to the party he leads will not be questioned. I read from the Montreal 'Herald' of 26th October last:—

In the administrative services it is the time for an overhauling and a fresh start. There are departments to which the strong hand must be applied, and people will not be satisfied unless proofs are given that this is understood. Efficiency is demanded and will be insisted upon. At the same time, every reasonable effort to add to the dignity of the service, to minister to the independence and self-respect of the man who works for the country, will be approved.

And, returning to the charge, on 31st October last, the same paper said:—

Similarly, the Liberal press is not disposed to take the triumph of Monday last as absolving the party from inquiring if all is well within it. The Ottawa 'Free Press' demands an impartial investigation, such as is being made into the Marine Department, into the workings of any other department which has come under suspicion. The Toronto 'Globe' urges the abolition of the patronage system in the purchase of supplies, the reform of the Senate, legislation bettering the conditions of life, the punishment of incompetency and dishonesty in public office, the completion of the scheme of Civil Service reform.

Then, it goes on with its own commentary on what others have said.

All this is good journalism, good partisanship, and good patriotism. The Montreal

'Gazette,' however, sees in it only evidence that the election was won under false pretences. The Liberal press and speakers, it declares, claimed that all the charges of the Conservatives were unfounded, and that the country took them at their word. What a narrow, partisan view. No wonder the Toronto 'Telegram' claims the 'Gazette' as a reactionary. No man or journal of any standing in the Liberal party has assumed what the 'Gazette' claims was the general assumption. On the contrary, confession has been made, time and again, that in the spending of millions of money, spread over twelve years, mistakes may have been made. The argument presented to the country, and accepted by it, was that the government, as a whole, was clean and honest; that it had instituted reforms of administration as the necessity developed; that it had ordered independent investigations of alleged evils; that the Premier could absolutely be depended on in every emergency where courage and honesty were required;.....

Now, after the conflict, with five years of work before the government, surely it is the part of well-wishers of it, and of the party, to point out the work that is to be performed.

. . . . . .

Sir Wilfrid has the ball at his foot as never before. He is under no obligation to any man, or group of men, to refrain from doing as he will along the line of departmental reform, of legislative reform, or of financial retrenchment. In the past he has faced, with courage, and intelligence, and fine public spirit, every issue that presented itself. He has shirked no task, once he saw his duty and his way. Thus he gained that confidence of his fellows so signally defined on Monday. And thus, we may be confident, he will face the tasks that the campaign may have uncovered to his mind. He has been engrossed for twelve years in the great work of nation-building, the work of harmonizing our diverse races, of cementing confederation, of peopling half a continent. Perhaps, for a season, the labours of our Canadian Hercules are to be in a large measure the humbler, but not less necessary, labours of perfecting administration, of safeguarding the public domain from the assaults of the selfish, of creating a healthier public opinion in regard to electoral corruption, and generally in strengthening the moral fibre of the party and the country.

The purpose of my motion is to call upon the government to do the work of generally strengthening the moral fibre, not of the party—I am not so much concerned about that—but of the country. It seems to me that the first step towards that is to make it quite clear that the departments of the government are not afraid to put their operations before the public, but that they are as anxious as the public is, that if there are wrong doings in the operations of those departments, they should be discovered and corrected. And I desire that this should be done, not only so far as the officials of the lower grades are concerned, but from top to bottom of these departments. I trust that I may be proven to have been mistaken in my view that all the indications were that we need not expect such action on the part of the government. If so, I for one shall hail with pleasure the fact that the government shows itself equal to the task that, it seems to me, clearly lies before it; and I shall be happy to congratulate the government and this country if the result of the investigation should be to show that there was no occasion to make that investigation save in so far as it might serve to relieve the public mind. I hardly venture to hope that that will be the result, but, if it should be, surely the government will not have reason to regret that it made the investigation, and most assuredly the country will congratulate the government and congratulate itself upon such a result having been shown.

But to do that—and I want to insist, just for a moment, on that point—we must have an untrammelled investigation; it must not be a matter of stopping when you strike at the members or when you strike at the man who was a member and is a candidate, nor of stopping when you strike at the man whose bribe went as an election subscription, nor of stopping even if you should reach up—which I am not insinuating in any way; it is foreign to my purpose to do so—to the very head of the department himself. To make it worth anything, we must have an untrammelled investigation.

We must not have an investigation that—take one startling instance in this investigation—will make it possible for a government to whom it is reported by an official, a judge entrusted by them to investigate, that an official occupying the highest position in the department under the minister himself, has improperly, at the instigation of two candidates in an election, put 100 men unnecessarily at work upon public work for the sole purpose of influencing their votes—that shall make it possible, I say, for the government, or the minister to whom this report was made, to do absolutely nothing about it. Yet that is what we have in this very report, which is perhaps the most startling instance, or one of the most startling instances of the undesirable effects of the limitation of the power of that commission. Yet I leave it to the common sense of this House if there is any more despicable form of bribery in this world than that which makes the labouring man's bread and butter the price of his vote. I therefore beg to move that all the words of the proposed motion after the word 'that' be left out, and the following be substituted therefor:

That the commission of 1907, in the course of their investigations into the conditions of the Civil Service, having made incidental in-

quiry into the workings of one of the departments at Ottawa, characterized that department as wanting in organization, lacking in conscience, and some of its officials as serving two masters, Scripture notwithstanding, and also criticised other departments.

That the Cassels commission was limited in scope to an inquiry into implied official incompetence and dishonesty in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the report thereof with attached evidence simply sustains the charge of official negligence, wastefulness and corrupt dealing in that department, and affords ground for the conviction that similar methods prevail in other great spending departments.

That in order to lift the cloud of suspicion that rests upon the administration of the various departments, to satisfy the demand of the country for honest and businesslike methods, and to purge the public service of inefficiency, reckless waste and corrupt practices, it is advisable and necessary in the public interest that a thorough and untramelled investigation be made by a competent business commission into the workings of all the great spending departments of government.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Mr. Speaker, I must say at the outset that I do not find any fault with my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) for the way he has presented the case he has just laid before the House; I desire even to offer him my sincere thanks for the personal allusion which he made to me during his remarks. I am exceptionally grateful to him for these kind remarks, because I have not been accustomed in the past to receive that sort of treatment. Ever since I have been in the department I have been doing all that I could to put it upon a proper footing. I was appointed Minister of Marine and Fisheries a few months before the session of 1906, when I had no time to put myself thoroughly au fait of the situation in that department. During that session, several investigations took place in the Public Accounts Committee, and some other committees, concerning the administration of that department. As a result of those investigations, I became aware that some reforms were necessary, especially with regard to the accounting system, which was particularly defective. I appointed some persons who were strongly recommended to me for the purpose of establishing in that department an accounting system which would permit the minister and the superior officers to exercise more effective control over the administration. Later on, when the Civil Service Commissioners came into my department to make an investigation, they may bear testimony to the fact that I gave them the fullest latitude to discover everything which might be wrong in the administration of that department. At last the commissioners reported, stating that:

There would also seem to be a lack of conscience. In connection with the enormous expenditures which are deemed necessary, the

word 'discount' never appears. It is tacitly assumed that there is no such thing; but the whole commercial world knows otherwise. If no one gets any benefit from trade with the government except the trader, then it must be clear that in these great purchases made for the government, without discount, its officers must be assisting the trader to get better prices from the government than he can get anywhere else; for everywhere else he has to give discount. In other words, some of the government's officers are serving two masters, and apparently succeeding with both—Scripture notwithstanding.

I then reported to His Excellency the Governor General and to my colleagues that:

It is assumed by that statement that commissions are received improperly, or enhanced prices paid through dishonesty on the part of the officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. But, unfortunately the report does not mention any names which would enable him to take definite action concerning those officials. It is, however, in the interests of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and of the country that immediate steps should be taken in order to determine what officials (if any) deserve condemnation and to give to all an opportunity to meet the charges implied.

That recommendation of mine was concurred in by His Excellency the Governor General and by my colleagues, and the Hon. Mr. Justice Cassels, whom I think everybody in this House recognizes as one of the ablest jurists in this country, a man of impartiality, a man of rectitude, was appointed to discharge the duties of investigating the charges made against the officers of the department. The report is now before us and we have taken action upon it. My hon. friend from St. Anne's (Mr. Doherty) has given us a synopsis of what has been done in connection with officers who were implicated in that report, but now my hon. friend states in his speech that though acknowledging the personal integrity of the minister he cannot fail to say that the minister is constitutionally responsible for the conduct of these officers.

Mr. DOHERTY. I think what I said was that what the constitutional responsibility might be was a question on which I did not want to express an opinion.

Mr. BRODEUR. As the question of constitutional responsibility has been raised, I may be permitted to say a few words upon it and once for all to lay the responsibility where it should rest, to ascertain whether the minister of the day should be held absolutely responsible for everything that has been done since confederation. Mr. Justice Cassels, in his report, says that the system which has been found defective in the department is mostly the purchasing of supplies, what he calls the patronage system, and he says:

The system seems to have been handed down from one administration to another since confederation.

That is the system which has always prevailed. I shall not take the statement of the hon. judge alone but I think I shall be able to prove to the House by correspondence and documents that the system has also been in vogue when members of the opposite party were in control of the department, and that I was the first minister to make the change which commends itself, to the judgment of Mr. Commissioner Cassels. I have been preceded in the department by a number of ministers, all men of greater ability than I. My predecessors and their terms of office have been:

Ministers.	Dates.
Hon. Peter Mitchell..	1867 to 1873
Hon. Albert J. Smith..	1873 to 1878
Hon. J. C. Pope..	1878 to 1882
Hon. A. W. McLelan..	1882 to 1885
Hon. G. E. Foster..	1885 to 1888
Hon. Sir Chas. Hibbert Tupper	1888 to 1894
Hon. John Costigan..	1894 to 1896
Hon. Sir Louis Davies..	1896 to 1902
Hon. Raymond Préfontaine.. ..	1902 to 1905

I was appointed at the beginning of 1906. Some of my opponents argue that I should be held responsible for a system which has prevailed under ministers who were very superior in ability to me, but as I have said I was the first minister to get rid of the patronage system in 1908. As this is likely to be the last chapter of this famous marine investigation it may be as well to review what has been done in the past. Let us look at the record since 1867 and ascertain whether I should be held constitutionally responsible for everything which has occurred during that period. In the report of the Auditor-General of 1887, page 393, will be found a letter written by the Auditor General, the late Mr. J. Lorne McDougall, to the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on August 21, 1886. In that letter Mr. McDougall said:

I was recently at Quebec and visited the office of your agent there. I find that the supplies purchased by Mr. Gregory are not obtained under contract, and that the prices paid are apparently higher than those which are paid for the same kind of goods for the marine hospital under contract. The differences probably arise from tenders being called for in the latter case and not in the former.

Then the Auditor-General in this letter not only suggests but requests that Mr Gregory should be ordered to purchase his supplies by tender.

An hon. MEMBER. Who was then minister?

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. member for North Toronto was then minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh come off.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not wish to find fault with the hon. member for North Toronto; he was simply doing what other ministers had done before him. My contention is that it is unfair for my opponents to endeavour to charge me with responsibility for every thing which has been brought out during this investigation when that investigation simply disclosed the same system as has existed since 1867.

In 1886, then, the Auditor-General requests that tenders be called for. A few months afterwards, on February 21, 1887, Sir Hector Langevin telegraphs to the deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries as follows:

I wish that as usual paint, powder, oils, drugs, common stationery for lighthouses, groceries, hardware and dry goods be purchased in Quebec, also provisions at once.

(Sgd.) HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

On February 10, 1887, a telegram was sent by the present member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) to the deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. William Smith, as follows:

Continue usual patronage Baudet & Chinic, Quebec, with conditions as per letter sent concerning Sir Hector's request, inform Caron.

(Sgd.) G. E. FOSTER.

This telegram was signed by the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Foster). On the 21st of February, 1887 Mr. Gregory telegraphs to the department as follows:

Navigation nearly open, say whom I am to purchase supplies from and prices to pay. Captains lightships want usual advance. Shall I pay, it takes $2,000.

(Sgd.) J. U. GREGORY.

Here is the memorandum which was prepared by the deputy minister for the then minister:

Please inform me what plan you have decided to adopt about Gregory purchasing supplies, as he does not like to purchase now without authority. The best plan in the public interest is to advertise openly for tenders and let all get a chance to state prices for the principal articles.

21st April, 1887.

WM. SMITH,
Deputy Minister.

Memorandum for the Minister of Marine, relative to the purchase of supplies at Quebec. Immediate.

Mr. McGreevy has handed in the accompanying list of names whom he recommends should receive patronage at Quebec in the purchase of supplies. With reference to the first list marked for tenders he recommends that tenders should be asked from the different parties mentioned therein when any articles are required.

Not public tenders mind you, but simply that tenders should be asked from those

who were political friends of the government of the day, these persons being recommended by Mr. McGreevy the then member for Quebec west.

With reference to the second list he recommends that these persons should be employed if their services are required, or that supplies should be purchased from them without tender as it would be difficult to make contracts for these articles mentioned in the second list.

(Sgd.) WM. SMITH.

22nd April, 1887.

Minister approves W.S. 23rd April, 1887.

This is a sample of how things were done under the Conservative administration, and if we look at what happened after the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) left the department we will find that the same system was perpetuated. In a memorandum from Mr. Smith deputy minister, to the minister on the 27th of October, 1888, he says:

I have visited the different light stations at Anticosti in the government steamer, and while on board the vessel I examined into her internal economy. On inquiry as to prices of provisions it appeared to me that everything was purchased at the fullest market prices, and the captain mentioned to me confidentially that the vessel could be provisioned much cheaper if he would be allowed to purchase in the open market without reference to political patronage.

There had been a change of Minister of Marine in the meantime and this memorandum was for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, in 1888, and here is what Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper wrote upon this memorandum:

Arrange a fair rate with each captain accordingly, slightly under existing extravagant system, and have it understood that in the event of complaints being made, if found to be reasonable, fines will be made and deductions from masters' pay for same.

(Sgd.) C. H. TUPPER.

March 11th, 1889.

From this it will be seen that Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper desired to make a change in the manner in which supplies had been purchased and he suggested that a rate should be made with each captain and a contract entered into with him. This system was in force for some years, and after giving the question some consideration I have come to the conclusion that it is certainly the best way in which to provision our vessels; we could contract with the steward or the master of the vessel paying a certain sum of money per head of the crew and no more and no less. But, in 1891 Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper changed this system and Mr. Smith the deputy minister in a report to the minister says:

As I presume it is intended to go back to our old system of provisioning the steamers at Quebec, namely, by allowing the agents to purchase the materials as required, and allowing them to use as much as crew wish, but holding the captain and steward responsible for the total average cost per month.

Then he suggested a plan of purchasing supplies from the different firms that were recommended, and letters were sent to Mr. Gregory in Quebec and Mr. Harding in St. John as follows:

I have to request you to invite tenders from a number of friends of the government in the trade for the provisions required during the coming season.

There were to be no public tenders and no public competition, but the purchases were to be made just from friends of the government. Then, I find that on the 4th of May 1891, Mr. Gregory states that he had complied with the instructions, that he had called upon all the friends of the government in the trade to send tenders for the provisions required, that he had consulted Mr. McGreevy and Mr. Chateauvert in order that he might not commit any error in calling on the tradesmen in question, and then he incloses tenders from two or three persons who were friendly to the Conservative government. However, Mr. Gregory was reproached for the manner in which he had done this, and then he answered that there were only two grocers who were friendly to the government and that he could not ask the others to tender because he was told to do business with the friends of the government only. Mr. Speaker, that is the system of purchasing supplies which existed under the Conservative government, and which has also existed since the Liberal government came in power until last year. Looking at the evidence before us I find, however, that in Montreal from 1888 to 1896 there were only 22 names on the patronage list, whereas from 1896 up to last year there were 170 names on that list, which goes to show that the persons from whom tenders were invited were much more numerous under the Liberal regime than under the Conservative regime. This system as I have shown has existed for many years, but I have come to the conclusion that it should be a system of the past, and last year I changed it and now goods are purchased by public tender in every case where it is possible to do so, without any reference to a patronage list. The system now established is that the purchasing agent should have the right to go not only to friends of the government, not only to my own political friends, but to go any where he wishes in order to obtain the best prices possible in the interest of the country and of the department.

I do not want to find fault with any person in particular for these abuses. The name of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has been mentioned; but I do not blame him in any shape or form. He simply followed the practice that had previously been in existence. But I ask for myself the same consideration

that I am willing to give to my opponents; I ask to be treated with the same leniency with which I am willing to treat my opponents who were maintaining a system which was bad.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the hon. member this question: If the same thing took place under a dozen governments before his advent to the department, would that make it less an offence now, that it is continued under his regime, when it is drawn to his attention by his own commissioner?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am drawing attention to the fact that this system and these abuses have been at all times in existence in the department. At all times it has been represented by officers of the department and by the Auditor General that public tenders should be called for, and that the patronage system should be abolished; and I am glad to say that the first one who had the courage to change that system was myself. My hon. friend will probably one day be a minister of the Crown, and he will then learn how difficult it is to change any system of administration; he will find how difficult it is to eradicate abuses. But I hope he will be able to do his duty, as I know he will be anxious to do it in the best interests of the country. In the meantime, I ask him whether he does not consider that I have done my duty in doing what I have done.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman asks me that plain question, I tell him that I do not think he has by any means done his full duty, in face of the report of the commission appointed by himself as one of the ministers of the Crown.

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course, that is a question of opinion; but when I have had the courage to remove abuses which I have proven existed since confederation, abuses which my hon. friend from North Toronto, one of the ablest men we have in this country, was not able to remove, my hon. friend must admit that the member for Rouville has shown some courage and energy, and has shown that he was willing to discharge his duty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the work of the department has enormously increased during recent years, and some new and important works have been added to it. We must take that fact into consideration in examining the situation of that department. Take, for example, the services under the control of the department; there were 19 twenty years ago; there are now 40, an increase of more than 100 per cent. The expenditure in 1886 was $1,144,520; ten years later it was $1,136,254; last year it was $6,174,855. What caused this great increase? Additional services in the department. I have in my hand a statement showing that the new services taken charge of by the department since 1896 entailed upon it last year an expenditure of over $2,000,000. These include the St. Lawrence Ship Channel, the dockyards at Esquimalt and Halifax, wrecking plants, the ice breaking steamer at Fort William, wireless stations, a naval militia, marine schools, reporting stations, pilotage, ice-breaking steamers, submarine bells, Parry Sound depot, the lighthouse depot at Prescott. Here are new services that did not exist in 1896, or were not then under the control of the department. If we look at the number of vessels, there were only eight twenty years ago, while there are now fifty-three. Of letters received there were last year 38,190, against 7,800 in 1886, and 13,000 in 1896. Of light stations there were in 1886, 534; in 1896, 629; and in 1908, 957. Of light-keepers, there were 682 in 1886; 646 in 1896; 914 in 1908. Of gas buoys there were 39 in 1886 and 470 in 1908. Of wharfs there were 134 in 1886, 416 in 1908. That shows the immense quantity of work which has been added to this department.

Mr. SPROULE. How much was dropped in the department when the department was divided into two—the Marine Department and the Fisheries Department?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am speaking of the whole department—the two branches of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. You are practically only dealing with the Marine Department to-day whereas before you dealt with both.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am dealing with the two branches of the department. They were divided, I think, in 1886, but in 1891 they were brought together again. We have done, I think, some useful work, and in the criticisms to which my department has been subjected, these works have been lost sight of. But I have testimony to the value of what we have done in improving the St. Lawrence. Take the resolutions passed by the Shipping Federation in 1886, 1887, 1906 and 1907. Take those of the Montreal Board of Trade in those late years. I might quote those because they show that something has been done which is very useful. Take the resolution of the 15th of November, 1906, by the Montreal Board of Trade:

Resolved that having received from the president and the representatives of the shipping interests on the council their reports on the annual inspection of the channel, which inspection, by courtesy of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, they attended, the council of the Board of Trade of Montreal hereby expresses its appreciation of the manner in which the Dominion government has met the desire of the country that a generous expenditure should be made for the purpose of improving our national waterways from Montreal to the ocean, and the council further expresses its gratitude to the hon. the min-

ister and to the engineers of his department for having so readily and promptly met the various specific requests for channel and lighting improvements made by this board and the shipping federation.

Here is the Montreal Board of Trade, the most important body in the country, praising the Department of Marine and Fisheries for what it has done in improving the St. Lawrence route. Take the resolution of the shipping interests of the 21st of November, 1906:

That this federation is extremely gratified with the permanent and substantial manner in which the many undertakings are being carried through and consider that great credit is due to the government and to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the way in which this national work is being done. The beneficial effects have already been felt in the lowering of insurance rates by the St. Lawrence route, which not only benefits the ships, but also the producers in the west.

That the members of this federation are pleased to note the able manner in which the minister has mastered the many details in the short period in which he has held office.

A resolution to the same effect was passed by the Shipping Federation in 1907:

Be it resolved that the members of the federation express their satisfaction with the permanent and substantial manner in which the many undertakings are being accomplished and consider that great credit is due to the government and to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the manner in which this national work is being carried through.

Those testimonies ought to be worth something. My hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames), who knows the people who have passed these resolutions, will appreciate their value. He knows that they were passed with the desire of being absolutely true and representing what really existed. I might quote also a resolution from the Board of Trade of Fort William of the 21st of May, 1907, in which they congratulate us for the work we were carrying out at that particular time in connection with the breaking of the ice:

This board fully appreciates the action taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in putting the ice-breaker 'James Whelan' at work to break the ice blockade on Thunder bay and in the harbour of Fort William this spring. The fact that this breaker opened navigation at least two weeks, and probably three weeks, earlier than it would have opened, fully justifies the action of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

That this Board of Trade felt that the work of opening this harbour, so well begun, should be continued each year. The result will be that navigation will open from two to four weeks earlier than it usually does, and such a result is a very important factor in the development of the west, and is of national importance.

Mr. BRODEUR.

What has been the result of our policy and of the work we have been doing on the St. Lawrence? One result has been the lowering of insurance rates to a very considerable extent. On grain these rates have been reduced by 60 per cent of what they were in 1900. On provisions they have been reduced by 54½ per cent, and the president of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, a man who is pretty well posted on all questions concerning finance and transportation, spoke in his speech at the annual meeting of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, as follows:

The Marine and Fisheries Department have also for some years past been steadily improving the lighting of the St. Lawrence, and it is claimed that during the last eight years the decline in insurance rates has been such as to make a saving to freight and vessel owners combined of about $6,000,000.

Here are $6,000,000 which we have saved to the country by improving the St. Lawrence route. Of course during the last elections not a word was said by our opponents about this very beneficial work done by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. They were too busy slandering the minister and his department, for small, petty things, to think of saying a word about the good work we have done in the public interest.

When I took charge of the department, I wanted to make some reforms, and I propose to state in a few words what reforms I have succeeded in making. When the investigation of 1906 took place in the Public Accounts Committee, I found that our system of bookkeeping was absolutely defective. At that time I was told that some changes were being made in the accounting system of the Department of Railways and Canals and that I might get experts who would establish in my department what is called the Cost System. What is that system; it is one by which we can find out in our different stations and places where we manufacture, the cost of each part of a manufactured article. We have not only the cost of the total article but of each part, so that we can easily ascertain whether it will be better for us to continue manufacturing or purchase at the prices elsewhere. Suppose we wanted to purchase anything which pertains to a boiler. What the cost of that part manufactured in one of our establishments was, I could not tell, but by the system I have introduced we can find out exactly what it costs. Then, we can compare that cost with the prices quoted by other dealers and in that way ascertain whether it would be better to continue the manufacture or purchase elsewhere.

That was the reason of the cost system. Formerly, we could not tell whether given parts of the manufacturing articles we were making were too expensive or not. Now, the exact cost to us of manufacturing any part of any article is known to the

officers of the department, and so we can judge whether it is advisable to continue manufacturing or to purchase. I think the establishment of this system will commend itself to the judgment of the House.

I found in the department a system, which had been in existence for many years by which there could be overlapping payments—in other words, the expenditure in each year was not kept within the appropriation. I do not remember exactly the amount paid out of the appropriations ot 1905-6 on account of expenditures incurred in the previous year, but I know that the amount was a very large one. I thought this system extremely detrimental to the administration of the department, and decided to change it. Within a few weeks after I took charge of the department, I instructed the proper officers to see to it that each officer under whom expenditures were made should make a statement showing exactly what he required to complete the expenditures of the year, and what money remained to meet these requirements. I was very sorry to find that, in the first report laid before me by Mr. Falconer, no less than $484,000 was paid during 1906-7 for expenditures incurred in the previous year. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) knows what abuses such a system can bring about. Being determined to change this system, I gave such formal and unmistakable instructions that now, to-day, on this first day of April, 1909, at the opening of the fiscal year, I am in a position to state that all the expenditures incurred in the fiscal year closing yesterday can be paid out of the appropriations for that year. I have here a monthly statement such as I get from my officers regularly, showing the amount of each appropriation, the amount spent during the month, the total amount spent to date and the balance available. Not only expenditures for the current fiscal, but also those made on account of last fiscal year must be clearly shown. With such a statement before me, I am able to judge whether there will be enough money to provide for the necessities of the year. I can completely control every expenditure, and can see whether each officer is living up to my instructions or whether he is transgressing those instructions. The report I have now in my hand is that of March 1, 1909. It shows that, on appropriations representing a total of $7,055,600, there was a balance available of $1,870,000, or enough to cover all the expenditures to be incurred during that year. This method enables me to absolutely prevent overlapping payments, a system which, perhaps, led to the abuses which were discovered in Quebec. Such abuses cannot occur under the system I have established. As a part of this system, I have a statement prepared by my officers, every month showing the amount of the appropriation and the amount expended and the balance available. For the fiscal year, 1908-9, the year which closed yesterday, is a balance of our appropriation of $883,000 that will not be required. In other words, there will be no overlaping payments for the fiscal year just closed.

Another reform that I made in the department was the classification of the lighthouses. I found that the salaries of the light-keepers were graded, not according to the work they had to do, not according to the importance of the lights they had to take care of, not according to any good business principles which should guide in such cases, but according to the favoritism a man might be able to claim, according to his influence, sometimes even according to the number of children he had. I thought that was a system that should be put an end to, and so I asked my officers to make a classification of all the lights according to their importance, according to their sites, according to the illuminating apparatus installed in them, in order that the salaries of these light-keepers should not be purely and simply at the discretion of the minister but should be regulated according to business principles. I did the same thing in the classification of the fog alarms, no such classification having existed up to that time.

I come now to another reform—the fifth —which I consider I have introduced in the department: the appointment of a purchasing agent. Abuses have been proved by the investigation to have existed because purchases were made without much consideration for the price, sometimes without much consideration for the quality or even the quantity of goods. I thought that we should centralize these purchases, and that local parties should not be the only ones to quote our prices. However, in order to protect the local dealers, to-day, when we advertise for goods we always state, if these goods have to be delivered at Quebec, Halifax, St. John or elsewhere, that tenderers shall quote prices for goods delivered at the point selected. The results have been very satisfactory. We call publicly for tenders in all cases where the amount is large enough to justify us in doing so. In all cases of purchases exceeding $5,000 we call in this public way for tenders. For smaller purchases, the purchasing agent is absolutely free to go where he likes to make these purchases, his instructions being to get the lowest prices and the best conditions possible.

Also , some two years ago, I abolished the free importation of goods, because I found there were abuses in connection with that system. Even before a law was passed by parlia-

ment declaring that goods purchased by government should pay duty, I gave instructions that goods purchased in my department should pay duty, and consequently I do not think that we will experience any longer the same troubles that were disclosed, in some cases, by the investigation. The contract system has been established on the boats, and now we have given contracts for supplies on all the boats of the government, with one or two exceptions. Last year my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) discussed this very question, and urged that it would be a good thing to provision the boats, not by purchasing the goods ourselves, but by making contracts through the captains and stewards of those boats. That system is now in vogue, it was in vogue even when he drew my attention to it on several of our boats, and at present the contract agent is completing arrangements for the other boats we have. I think I may also mention the great improvement that has taken place with regard to the works under the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. My hon. friend from St. Anne, Montreal, (Mr. Doherty), knows very well how those works were carried on previously in the Montreal harbour. A new commission has been appointed, and now the work is being done in a way which is creditable, not only to the commissioners, but to the whole country.

My hon. friend from St. Anne states that corrupt acts have been committed; it is true. He states that corrupt acts have been disclosed; it is true. But let me assure him that these corrupt acts were unknown by the minister or by any of the superior officers of the department. Those acts took place under a system which had been in vogue for many years, a system which had not given satisfaction, and a system which we are now changing. I do not desire to prolong my remarks. I think I have shown that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is now on a footing which will commend it to parliament and to the country. Should we go further? My hon. friend says we should go further, and make a further investigation. In all cases there is not the same justification as there was in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Does he want to have all the officers branded as robbers? Does he want all the officers of the government branded as thieves, or as having received gratuities? I know he does not want that. We must take it for granted that these officers are honest. There was justification for an inquiry in the Marine and Fisheries Department, because we had before us the report of the Civil Service Commissioners, in which they stated that there was a lack of conscience in the department. But I do not think my hon. friend is justified in going any further.

Now, some allusion has also been made to the dismissal of officers from my department. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that it was a very painful duty for me to perform. I received a great many letters, supplications from mothers, sisters, wives and children, imploring me to show compassion on those who had been implicated in the disclosures of the Cassels investigation. I did find that in some cases it was very hard to resist the appeals of these persons. But I approached the matter, neither with antipathy nor with sympathy, but with the sole desire of rendering justice to all those who were the subjects of the investigation. I have tried to do my duty, not as an enemy, not as a friend, but purely and simply as a judge in the discharge of his duty. The report on this matter, which was laid before the House a few days ago, was a result of the mature judgment and consideration of all the cases of men who were implicated in those disclosures. I think, Mr. Speaker, that in doing this I have only fulfilled my duty, as I was bound to fulfil it, in view of the disclosures which were made. Finally, I place myself in the hands of parliament. I am ready to submit to the judgment of the country, and it is my belief that the country will see the Department of Marine and Fisheries conducted in future in such a manner that is will be at all times a credit to this country.

Mr. J. W. MADDIN (South Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, the resolution which has been placed in your hands, moved by the hon. member for St. Anne, Montreal, (Mr. Doherty), has for its object to impress upon the government the necessity of making an inquiry into the other spending departments of this government, such as has been made into the Department of Marine and Fisheries by His Honour Mr. Justice Cassels. In fact, the resolution goes further than that, it suggests a searching, untrammelled and a more thorough inquiry than that which was held by Mr. Justice Cassels. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, after occupying the attention of the House for something more than an hour, endeavouring to answer the arguments of my hon. friend from St. Anne, has not succeeded in answering one of them. During nearly the whole of his speech he seemed only anxious to defend himself, and to make out for himself a good character in respect of his administration and the efficiency of his department. He appeared to be very anxious to exhibit the endorsations

which he had received from various boards of trade throughout the country. Sir, in that respect his department is not in question in this resolution, nor is it before the House at the present time. No one at this time is making any complaint that his department is not efficient, no one on this side of the House denies that improvements have been made in his department. That might be said at another time and under other circumstances; that aspect of the minister's department is not now before the House. The question before the House is simply this: Do we learn sufficient from the report submitted to us by Mr. Justice Cassells to warrant us in taking the public behind the scenes in the other great spending departments of this government? The Minister of Marine has not offered one reason why such an investigation should not be had. He asks that his conduct in the department should be condoned and points out that he is the least of a great number of men who have filled that office, and then he tries to show that he was the one man of all these who had the courage to boldly come out and undertake reform. He tells us that he was appointed Minister of Marine in February, 1906. On May 8, 1906, only a few months after the hon. gentleman undertook the duties of that office, the member from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) in addressing the House, spoke as follows:—

Up to about two or three years ago, we had the Pintsch gas system by which we had a permanent light on the gas buoys. It was changed then to the acetylene gas system.

Further on he says:

I have not the slightest hesitation in saying, as I see from the Auditor General's report, that the government have spent in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000 in the fiscal year of 1905 in making these changes, that there has been a very considerable rake-off, say from 25 to 50 per cent. Some one is getting that rake-off. There is a system going on in the Marine and Fisheries Department by which, on almost every item in connection with this matter, there is a rake-off of at least 25 per cent, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when he examines the accounts that go through his department, will have to come before the House and admit that there is 25 per cent at least paid on every item in connection with this matter over and above what I or any other member of this House could purchase these appliances for. That is a fact, and I defy the minister to dispute it. I can prove it here by the items in the Auditor General's report. It is most unfair to have a system of that kind going on in the Marine and Fisheries Department. It is not going on without some one getting a rake-off. We should know who is getting that rake-off. It is a shame that this country has to pay these exorbitant prices.

This was in May, 1906. Yet the Minister of Marine boasts here of the virtue in his department. When a woman boasts about her virtue we at once become suspicious. The minister did not waken to his sense of duty until in 1908 he says he had the courage to order goods to be purchased in his department by public tender. Further than that, after the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) brought this matter to the attention of the Minister of Marine, a new system of bookkeeping was introduced into that department at the instance of the minister; at a very great expense to the people of this country, Falconer & Co. of New York made a searching inquiry and audit of the books of the Marine Department. What did they discover? They discovered a system prevailing there that was even worse than Mr. Reid in his modesty had suggested. Although this investigation took place in 1907 the minister undertakes no reform until 1908. The minister says that from the earliest time in this department of the government the system of buying goods through government patronage has obtained and after doubtless searching the records of the department with the greatest care he brings here a letter written in 1886 and points out that it is shown in that letter that when the hon. member for North Toronto was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the purchase of supplies at Quebec was under the patronage system, that the sale of supplies for the St. Lawrence branch of the Department of Marine and Fisheries was not open to the public but was circumscribed to the extent that purchasers were obliged to buy from certain Conservatives whose names were put on the patronage list. For years preceding 1896 hon. gentlemen opposite were wont to go to the country and point out amongst other evils which characterized the Conservative administration that of the patronage system. They boasted on every platform that when they got into power they would abolish that system forever. In that way they obtained the confidence of the people and were entrusted with the administration of the affairs of the country and why did they not then bring about these reforms? It ill becomes the Minister of Marine in 1909 to say that because in 1886 a system obtained which was bad the government were justified in carrying on the same system. Two wrongs cannot make a right and the minister's statement that this system obtained in the past does not by any means exculpate his department and the present administration.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MADDIN. When you left the chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was referring in detail to some of the instances disclosed

by this report of the Cassels commission. We find that a man named Wm. Blackeson, who followed the occupation of his father as a sail maker, testified that he paid five per cent commission to Mr. Gregory as his father had done before him. Mr. J. J. Murphy paid five per cent commission to Mr. Gregory, and Mr. Murphy received 15 per cent profit on his sales to the government over and above what he paid Gregory. We find also that no less than 28 officials of the department in the city of Quebec received from Mr. Drolet a sum of $9,342 in a period of three years, an average of $3,114 per year, on an average per head of $111 for these 28 men. Then we have it in evidence that Mr. P. J. Mailloux knew of payments being made to Mr. Gregory, and that George Davie of the firm of Davie & Sons paid Gregory $500 per year on an average for eleven years, in addition to paying $75 to Mr. Petty, engineer of the 'Montcalm.' Mr. Davie, who had large contracts with the department, well knew that in receiving these payments Gregory was violating the law of the country, and he doubtless also knew that he himself was guilty of an offence because he admits that he departed from the ordinary custom of his business, and, in order, as he says, to shield Gregory, he took the extraordinary course of drawing the $500 on McGee & Company, brokers, and having it paid in five-dollar American green-back bills so as to leave no record of the payment. This man also testifies that a further sum of $800 was paid to Mr. Gregory on August 30, 1906, and a still further sum of $500 was paid to him in August, 1907. This same man Davie was making a profit of 50 per cent on his contracts with the department. Among other favours conferred on Mr. Gregory by Mr. Davie the latter paid Gregory $400 to go to New York to transact some business for him, and it developed that he was paid this sum to use his influence as a government official to assist Mr. Davie in selling some dredging apparatus to an American firm. In addition to this, in December, 1907, Mr. Davie paid the captain of the La Canadienne $25; in December, 1906, $50, and in 1905, meeting him on the street one day, he casually handed him a one hundred dollar bill. Here are specific instances in which a briber approached the officers of the government and bribed them, not with trifling sums, but with sums aggregating more than a year's wages for most of the artisans and labouring men of the Dominion. An artisan who averages $800 per year thinks he is well off, and yet on one occasion this lump sum was paid by one contractor to this official of the government. The evidence with regard to the Halliday Bros. is a striking illustration of how things were manipulated at Quebec. They had a contract with the government for the services of the S.S. 'King Edward' by which originally they were to be paid $135 a day, and these men were receiving pay from another department at the same time they were under contract with the Marine and Fisheries Department. They subsequently rendered a bill to the Marine Department for $200 a day for the steamer, and eventually they were paid at the rate of $180 per day or $45 per day more than the original contract. A Mr. George B. Hall handed Mr. Gregory a gratuity of one hundred dollars, and although Mr. Hall is a lumber merchant, yet he was selling oil to the department and making a rake-off from 25 per cent to 30 per cent as a middleman in that business. Mr. Wm. Doyle paid Mr. Gregory a commission of 3½ per cent or $495 on $17,300 worth of goods which he sold to the department. It seemed that Mr. Gregory owed Mr. Doyle $613.90, and that account was wiped out by Gregory paying Doyle $117.77. Mr. Drouin allowed Gregory five per cent on the purchases which Gregory made from him for the department, the scheme being that Gregory paid the amount to Drouin previous to the receipt of the government cheque and this five per cent was said to be by way of discount. Then, Mr. Gillespie also borrowed from Gregory so as to allow him five per cent. I shall not go further into minute details in connection with this matter, but I do wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that section 158 of the Criminal Code, was framed to meet such cases. Section 158 reads as follows:

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a fine of not less than one hundred dollars, and not exceeding one thousand dollars, and to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year and not less than one month, and in default of payment of such fine to imprisonment for a further time not exceeding six months who—

(a) makes any offer, proposal, gift, loan or promise, or gives or offers any compensation or consideration, directly or indirectly, to any official or person in the employment of the government, or to any member of his family, or to any person under his control or for his benefit, with intent to obtain the assistance or influence of such official, or person to promote either the procuring of any contract with the government for the performance of any work, the doing of any thing, or the furnishing of any goods, effects, food or materials, the execution of any such contract, or the payment of the price or consideration stipulated therein, or any part thereof, or of any aid or subsidy payable in respect thereof; or,

(b) being an official or person in the employment of the government, directly or indirectly, accepts or agrees to accept, or allows to be accepted by any person under his control or for his benefit, any such offer, proposal, gift, loan, promise, compensation or consideration; or,

(c) being an official or employee of the government, receives, directly or indirectly, whether personally or by or through any member

of his family or person under his control or for his benefit, any gift. loan, promise, compensation or consideration whatsoever, either in money or otherwise, from any person whomsoever, for assisting or favouring any individual in the transaction of any business whatsoever with the government, or who gives or offers any such gift, loan, promise, compensation or consideration; or,

(g) having dealings of any kind with the government through any department thereof, pays to any employee or official of the government, or to any member of the family of such employee or official, or to any person under his control or for his benefit, any commission or reward or within one year before or after such dealings, without the express permission in writing of the head of the department with which such dealings have been had, the proof of which permission shall lie upon him, makes any gift, loan, or promise of any money matter or thing, to any such employee or other person aforesaid; or

(h) being an employee or official of the government, demands, exacts or receives from such person, directly or indirectly, by himself, or by or through any other person for his benefit, or permits or allows any member of his family, or any person under his control, to accept or receive (i) any such commission or reward, or (ii) within the said period of one year, without the express permission in writing of the head of the department with which such dealings have been had, the proof of which permission shall lie upon him, accepts or receives any such gift, loan or promise.

Now, I wish to read section 159:

Every person convicted of an offence under the last preceding section shall be incapable of contracting with the government, or of holding any contract or office with, from, or under it, or of receiving any benefit under any such contract.

I have read these portions of section 158 which are pertinent to this resolution and the whole of section 159, in order to emphasize to this House that in 1892, and I doubt not previous to that, there were provisions in the Criminal Code of this country for the punishment of the identical offences which Mr. Justice Cassels has found to be so rampant in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I do this to emphasize the fact that the criminal law of this country was framed and passed in order to meet just such cases as have arisen here. This report of Mr. Justice Cassels came down in the latter part of January, and on the first day of February a Bill, entitled 'An Act to prevent the payment or acceptance of illicit or secret commissions and other like practices,' received its first reading in this House. The first section of that Act is as follows:

This Act may be cited as 'The Secret Commissions Act, 1909.'

When that Bill was introduced into this House by the hon. the Minister of Justice, while agreeing with him that the provisions contained in it would meet with the approval of a majority of the people, I endeavoured to point out that it was most desirable that the criminal law of this country should be preserved in the codical form in which it had been handed down to us by the late Hon. John S. D. Thompson; so that we should have our criminal law in one volume and not distributed through the various statutes of Canada under different headings, and with various high-sounding titles. Was there any special motive for introducing that Bill at that particular time? As up to that time there had been no persons prosecuted under the Criminal Code for receiving secret commissions, was it hoped that the people throughout the length and breadth of the country would, by the introduction of that Bill, have their eyes closed to the lack of prosecutions by the government for the flagrant disclosures made in the report of Mr. Justice Cassels? When it became known that that report would bristle with the most flagrant instances of violations of the criminal law of the country, it was sought to draw a red herring across the trail, by introducing a piece of legislation which, although it does not on its face say so, implies that it was framed for the purpose of meeting any future cases that might arise similar to those disclosed by the investigation into the affairs of the Marine and Fisheries Department. The criminal law of the country is quite clear with regard to these offences. I have read what sections 158 and 159 of the Code have to say, and I can readily appreciate the sentiments in the mind of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he says that no one knows how hard it was for him to apply the pruning knife to his department, to the extent he did, as shown by the order in council brought down the other day. I can readily understand how, moved by letters addressed to him from the wives, mothers, sisters, and children of officials in his department, he is loath to institute prosecutions against them. I would not for a moment advocate that an example should be made in every individual instance in which an offence has been disclosed by this investigation; but I say this, that when it comes to the knowledge of a community or a country that a part of the criminal law of the country has been openly and flagrantly violated for a period covering several years, it becomes the duty of the person responsible for the administration of the department in which these crimes arose, to make an example of someone;—to single out some of the more flagrant instances—and there are many—and institute proceedings against the parties.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisher-

ies, in replying to the mover of this resolution, in a speech which occupied the attention of this House for a full hour, claimed to have been the one who had the courage to undertake reforms in his department. He said that whilst the mover of the resolution had criticised his conduct, he had not given him credit for the reforms which he had effected. During the election campaign in his own province the hon. gentleman had a very different reason to offer. To-day he tells us that he was not given credit for the good his department did, but that he was subjected instead to a campaign of slander. Why, in his own province, the Liberal press, which advocates the virtues of his administration as well as its vices through thick and thin, in season and out of season, claim, and that claim was put forward by the minister himself, that the only reason for criticisms of himself and his department was because he was a Frenchman. That was the reason given by the 'Soleil' and 'La Presse' and another French-Canadian paper as well as by the minister himself.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to quote one instance when I said anything of the kind.

Mr. MADDIN. I am not prepared to state on what platform or on what day the hon. minister said it, but I promise him that I will furnish him with the place and date.

Mr. BRODEUR. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. MADDIN. In deference to the hon. minister and to the rules of the House I am obliged to accept his denial, but I was told this on the authority of members from the province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name them.

Mr. MADDIN. I do not propose to name them. They are not on that side of the House at any rate. This was the reason put forth by the French-Canadian press in the province of Quebec to account for the attacks made on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Let me say that the Liberal-Conservative party has never been found wanting in regard and esteem for French-Canadians. That party, from the beginning of confederation, and long previous to confederation in Upper Canada, held the French-Canadian people in the highest esteem. Hon. gentlemen on this side are always willing to pay any tribute due to the memory of Champlain and Cartier and even to the right hon. the leader of the government, in so far as he is a Canadian citizen. We have never been lacking on this side in regard for our compatriots of French origin, so that it cannot be said, with any degree of truth, that it was because of the hon. minister's origin, he and his department were attacked.

Let us trace the history of this investigation. A commission was appointed and this commission reported in 1907, and in its report reflected on the administration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The hon. minister then suggested this inquiry, urged on by his colleagues in the cabinet. It was they who instituted these proceedings, and for any disclosures which have arisen, they have only themselves to thank. But the resolution moved this afternoon has for object an inquiry into the other spending departments of the government; and unless hon. gentlemen opposite support this resolution, it may be said, with some degree of truth, that the Marine and Fisheries Department was made the scapegoat for the sins of the other departments as well as its own. Unless this resolution be accepted by the government, they must consider that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is better administered than the others. After the mover of this resolution (Mr. Doherty) had addressed the House this afternoon, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries rose to reply; and I venture to say that this is the first instance in the history of confederation, when a minister of the Crown replied to a resolution without committing himself either to an endorsement of it or to opposing it. He did not intimate how he proposed to vote if the House came to a vote on the question. He did not say that he was opposed to the resolution or that he approved it; but by inference, perhaps, it may be concluded that he does not intend to support it. The hon. minister went back through the history of the Liberal-Conservative party looking for precedents. It is remarkable how, when this government wishes to find a precedent for anything that will hardly bear close scrutiny, it always endeavours to find one in the past records of the Liberal-Conservative party. Well, after going through the records of that party from 1878 to 1896, one letter was discovered written in 1886.

Why, asked the minister, do not my opponents give me credit for the great results I have accomplished, for the good I have done? But on the other hand, why does not the minister play fair? Why does he not give credit to the then Minister of Marine for the good things done under the Liberal-Conservative party in the eighteen years they were in power? Instead of looking up ancient history, why does not he apply himself to something more modern and look through the correspondence on the files, from 1896 to the present, regarding expenditures of the character described in Judge Cassels' report? If he had any desire to act fairly, he would do that, but evidently he has no such intention.

In conclusion, I have only to observe that the minister has not met the issue

raised in this resolution, but has simply contented himself pointing out the reforms undertaken and carried out by his department. He has argued in a most peculiar fashion, and made some very illogical deductions. In effect, he says. 'Under my administration I have improved the St. Lawrence service, as you will see by resolutions passed by the Quebec Harbour Commission; I have introduced ice breakers, and call your attention to the resolution adopted by the Board of Trade of Port Arthur. I have caused the rates of insurance to be reduced on the St. Lawrence route; I have introduced a new system of bookkeeping in the Department of Marine and Fisheries; and because I have done all these things there should be no inquiry into any other spending departments of the government.' Would any one call that a logical argument? In his report Mr. Justice Cassels states that in order to bring about a successful reform in the spending departments of the government, it was advisable to awaken the public conscience. Why then will not the government accept this resolution? Have they anything to fear from it or to lose by it? Does the government consider that suspicion, as a result of this Cassels inquiry, is not deeply rooted in the public minds? If the other spending departments of this government are above reproach, an inquiry will redound to the credit of the administration, and I believe that there is no member on this side of the House but will be only too happy to find that there was no ground for such an inquiry. But that the circumstances demand that the inquiry be made, I think no reasonable man can deny. Why, what would be thought of a business man, say Mr. Thomas Lindsay, of the city of Ottawa, who runs the department store down town, if he, upon investigation, found fifteen or twenty people trading with the clerks in his grocery department had been bribing those clerks with thousands and thousands of dollars which they had added to the price of goods which they sold to the department, and, though these identical men were doing business with his millinery department, his furniture department and other departments, should still say: 'Oh, it's all right; I will not inquire into these other departments; probably everything is straight there'? Do not you suppose that under such circumstances any business man would at once investigate every department under his control? And do not you suppose that, in any event, he would at once cut off from the list of those with whom he transacted business the names of persons whom he found guilty of corrupting the employees under his control? Will the government follow the counsel of this commission and make an endeavour to awaken the public conscience? Or are they afraid that they may awake the wrong passenger, that they may awake public indignation?—that they fear that an investigation into the other spending departments of the government would not redound to the credit of their administration? I wonder if the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), and the Minister of Mines (Mr. Templeman)—I wonder if these gentlemen were to take the evidence submitted by Mr. Justice Cassels in his report and make a careful perusal of it, if they would not recognize the names of those who have corrupted officials in the Department of Marine and Fisheries as the names of those who are still doing business with their several departments. For the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to argue that this system of patronage obtained under Liberal-Conservative rule is no justification. In his perusal of the files in his department from 1896 to date, he does not show us any instances such as the dozen or more that I cited to him here to-night; all that he does show—and I suppose he has shot his bolt, that he has selected that specific case which he thought would apply here—is that a system of competition by which the late government practised the custom of buying from friends of the administration. They bought by tender from amongst the supporters of the Liberal party who were on the patronage list of the government. But still there was competition among the supporters of the government to get the contract whatever it might be. That is entirely different from the condition that has obtained under the present government up to this time. I submit that it is one matter to have a patronage system where goods are bought in competition between friends of the government and an entirely different matter to have a system under which friends of the government are put up to compete against each other, the contract to go to the one who will give the highest bribe to the officials. I say that in view of the evidence submitted in this report showing the relation of these bribers to this department and other departments (the significance of the report being as much in what it does not say as in what it does say), and in view of the circumscribed nature of the commission which Mr. Justice Cassels had which would not let him go beyond certain means and abuses, taken under these circumscribed conditions, it is of such a character as not only requires but demands the fullest and most untrammelled inquiry that the government can hold.

Mr. GEO. W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.). I desire to offer one or two observations touching the matters that have been discussed this afternoon in connection particularly with the report of Mr. Justice Cas-

sels in his investigation into the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I presume that there will be no question on the part of gentlemen on either side that it is in the highest degree desirable that the very best officials, the most competent and honest men, the most trustworthy men, should be employed by every department of the government throughout the whole country. I think that every hon. member will agree that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), like every member of this government, is not anxious to retain in the employ of the government men who are guilty of a breach of trust or of violating the sacred honour reposed in them in respect of their employment. But we must not lose sight of the fact that the government of Canada is a large institution, that it employs a horde of officials from one end of this broad Dominion to the other, that these employees are not brought directly under the supervision of the minister responsible for their actions, and it naturally occurs—it must inevitably occur— that much must depend on the personal integrity of the men so employed. It has happened that certain officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department have been proven guilty of wrong-doing and of neglect of that standard of honesty and rectitude set up for the guidance of public officials. The question is not whether the government has acted faithfully in carrying out its trust in this matter—the charge is not made that the government or any department has not dealt out summary punishment to those officials when any wrong-doing was brought to their notice. The report of Mr. Justice Cassels deals with a number of officials in Quebec, in St. John, in Halifax, who have been more or less derelict in respect to their obligations to the government and of the code of honour which they should apply to their own conduct. We have before us an order in council submitted by the First Minister a couple of days ago in which is recited what has been done with respect to the officials thus wanting in their duty and honesty. One would think, from the address of the hon. member for Ste. Anne (Mr. Doherty) and the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr Maddin), that the government, having learned that its officials had been derelict in their duty or guilty of breach of trust, instead of summarily punishing them had condoned the offences of which they were proven guilty. That is not the case. The evidence before us in respect of that order in council goes to show that every official who was guilty of wrong-doing has been punished in the manner called for by the obligations of the government in this regard. I am not going to enumerate the names of those officials, because I think it is not desirable that their names should be embalmed on the public records of this country. I will merely repeat, that every one of those officials who has been proved guilty of dishonesty has been dismissed, and they are no longer in the employment of the government.

Now, with respect to the ministers themselves, I beg to remind the hon. gentleman that there is not one single word censuring any member of the government, in the whole of this inquiry and report of Mr. Justice Cassels. I am well aware, and the House is well aware, that for the past twelve months the atmosphere resounded with all kinds of charges of wrong-doing and wholesale corruption in respect of the various departments of this government. During the last election campaign we remember that every minister was put upon his trial, and charges the most flagrant and most unjust were levelled against them. But the report of the commissioner exonerates absolutely every minister whose name was dragged into this question. Inasmuch as the hon. member for St. Anne devoted a great deal of attention to the report of the Civil Service Commission, I wish to call attention to the fact that that commission did not examine any person upon oath. They had a commission to inquire into certain departments of the government, and as a result of that inquiry, not based upon any sworn testimony, they came to the conclusion that there were certain things transpiring in some of the departments that were not desirable. Referring to their strictures in respect to the light house board, on page 8, Judge Cassels says:—

> I am quite satisfied that had Messrs. Fyshe and Bazin heard the evidence adduced before me, the language quoted above would not have been used by them.

That is, language referring to certain maladministration with respect to the Lighthouse Board, in which wrong-doing or want of conscience, as they put it, was charged. But, as I said a moment ago, Judge Cassels having heard the sworn testimony of every person giving evidence, came to the conclusion that if these gentlemen had heard the sworn evidence adduced before him, they would not have used that language. With respect to their references to other branches of the Civil Service, I desire to point out that the commissioner does not censure the minister of any one of the departments of the government. As a matter of fact, the Civil Service Commission does speak of the Post Office Department, the Department of Railways and Canals, the Department of Customs and the Department of Secretary of State, but in terms which do not at all imply that they had discovered the slightest trace of wrong-doing. The only two departments referred to at length by the commission were the Department of Marine

and Fisheries and the Department of Militia and Defence. Let me refer for the moment to the statement with respect to the Department of Militia and Defence. The only charge made against that department is the charge that they were spending a great deal of money, and this is what the report says:—

The expenditure in this department is going up by leaps and bounds. In 1903-4 the total expenditure, both in capital and consolidated fund, was in the neighbourhood of three and a half million dollars. In the estimates lately submitted to parliament for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1909, appropriations are asked for aggregating $6,500,000. That is to say, in four years and three-quarters the expenditures will have increased, if the supply asked for is granted, to the extent of three million dollars.

Now, that in itself does not imply any wrong-doing in the Department of Militia, though one might be inclined perhaps to suppose that the commissioners had in mind some suspicion that money was improperly spent. I need scarcely remind you that within the period referred to by the Civil Service Commission during the last four years the Department of Militia and Defence, in pursuance of that policy of expansion and with the object of relieving the mother country of some of the burdens that she bore for a hundred years in our defence, came to the conclusion to assume the maintenance of the fortifications at Halifax and Esquimalt. Hon. gentlemen opposite are loyal to the British empire, are loyal to the flag of Great Britain, and we had evidence a few evenings ago of what these hon. gentlemen think of Canada's duty to aid in the defence of the empire. Surely, then, those hon. gentlemen will not censure the government because the expenditure in the Militia Department has increased two or three million dollars by reason of the added responsibilities assumed by that department in taking over these fortifications. It is a fact that the estimates of the department were increased by over two millions on the single item to maintain the garrison at Halifax, but surely no hon. gentleman opposite will find fault with the department for undertaking this expenditure, inasmuch as by so doing they are relieving the mother country of a great burden. Now, with respect to the internal management of the Militia Department, they do make some criticisms of certain officials, and of the duties assigned to them, and they point out that perhaps in some respects the expenditure might be decreased and greater economy practised if that department were reorganized. Well, I have every confidence that the Minister of Militia and Defence will not lose a moment to investigate in what respect he can reduce the expenditure, while at the same time providing for the increased expenditures that must come from time to time. With regard to the Post Office Department, the commissioners say as follows:—

Your commissioners find that this is the third of the big departments scheduled under the Civil Service Act. As far as the commissioners can ascertain, the working of this department is conducted in a good businesslike manner, and except for the intervention of politics, and, possibly, the desire to run the department too cheaply, no fault can be found with the administraion.

I wonder if our hon. friends opposite complain of the Post Office Department because it is running affairs too cheaply. While we would regret if the Postmaster General were obliged to turn a deaf ear to certain requests made to him for improvement of postal facilities, I am sure every hon. gentleman in this House will rejoice that the Civil Service Commission state that the only fault to be found with that department is that the minister is running it too cheaply. There is no suggestion there of any wrong-doing. Now, I come to the Department of Railways and Canals:

Your commissioners do not propose to make any specific remarks about this department, although it is a great expending department and also has large revenues derived from the government railways. The present Deputy Minister of Railways, who has not been long in office, has established a new system of bookkeeping on the Intercolonial Railway, and it would seem probable that improvements will be effected generally.

I might go through all the departments referred to, and not in one instance do the commissioners reflect in the slightest degree upon the minister in charge, or upon the administration of the department. Then I come back to the sole point under discussion, and when I state that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has discharged his duty in dismissing the officials who have been found guilty of wrong-doing, when I state that by order in council the government have undertaken to dismiss every one of those men who have been proved guilty of dereliction of duty, I am satisfied that no reasonable gentleman on either side of the House can refuse to accept that act as an answer to the charge made by the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution. Another matter I desire to refer to is of the contract entered into between the department and Halliday Bros., of the city of Quebec. It was stated by the hon. member for St. Annes that the original contract was for the use of their steamer at $125 a day, and that subsequently that sum was increased to $200 a day, and the insinuation is there made, that the late minister in charge of the department was responsible for that. But Mr. Justice Cassels in his report states:

Repeatedly during the examination of Colonel Gourdeau he stated that he could bring evidence to corroborate his statement that the variation took place with the assent of the late minister. The witness referred to was Mr. Power, late member for Quebec. I invited Colonel Gourdeau to produce the evidence. No such evidence has been given and I have to judge of the matters on the evidence adduced before me. In a great many respects the evidence of Colonel Gourdeau was unsatisfactory and contradictory.

Not a single suggestion is made in the report of Mr. Justice Cassels to show that the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries was in any way responsible for increasing the amount of Halliday Brothers' contract; but on the contrary he stated that Mr. Gourdeau's promise that he would produce evidence in that regard had not been fulfilled and he was obliged to come to the conclusion that the late minister had nothing whatever to do with it. The hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) referred to the fact that hon. gentlemen who were implicated with respect to these charges had not been haled before the court. I shall speak for a moment of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. There is a court in this conutry, the highest court we have, the high court of public opinion. Down in the county of Rouville there is such a court, the court of the people of the county of Rouville, the county represented by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. In view of all the charges made against the minister in the last 12 months with respect to maladministration in his department one would imagine these hon. gentlemen would have made good and would have availed themselves of the earliest opportunity to appeal to that court and to prove there that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was no longer worthy of their confidence and should not be returned to represent them in parliament again. It is a most extraordinary circumstance that the one minister against whom all their attacks and all their shafts were levelled for 12 months was allowed on the 26th of October to be returned by acclamation to this House. Surely if these hon. gentlemen were sincere, surely if they felt the full responsibility of the charges they made against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and against his department, they would have taken the earliest opportunity to have prevented the minister from coming back to preside over the department which they insinuated he had so ineffectively and so dishonestly administered. If there was one constituency in the whole of this broad Dominion that they should have fought and fought to the death in the last election that was Rouville, in order to prevent that minister coming back to disgrace the high office he had held, as they would have expressed it. But the only constituency in Canada which they allowed to go by acclamation was Rouville, and surely that is the best answer and the only answer that is required to the charges against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is quite true that we had the pleasure of listening to a high certificate of character in respect to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries this afternoon given by the hon. member who moved this resolution (Mr. Doherty). I was not unprepared to hear that because I had felt ever since the election of the 26th of October last, that the hon. gentlemen opposite when it would be up to them to produce evidence to support their contentions would find it exceedingly difficult to carry on their campaign any longer. I was prepared to hear the hon. member for St Anne (Mr. Doherty) paying high enconiums to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and why should I devote one instant of time more to defend the hon. minister against charges which have been thoroughly dissipated, from which he has been completely vindicated, charges which hon. gentlemen themselves testified this afternoon are absolutely without any foundation in fact. But, Sir, perhaps it is not desirable that the senses of the people of Canada should be steeped in forgetfulness with respect to the record of the Conservative party themselves when they were in power. The hon. member for South Cape Breton made an admission which was so significant that I shall refer to it. He said that whenever the Liberal party wanted a precedent for corruption they went back to the regime of the Conservative party. That statement is so absolutely true that I was rather amazed that the hon. gentleman found himself called upon to make it. I shall not go over the lurid history that filled the pages of 'Hansard' from 1878 to 1896, but I shall cite one case to show that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should not be held responsible for anything that his officials did, particularly when those acts were committed hundreds of miles away from his direct supervision. I shall refer to the case of the Curran bridge which was investigated here in 1894, and was one of the last cases investigated prior to the defeat of the Conservative party. A vote of $170,000 was asked by the Conservative government for the construction of the Curran bridge in Montreal. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. John Haggart) was then Minister of Railways and Canals. The construction of the bridge was undertaken by day's work, not by tender and contract, and it was found that instead of $170,000 being sufficient to complete that work, it cost nearly $400,000. No pains were taken by the Minister of Railways of that day to supervise the carrying out of that contract or to ascertain for himself whether the money was honestly spent. I exonerate the ex-minister from any dereliction of duty in that regard, for notwithstanding the fact that the work was carried on only three

hours' ride from here, in Montreal, within easy rail, telephone and telegraph communication, although the minister could much more easily have an eye on the supervision of that work than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could have upon a horde of officers scattered all over Canada, I do not say that the mere fact that money was grossly misspent is any personal reflection on the ex-Minister of Railways. When this came up in parliament it was proved beyond peradventure that this money was misspent to such a degree as had never been heard of in any committee of this House. The quantity of lumber required to be used was 2,594,000 feet, and there was charged and paid for 3,613,000 feet, or a steal of over 1,000,000 feet representing over $15,000. The stone-cutting which should have been $16,000 was $40,000. Upon the Wellington street bridge the cost of stone-cutting by day's work, which should have been $3,000, was $16,715, and the Grand Trunk bridge work, which should have cost $3,000, cost the government $23,180. The attention of the government was called to that condition of affairs by certain references made to it in this parliament and by certain items in the Montreal press. The ex-Minister of Railways then undertook to investigate and he found every charge made in respect to the expenditure of that money was absolutely true. In the session of 1894, Sir Richard Cartwright, then a member of this House, moved a resolution censuring the government in respect to that work. The concluding paragraph of that resolution reads:

That in the opinion of this House, the Department of Railways and Canals is deserving of the severest censure for inefficiency, neglect of duty, extravagance and the general management in connection with the said works.

The defence made then by the Hon. Mr. Haggart, Minister of Railways, was just such a defence as I would expect he would make, and I believe every word of it; he said:

I never heard, until the evidence was given in the Public Accounts Committee the other day, that there were a number of men transferred from Mr. Kennedy's roll to Mr. St. Louis's pay-roll, and I may as well here show how impossible it was for me to find out the frauds which I knew were being committed there. I knew that the timber charged for was in excess of what was required for the purpose of building that bridge; I knew that the labour charged for could not possibly be employed in its construction, and I knew that the demands made upon the department were in excess of what was honestly used in the construction of the work. I tried every possible means to get at the bottom of the frauds, and to that end I had the detective force employed on the Intercolonial Railway sent up and put on the Montreal works; but I found it impossible to discover where the frauds were committed. I had great difficulty in obtaining the evidence of the time-keeper, Mr. Doheny, for the purpose of defending the government against an action brought by Mr. St. Louis in the Exchequer Court for a sum of money, amounting, I think, to $67,000 or $68,000. I had great difficulty in getting evidence sufficient to prove that there had been frauds on the work.

Again he said:

The chief engineer reported the condition of affairs to me, setting forth that, so far as Mr. Douglas had been able to investigate, he believed the cost would reach no less a sum than $360,000, but that Mr. Douglas would continue his investigation. Mr. Douglas continued his investigation, and reported that he believed the cost of the bridges would exceed the amount he had already named.

Here we have the Minister of Railways in the Conservative government setting up as his defence that it was impossible for him to be cognizant of this wrong-doing which was perpetrated only 100 miles from the city of Ottawa; that defence prevailed, and the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright was voted down, every Conservative member voting to justify the minister. The hon. Mr. Haggart declared that the money was mis-spent without his knowledge, that he could not personally supervise the expenditure, that he was deceived and misled by his officials, and is it not fair to ask this House now to declare that the wrong-doing in the Department of Marine and Fisheries was absolutely without the cognizance of the minister and was such that it was absolutely impossible for him to detect it.

Mr. STAPLES. I was not in when the hon. gentleman began his remarks, but might I ask him if he is referring to the Quebec Bridge?

Mr. KYTE. I was referring to the Curran bridge.

Mr. STAPLES. Is the Curran bridge still standing?

Mr. KYTE. The Curran bridge was completed, and was supposed to stand. Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the conditions that existed in Canada from 1891 to 1896 let me quote the utterances of some English newspapers. The London 'Times' says:

Here in the mother country there can be only one feeling, that of deep regret for the wrong done to the fair fame of the eldest of her daughters.

The London 'Graphic':

It is no longer possible to doubt that corruption in its worst form is rampant in a large portion of the Canadian Civil Service.

The London 'Telegraph':

Enough, unfortunately, is already known in England to make it clear that only the most resolute and drastic purification can redeem

public life in Canada from the taint of corruption, the like of which we have not seen in our own country for hundreds of years.

The London 'Echo':

No country can prosper where public departments are in league with fraudulent contractors, and where ministers are open to offers.

These English newspapers perfectly describe the condition of affairs in Canada from 1891 to 1896, and there is absolute truth in the statement made by the hon. gentleman for South Cape Breton when he said that we were obliged to go to the regime of the Tory party to find precedents for corruption in this country. The hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) gave a certificate of character to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and although the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) used much stronger language and exhibited much more temper than his colleague (Mr. Doherty) he also paid a compliment to the minister. He said that he would not now make a complaint against the administration of that hon. gentleman, but that a charge would be made at another time. I wonder if the hon. gentleman had in mind the time some years hence when this parliament will be dissolved and the right hon. the Prime Minister will again appeal for the support of the electors. I wonder if the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton thought that when that time comes around he will revamp these charges against the Minister of Marine. Well, Sir, I tell him and I tell others that here and now are the place and time to make charges against any minister of this government and not when the election campaign is on and when they can give free scope to their unfettered imagination and irresponsible rhetoric. When the Liberals were in opposition in this country they made charges in this House, they met the accused face to face and they asked for committees to be allowed to prove these charges. That was the manly course to take, but the Conservative government then in power made sure that if an inquiry were granted the accused should be surrounded by all the technicalities the law afforded for their protection. The resolution of the hon. member for St. Anne simply calls for an inquiry into other departments of government to see if any wrong-doing has been committed. We are bound to assume, as these gentlemen opposite have failed to make charges, that the truth is that having made all the inquiry they could they are unable to point a finger at one single act of maladministration committed by any minister of the Crown. The hon. gentleman from St. Anne gave his case away when he said a cloud of suspicion rested on the department. Well, there is no cloud of suspicion in the minds of gentlemen on this side of the House, and in view of the result of the elections on the 26th of October last I venture to say there is no cloud of suspicion in the minds of the electorate of this country. And, Sir, the government having been charged by the people of Canada with the full responsibility of conducting the affairs of this country, I believe they can find themselves much better employed than in appointing roving commissions to investigate foundationless charges. The motion of the hon. member (Mr. Doherty) is one of non-confidence, and it asks us who support the government to say that the ministers are not worthy of our confidence. I believe, Sir, that the members of this government are at present, and have at all times been exercising such care over their departments, that where there is wrong-doing shown to have been committed they will treat the guilty officials in the same way as they have treated certain officials of the Marine Department, and it seems to me that is all the country can reasonably expect the ministers to do.

Mr. THOMAS W. CROTHERS (West Elgin). As I understand it, the charge made against the government is not that certain officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department have been guilty of wrong-doing. One can easily understand some of the officials of so large a department as the Department of Marine and Fisheries going wrong, and it would be unreasonable to find fault with the minister or the government if the minister, on ascertaining the wrong-doing, or at the time he should have ascertained it with ordinary vigilance, had dismissed the wrong-doer and punished him, as the law provides. What we charge is, that not only the head of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but the head of the government who knew, or ought to have known, of the wrong-doing of these men three or four years before they were dismissed, did not take the course they should have taken. We also charge that at the present time, they are not taking the course they should take with reference to the men whose guilt has been established. They knew at least three years ago of the misconduct of one of the men whom they dismissed only a day or two ago.

The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), who has just sat down, said that the report of the commissioner found no fault in any of the ministers. Let me remind that hon. gentleman that the scope of this commission did not warrant the commissioner in going into any investigation of the conduct of the ministers, and when some of the witnesses were asked respecting the conduct of the ministers,

and respecting what the ministers knew of the wrong-doing, they were not allowed to give evidence with regard to that. The commissioner himself gives in substance the scope of the inquiry where he says:

Thereupon the commission, dated the 6th April, 1908, appointed me commissioner 'to investigate and report upon certain statements contained in the report of the Civil Service Commission reflecting upon the integrity of the officials of the Department of the Marine and Fisheries, or some of them.

Not the integrity of the government or the integrity of the ministers, but the integrity of the officials. Then he goes on to say:

Some limitation had to be given to the inquiry, and as the charges made by the report of the Civil Service Commission are mainly confined to the fiscal years 1904-5, 1905-6 and 1906-7, I limited the investigation in the meantime to those years.

So that the scope of the investigation is to inquire as to the integrity of certain officials and as to their conduct during those three years. The evidence adduced before the honourable the commissioner, covers nearly 2,200 large pages of printed matter, and the report of the commissioner, which is composed largely of quotations from the evidenc, covers 78 pages. I do not propose to detain the House to go over all the evidence contained in these 2,200 large pages of printed matter; but any hon. member who has read that evidence and the report of the commissioner must have reached these conclusions which I propose to read as the conclusions which I have reached on a fair reading of the evidence and the report:

(1). That the Department of Marine and Fisheries as a whole was loosely, extravagantly and dishonestly carried on.

(2). That both judge and counsel were anxious that all the officials should be able to prove themselves innocent, and that every opportunity to that end was given them. I have not drawn this conclusion with any intention of reflecting on either the counsel or the judge, but simply to show that every individual who was charged, or against whom there was any suspicion, was accorded the most ample opportunity to come forward and clear himself.

(3). That the investigation which was actually had, was fragmentary, disconnected and incomplete.

(4). That large numbers of officials were shown, even by such a partial inquiry, to have been dishonest.

(5). That the fraudulent transactions extended over at least three years, from 1904 to 1907, to which the inquiry was limited, although there was some evidence reaching into the year 1908.

(6). That there was an utter absence of any man, from the Prime Minister down to the petty agent, exerting any intelligent zeal for the protection of the treasury.

(7). That owing to the limited scope of the commission, the responsibility for the shameful conditions exposed, was not fixed.

(8). That grounds are disclosed, which demand a thorough examination into the workings of the other great spending departments of the government and a completion of the partial investigation already had in the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

As I have said, I do not propose to travel over these 2,200 pages of evidence, but I propose to confine my observations to a little evidence that was given by the Auditor General, beginning at page 230:

By Mr. Watson:

Q. Now, in the first place, take the deputy minister of the department, Colonel Gourdeau. What, if anything, has come to your knowledge in your official capacity bearing upon acts of irregularity and of that character as issuing from him? If that is too close and specific broaden it if you please. You know the scope of the investigation?—A. Well, I felt he did not sufficiently control or ascertain the manner in which the business was done by his officials although he was the responsible head.

Q. Then will you just state what you have in regard to the matters as issuing from him?—A. Well, I have had to complain very frequently about the prices, the cost of goods, the manner of purchase, the lack of calling for tenders, and all that sort of thing.

At page 232, I find the following evidence:

By Mr. Watson:

Q. Will you proceed then?—A. I notice another one on page 208 headed, Silverware for steamers 'Montcalm' and 'Champlain,' December 26, 1905,——

You will notice that this transaction precedes that date, December, 1905,—

By Mr. Watson:

Q. Will you proceed then?—A. I notice another one on page 208, headed 'Silverware, &c., for steamers 'Montcalm' and 'Champlain,' December 26, 1905.' Sir,—I beg to bring to your notice the accounts rendered by Messrs. B. J. Coghlin & Co., for silverware, glassware, and other table furnishings to the amount of $3,492.79 for the steamers 'Montcalm' and 'Champlain.' I should like to be informed of the advantage to the department of purchasing the articles in question through Messrs. Coghlin instead of direct from the trade. I should also like to be informed if it is customary to equip these vessels, which are not passenger carrying vessels, with silverware, cutlery, &c., of such an expensive nature as that which appears in the accounts above referred to.

We find that afterwards that the man who got the amount of $3,492 admitted that he had made a rake-off on the transaction of $1,100 and refunded it to the government. And this government knew, or ought to have known in 1905 of that trans-

action; and knowing of it, I submit they should have dispensed with the services of the man who was guilty of such a transaction.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Might I put the hon. gentleman a question? I desire to ask him if he will give the evidence of an accountant named William Duff at Montreal, selected by the Cassels Commission, and who gave evidence respecting this particular transaction?

Mr. TAYLOR. Let the hon. gentleman take the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. CROTHERS. I think that before I get through I shall have given the hon. member all the evidence he would like to hear. I find this evidence on page 234:

By Mr. Watson:

Q. I understood you to say before the silverware was not in his line?—A. No, although he may have had facilities for purchasing. He did buy some few years before, I ascertained, for some other steamers some silverware. When I confronted him with the original invoices he said there must be some mistake, and in fact he did not know what to say. It ended, however, in Mr. Coghlin refunding about $1,100.

Q. Oh, indeed, Mr. Coghlin refunded about $1,100 on the purchase price of something over $3,000—A. Yes, taking the contract to be what Colonel Gourdeau told me, and as it was confirmed by Mr. Coghlin, that they were to be furnished at the original wholesale price and 5 per cent commission allowed.

By Hon. Mr. Cassels:

Q. That would mean he utilized his being in the wholesale business to get from some other trades wholesale prices, that is what that would mean?—A. Yes.

Mr. Watson.—But the statement of the wholesale price was not correct.

By Hon. Mr. Cassels:

Q. I understand that. But he was using his position as dealer to get wholesale prices?—A. Yes.

Q. What did the deputy minister know about the contract originally?

By Mr. Watson:

Q. Yes?—A. Well, I think if I recollect he had something to do with ordering the goods.

Q. Oh yes, ordering the goods, but about the prices. What information did you get from him as to his personal knowledge about matters of contract?—A. He said that was the bargain they made with Mr. Coghlin.

That he was to buy the goods and get 5 per cent commission on the invoice price. Then take the evidence on page 235:

Witness—I understand they had the original invoice in the department? I dont know. I could not get it there.

By Mr. Watson:

Q. You mean showing smaller prices?—A. Yes.

Hon. Mr. Cassels—What you mean is, Colonel Gourdeau knew the prices being charged were less than the prices contracted for.

Mr. Watson—More, my lord.

Mr. CROTHERS.

At page 236:

By Hon. Mr. Cassels:

Q. Had you any conversation with Colonel Gourdeau after the refund of $1,100? We want to get all the information you can give us?—A. Yes. Colonel Gourdeau asked me since if we should not pay the $1,100 back to Mr. Coghlin,, as it came out in evidence afterwards that he should not have refunded that according to his contract.

Q. That Coghlin should not have?—A. Coghlin.

Q. Coghlin should not have refunded the amount?—A. Yes.

Q. That was the attitude of the deputy minister?—A. The peculiar thing was that they were both agreed on this statement, that the goods were to be supplied at the original cost price and 5 per cent commission charged, and on the strength of that Mr. Coghlin had made the refund of the overcharge, the apparent overcharge. Afterwards, some months afterwards, when the agreement in writing was produced at the Public Accounts Committee he wanted to get his money back. It has always seemed strange to me ever since that neither of them had any recollection of the original agreement, why they should contend that the agreement was one thing, which would mean a lower price to Mr. Coghlin, and it should transpire afterwards that there was the higher price he should have got.

Perhaps I had better read just in that connection another little passage showing what the contention of Mr. Coghlin was. It was that a year or two before he had an agreement with the government, under which he was to get the regular discount, and the Auditor General said that this discount amounted to between 40 per cent and 60 per cent. He discovered that he had been purchasing years before and getting 40, 50 and 60 per cent from the government, and therefore ought to have got it on this particular transaction instead of 5 per cent, so that the agreement does not help us very much. Then at page 238:

Q. Yes, I am aware of that. Now, let us exhaust the information you have in regard to each, first in regard to the deputy minister. You have spoken of one or two matters, is there anything else that has been called to your attention as affecting his position?—A. Well, his certificate came in the same category, after I had found out in the case of the silverware that the prices were not fair and just.

Q. Yes. Then did you get any specific information afterwards which would lead to any inference other than a favourable one as to his conduct?—A. In connection with the silverware?

Q. Yes, other than that?—A. No. It has been in that unsatisfactory condition to my mind ever since, that the matter was never satisfactorily explained.

Q. That is as to the silverware?—A. Yes.

Q. But I am seeking to carry it on to any other transaction by him. Have you a knowledge of any other transaction of a similar character or in which you were not satisfied

with the evidence of proper business transactions?—A. Well, I have seen his certificate in connection with the admission of goods free of duty where the certificate was not correct.

Q. Do you mean in favour of importers, contractors?—A. No. This is a certificate that the goods were required for the use of the government, and they were not.

Q. When they were not?—A. Yes.

Q. Yes?—A. To that extent the government was deprived of revenue.

That is another case where the falsity of the certificate was made apparent to the Auditor General. Now we have another one on page 240:

By Mr. Watson:

Q. Did you actually?—A. When he was present in the department here.

Q. I see. Well, I asked—probably there was some information that I had not been able to obtain when I examined Commander Spain yesterday, but I intended my questions to cover everything, and I think they did cover everything. His statement was they were correct. What did you find, Mr. Fraser, in regard to that?—A. Well, he had to make a refund, I think, between $800 and $900 on one year's travelling expenses.

Q. What year was that, 1905? I see in that year the expenses charged at $4,627. I called his attention to that yesterday. A refund of $800 or $900,—do you mean that expenses were charged for being out when he was in?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that the character of the charge? It is not excessive payments, that is where he paid $2, $3, $4 or $5 a day too much, you don't mean that; you mean, I understand, charges he made for being out when he was inside?—A. Precisely. Railway fares and the ordinary expenses.

Q. And did you ascertain the fact that he was actually in Ottawa when he was charging for expenses outside of Ottawa?—A. Yes, by the record.

Q. And you say that that existed to the extent in one year of $800 or $900?—A. That is as far as I could check it. I could not get the whole of the records.

Q. Why not?—A. I could not find them.

By the Hon. Mr. Cassels:

Q. Did you get the records in the Marine Department?—A. Yes.

Q. Who keeps them?—A. Well, it was the attendance book I asked for, and I don't know, the books usually run a month or two months, something like that, and I could not get the whole of the books for that year.

Q. Was part of that $800 the $6 a day allowance?—A. Not at that time. At that time he got $6 a day or a per diem allowance, I think it was $6, while investigating wrecks; on any other business he got his actual expenses.

Q. This was $800 actual expenses which you say he should never have charged?—A. Yes.

* * * * * *

Q. Then you mean there was no satisfactory explanation?—A. No, I did not consider that was a—it was unsatisfactory. that he had to refund the money.

Q. Had he to certify to that account?—A. Yes.

Q. Any one else?—A. The deputy minister's initials were on it.

Q. Yes.—A. I do not know whether that account is the one on file. I think it was remodelled.

Q. Oh, the account was corrected?—A. I think so.

Q. Well, the original account should remain on record, should it not?—A. Well, they got it back to examine it and see what was the trouble with it, and I think I got a new account.

By Hon. Mr. Cassels:

Q. Was the old account not kept?—A. It was out of my hands then.

Q. What?—A. It was out of my hands.

By Mr. Watson:

Q. You have not any personal knowledge whether that was kept or not?—A. No.

Q. You indicate a doubt?—A. I do not know anything about whether it was kept or not.

Q. I see. Have you knowledge of the system sufficiently to say whether or not the deputy should have personal knowledge that he was in and not out when those expenses were charged for?—A. He should have personal knowledge.

By Hon. Mr. Cassels:

Q. Was this fact brought to the attention of the minister or anybody else?—

He was so startled that it struck him at once that such a state of things should be reported at once not only to the minister, but to the head of the government if reporting it to the minister was not enough.

A. Your lordship. I might be permitted to say just at this point——

Q. What?—A. At this point I would like to say, if it were possible, that I would not like to go into any confidential conversations with the minister.

Q. I don't want any conversations, but it seems to me on the statement you made this morning the first duty of somebody would be to report the fact to the minister?

Not only to the minister, but to the Prime Minister; and if the minister or the Prime Minister would not pay attention, then the Auditor General should have reported it to the people of this country through the press.

Q. I don't want any conversations, but it seems to me on the statement you made this morning the first duty of somebody would be to report the fact to the minister?

That would strike anybody. And what answer do we get from the Auditor General?

A. His deputy should have done it.

That is to say: 'I knew all about it as Auditor General; I knew that this man had certified to an account of $800 larger than it should have been and that he had to refund half of it; I knew that he gave a certificate to a party for an amount of something over $3,000, and that of this the party had to refund $1,000; I knew that he gave a false certificate to enable a party to bring in goods free of duty;—and still I thought it was the duty of the deputy minister to tell the minister.

Then, down near the bottom of the page you have the following:

Q. You do not know whether the matter was ever attempted to be cleared up. Did you ever get any clearing statement of that afterwards?—A. No. I never had any doubt in my own mind as to the padding of the account.

Q. Because it is inconceivable——

I should think so.

—in the absence of explanation that the matter was not put in the hands of the County Crown Attorney.

—that an officer of this government had falsely charged up $800 to travelling expenses, that that fact had come to the knowledge of the deputy minister and the Auditor General, and that the facts are in possession of the government to-day and still the matter is not in the hands of the County Crown Attorney as far as I know. Why, we have had cases of poor washerwomen stealing a few red herrings and being sent to jail for six months, here in this province of Ontario, and here we have public officials, not only one but three or four, knowing of the grossest irregularities—to use a mild word—in the handling of the public funds, and still the government does nothing to punish the man who placed himself in that position. Not only that, but they actually retire the deputy minister, give a comfortable allowance for the rest of his life to a man guilty of the offences here charged against him by the Auditor General.

At all events you do not know what explanations were made or were not made afterwards?—A. No, I have no administrative duties at all.

Q. Then anything else in regard to Commander Spain?—A. Oh, I think his next account following that one had two or three items in that had to be struck out.

Q. You mean not excessive charges, but wholly false items, distinguishing them in that way. It would be an entirely false item if he charged an item for expenses out when he was in, would it not?—A. My recollection is it was some boat-hire or horse-hire, some thing of that sort, he charged in his next account that I called his deputy's attention to.

That was a second offence.

Q. Yes?—A. And he ordered it to be struck out.

By Hon. Mr. Cassels:

Q. Was that because it had not been used, or because it was not a proper payment? There would be a great difference between the two?—A. In that case the deputy said it had not been expended.

Q. What?—A. It had not been expended.

By Mr. Watson:

Q. That is, the deputy told you?—A. Yes.

Q. It had not been expended at all. Was that in 1906?—A. That would be 1905 or 1906.

Q. Anything else, Mr. Fraser?—A. Well, I asked the deputy then to keep a record for the next year's audit, that I would require a memorandum at the end stating the dates on which Commander Spain left the department on business, what the business was, and when he returned, to enable me to check his next year's account properly.

Mr. CROTHERS.

After the close of the year when I asked to be furnished with that information I was told that it had been kept, but they thought it was not necessary, or something, at the end of the year, and it was thrown in the waste basket?

Q. Who told you that?—A. The deputy minister.

Q. Yes.—A. So his accounts were in that unsatisfactory condition that they may be right or not.

Q. I see. You have the instances which you have given where you learned they were positively wrong, in fact false?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ascertain that any other items afterwards were false, that is, the next year 1906 and 1907, did you get evidence of falsity of items?—A. No, I had no means of getting it.

Q. I mean by inquiry or otherwise. you did not get it?—A. No.

Q. Then did you pass it?—A. I had to, certified correct.

Q. I see. Certified correct by whom, by him and the deputy minister?—A. I could not say now what certificates were on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would be very interesting to complete this investigation, that has only gone a little way. When the Auditor General came up to a certain point, and then stopped, saying, 'I would not like to say anything further about any private conversation I had', it would be interesting to trace this up to its source, and fix the responsibility for these large expenditures of public money, and for keeping men in public office where they could repeat that sort of thing year after year. It would be interesting to fix the responsibility for that, and that is what this investigation did not fix; and for that purpose alone I submit that the investigation in the Marine and Fisheries Department ought to be completed. Now I want to read a letter that was sent away back in 1908 by the Auditor General with respect to this same matter. It was addressed to the acting deputy minister Mr. Desbarats, and read as follows:

I wish to call your attention to the accounts of Commander Spain of your department for travelling expenses for the fiscal year 1907-8, and to say that notwithstanding the fact that these accounts appear to have been approved by Col. Gourdeau, deputy minister, I cannot accept them, as they bear on their face the too evident appearance of incorrectness.

This is in 1908, although they had this deputy minister's certificate, the man who has been by this generous government superannuated for life.

It is almost an impossibility for this office to test anything more than the mathematical correctness of an account for travelling expenses unless we take unusual and distasteful means to obtain information. It is sufficient under the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act to have the accounts bear evidence of having been examined by the department having control and vouched for by some officer having a personal knowledge of the

expenditure, and in most cases this is found sufficient. For various reasons I cannot, in the case of Commander Spain's account, accept these conditions.

On an examination of his accounts for 1904-5 they were found to bear such evidence of incorrectness that unusual means were adopted, with the result that about one-sixth of the whole sum had to be refunded, and the circumstances were such that the deputy minister undertook to say that future accounts should be correct.

That is away back in 1908.

The present difficulty appears to be a continuance of the practice complained of in 1904-5, namely, charges for railway fares, &c., when, in my opinion, no travelling such as charged for was done.

Then at page 245 we have counsel asking this question:

I do not quite understand the functions of the auditor. What actually is your duty, simply to represent to the deputy minister, and then if he passes the matter that is the end of it?—A. Well we have to question anything that we think is not in accordance with the rules and regulations or with the Act, or anything improper.

Q. Well, supposing he says it is all right, is that the end of it?—A. Oh no. We have got to get a better explanation than that, we have got to satisfy ourselves in some shape or form that the matter is all right, or report it to the Treasury Board.

Now, Mr. Speaker, who compose the Treasury Board? By section 9, chapter 23 of the Revised Statutes, it is to be composed of the Finance Minister and five other ministers of the Crown. Now the Auditor General tells us that unless he gets a satisfactory explanation it is his duty to report to the Treasury Board. He has told us over and over again during this evidence that for four years he did not get satisfactory answers, and therefore it was his duty to report to the Treasury Board. Mr. Speaker, did he report to the Treasury Board? One of two things exists: Either the Auditor General did report these transactions, not merely to the Treasury Board, but to the Prime Minister of this country, or he did not. It was clearly his duty to do it. If he did not do it, I submit that it is up to us to get another Auditor General; and if he did do it, it is up to us to get another Prime Minister. Now I do not propose to read any more evidence. I have gone over enough to satisfy, I think, every hon. member that we have several high officials who, for three or four years, were guilty of offences, not one slip, but repetitions of offences, known to the Auditor General, it being the duty of the Auditor General in such cases to report these offences to the Treasury Board. Nay, more, although the Audit Act may not require it, still I submit that it was his duty to report a transaction of that kind to no one lower than the right hon. the Prime Minister of this country. Surely the Auditor General would not stand upon the matter of the Audit Act; surely he would not repeat the act of the man who preferred to drown rather than be rescued from the water by a man to whom he had never been introduced. Surely some one is to blame. If the Auditor General reported, as we have a right to assume he did report, to the Treasury Board, composed of the Finance Minister and five other gentlemen, members of the government—I do not know whether it includes the Prime Minister—but I think it will occur to every member of this House that it was the duty of the watchdog of the treasury, in circumstances such as these, not to stop until he went to the head of the government and told him the conditions that were existing in the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

What have we now? We had the Civil Service Commission referring to lack of conscience in the lower officials, and we had the commissioner who was appointed suggesting as a remedy the awakening of the public conscience.

Did it ever occur to these gentlemen that as in nature decay very often sets in at the head, so in the body politic lack of conscience at the foot is often the result of lack of conscience at the head. And, Mr. Speaker, a government that had been convicted—I do not wish to speak excitedly, but I say correctly and advisedly—a government that has been convicted of squandering millions of the people's money and of plundering the public domain of this country and of appointing to high public office men who had been guilty of the most serious election offences against the state—I say that when we have such grand larceny at the head we cannot be surprised to find so much petty larceny at the bottom.

To show that these officials received fair play from Mr. Justice Cassels and counsel I would refer to page 3 of the report of the commissioner where he says:

I think what we want is to do everything possible to free these gentlemen from the suspicion they are under.

That was the attitude of the judge, not a hostile attitude and not an improper attitude. I quote that to show that every official got the fairest opportunity. Many of us know His Lordship Judge Cassels; we know he is a very kindly disposed man, a generous soul, a man who endeavours to find everybody innocent if he possibly can, and he says:

I think what we want is to do everything possible to free these gentlemen from the suspicion they are under, and I would like it to be understood that every officer will have the fullest opportunity if occasion arises of clearing himself, and every official of the Marine Department who feels that without specific charges being brought up, their honour or reputation is stained in any way will have an

opportunity to come forward and clear themselves under oath.

A word with reference to one or two other departments, because this resolution says that other departments should be inquired into. I find at page 32 of the report of the Courtney Civil Service Commission a reference to one of the departments. The commissioners say:

The same remark to a certain extent applies to the Department of the Interior. With its large staff of 500 employees at Ottawa, it would require months to thoroughly inspect the work and see that the several officials are properly employed.

The commissioners regret extremely that with the short time at their disposal they were unable to visit the Northwest, much as they desired to see how the land, and more especially the timber sales, are effected.

They would perhaps not find it necessary to do that now since my hon. friend from St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames) has given us such a clear and full exposition of that work in the west.

At page 37 we find this reference to the Militia Department:

Militia and Defence.

The expenditure in this department is going up by leaps and bounds. In 1903-4 the total expenditure, both in capital and consolidated fund, was in the neighbourhood of three and a half million dollars. In the estimates lately submitted to parliament for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1909, appropriations are asked for aggregating $6,500,000. That is to say, in four years and three-quarters the expenditures will have increased, if the supply asked for is granted, to the extent of three million dollars. Your commissioners have made a comparison between these two years for specific reasons. In 1904 there was introduced into parliament an Act respecting the Militia and Defence of Canada.

The Governor in Council may appoint a Militia Council to advise the minister on all matters relating to the militia which are referred to the council by the minister . . . .

It follows, therefore, that the Militia Council have the full control of the department; that it is in effect the department; and in presenting the report the department as an entity is swallowed up by the council.

* * * * * * * *

It follows, therefore, that the control of expenditure is in a great measure the business of the Militia Council, and in gauging the efficiency of the department attention should be given to the composition and powers of the council.

In Canada the Militia Council is made up of seven members—the Minister of Militia and Defence, four military members bearing titles of Chief of the General Staff, Adjutant General, Quartermaster General and Master General of Ordnance; the titles also borne by the professional members of the Army Council in Great Britain—but the other two members of the Canadian Militia Council are the deputy head of the department and the accountant. That is to say, the Militia Council in Canada differs from the Army Council in Great Britain in that the department is swallowed up in the one and entirely distinct in the other.

* * * * * * *

In fact, for the service performed, the Militia Department awards to its officers pay vastly higher in proportion than any other of the departments under the Crown. Since the formation of the Militia Council several adjuncts to the militia service have been created. This will be seen by reference to the evidence of Major General Lake. Your commissioners are not prepared to say whether the Ordnance Store Corps, or the Army Service Corps, or other corps are necessary, but one particular corps your commissioners regard as unnecessary and undesirable. Your commissioners refer to the staff of paymasters.

* * * * * * *

The Auditor General in his evidence shows the evil effects of this system. Large sums are sent to the district paymaster, portions of these sums are sent to the sub-paymasters, until at one time as much as $60,000, according to the Auditor General, was held by the paymaster at Halifax.

* * * * * * *

Your commissioners have referred to the high rates of pay enjoyed by the officers in the service of this department. This is no doubt a cause of grave dissatisfaction to the members of the other departments in the public service, who, while occupied with grave questions relating to the government of the country, with their time fully occupied in the earnest pursuit of their duties, see in a favoured department people paid much better than themselves and working no harder, even if as hard, and in work of less paramount importance. The accountant of the Militia Department, who has an expenditure of six million dollars a year confined to a few appropriations, is much more highly paid than any of the accountants of the other departments. The accountant of the Railway Depart has to adjust accounts relating to a revenue of six or seven millions and has also to do the bookkeeping in connection with the expenditure of eighteen millions a year. The accountant of the Public Works has under his control accounts connected with appropriations totalling ten millions a year, and numbering some hundreds. The accountants of the Finance Department, gathering up the details from all the other departments, have under their examination a daily turn over in cash of one million dollars a day, and the accountants of the Audit Office have under examination the expenditure of all the other departments. None of these accountants are so highly paid or so highly placed as the accountant of the Militia and Defence, and the result causes grave dissatisfaction.

In conclusion, your commissioners have to point out that the expenditure has grown in a little over four years from three and a half millions to six and a half millions; that the permanent and headquarters staff have increased to the number of about 220; that in addition to the general system of high pay the favoured men of the militia service in Canada draw pensions not only for themselves but for their wives and children; that the staff is sufficient for a corps of one hundred thousand men, according to the evidence submitted; that the permanent corps are under three thousand men; that

the desertions have been one in three; that the number of militia trained in the annual camps is about 40,000 men; that according to the evidence of Major General Lake, the men attached to the rural battalions have no drill except at the annual camps, and it is arguable whether the city corps are as efficient as they were some years ago; that while only 40,000 men come out for drill of ages from 18 to 50, yet compared with the population of over a million men in Canada between the ages of 20 and 40 the proportion seems small. Whether with all the large expenditures of public moneys the result as detailed shows efficiency, your commissioners leave to the consideration of Your Excellency. Your commissioners have not gone deeply into the question of stores purchased for the militia service, as there is no means by which they could appreciate whether the amounts payable for sub-target guns or for Ross rifles are proper and just, but according to the evidence the contract for the Ross rifle was prepared by the counsel employed by the company, and no security was exacted.

If with all the consideration of the Public Accounts Committee and the War Office, the expenditure in Great Britain is such that the Public Accounts Committee consider it their duty to draw attention to expensive ideas, particularly amongst military men, and that grave irregularities are punished by reprimand, the system in Canada where the control is not as effective as in the motherland would seem to be more disadvantageous to the Dominion.

I ask hon. gentlemen to listen to the conclusions of these commissioners:—

While the commissioners have felt bound to point out what they consider the several defects in the Militia Department, they are constrained to report that in some cases the officers employed by that department are men of high character and fully alive to their responsibilities.

This refers to men who are getting bigger salaries than any one else in the service, and after looking into the whole matter, the commissioners find that in some cases they are men of high character and fully alive to their responsibilities. Don't you think, Mr. Speaker, it would be advisable to have a little peep into the Department of Militia and Defence in view of that report from the commission? Next comes the Public Works Department, and the commissioners say:—

This department has largely increased its expenditure during the last few years, although a large expenditure, that of the ship channel, has been transferred from the Public Works Department to the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The expenditure of the Public Works Department in 1903-4 was, in round numbers, $5,000,000; and this is to be increased during the coming year, according to the estimates recently brought down, to about $11,250,000. In looking over the system adopted in this department it will be found that with the exception of a very few instances all the officials both at Ottawa and in the outside are not under the Civil Service Act. In Ottawa alone hundreds of labourers are employed and in the outside service there are engineers, archiects, clerks of works, foremen and outside labourers to a very large number.

In certain cases there may be overpayments of wages such as the notorious instance which was brought to light about a year ago, when a clerk of works appointed by political influence was found to have sublet his work to another person at a much lower rate. Your commissioners consider that some steps should be taken to organize the large army of employees in connection with this department, many of whom have served their entire lifetime in its employ, and bring them under the definite regulations so that their employment may be considered fixed and stable. Your commissioners desire to point out that in this department the services of officials are often charged to several different votes. Your commissioners are of opinion that in all cases the salaries of officials should be charged against one appropriation only; and that no allowances for extra services should be paid unless a sum for the purpose has been voted by parliament, not in a general clause merely, but individually and by name. This remark should be of general application to all departments. In all such cases parliament should be fully advised of the circumstances.

Your commissioners are led to believe that in many cases works have been undertaken by the Department of Public Works at the instance of municipalities or bodies of people locally interested, in which the opinion of the outside officers of the department as to the desirability of the proposed works was not asked for. The only information sought for related to the feasibility of the works in question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this report shows that the investigation into the Marine Department should be completed by tracing these things to their source. That is what the people of Canada want. The people of Canada do not want a witness to be cut off when he is asked whether or not he conveyed this information to the Treasury Board, or to the ministers, or to the Prime Minister himself. What the people of Canada want is an investigation that will go to the root of the matter, and which will show, if it be a fact, that lack of conscience at the bottom has been caused by lack of conscience at the top. We have had it constantly said by hon. gentlemen opposite that on the 26th of October last there was a majority returned to support the government, and time after time have they boasted of that majority. Why, there is not a man in this House but who knows that no part of that majority rests upon the peoples' approval of the administration. We have that statement upon the evidence of no less a person than the distinguished and shrewd politician, the right hon. the prime minister of Canada, because he has stated this very session that in the province of British Columbia alone

were the recent elections conducted on anything like principle. That being so, the result was just what we might expect, one member returned to support him and the others against him. We had the right hon. the prime minister finding fault with that state of things. I was astonished that he was surprised at that result, because it is nothing new in his career for him to find that where principle is involved he is always worsted. The right hon. the Prime Minister's talents and skill find their broadest scope and shine the brightest when he is inciting passion and generating magnetizing and utilizing prejudices. And so I say that as we have it on the authority of the Prime Minister himself that in all the other provinces the contest was not fought on principle but on prejudice, his supporters will not again boast of the majority they have in this House.

Mr. ARTHUR ECREMENT (Berthier). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin), on resuming his seat a moment ago, was obliged to take back the statement he had just made to the effect, that the Minister of Marine had complained of being attacked on account of his being a French Canadian.

I may then be allowed, Mr. Speaker, as one of the younger members on this side of the House, to say in French, a few words of praise concerning the Minister of Marine, in regard to whom so many unkindly references have been made, in English, by hon. members on the other side.

In my case, as in that of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Crothers), it happened that I visited this House, without ever dreaming that I would occupy a seat within its precincts. I admired, as he did, its severe style of decorations, and the impression it made on my mind, was one of awe and grandeur. It seemed to me as if there remained something of the minds of bygone generations of members flitting within its walls, and I almost broke the impressive silence reigning all around, to say to myself, what great respect should inspire such an institution, wherein men endowed with the authority of a whole people work out the improvement and progress of the country.

I am free to admit that I felt unwilling to drop all my illusions on entering this House. However, we young members of the House, are bound to drop one of these on witnessing the re-opening of this debate. We are led to believe in consequence that we are old members, considering the length of time this famous question has occupied the attention of the House and that we are called upon once more, to listen to unfair criticisms of the management of the hon. minister, whose useful career I bow to with respect and whose reputation will once more come out unsullied from the fray. It would be unbecoming on my part, Mr. Speaker, to go over all the details of the Cassels inquiry, which supplies the basis for the amendment introduced by the hon. member for St. Anne's. That evidence has for months been served out to the public by our large daily newspapers, and in any case, the hon. member for Elgin, who has just taken his seat, would not have omitted reading it all for the edification of the House.

Nevertheless, that evidence, whether obtained in Halifax or in Quebec, goes to show primarily, as stated this afternoon, by the hon. Minister of Marine, that previous to the changes brought about by the present head of the department, the condemned system had been long in existence. The hon. member for St. Ann's wishes to know what is going on in the other departments, but how embarrassing it would be to hear, from him or from some of his neighbours, what some witnesses only let us surmise as to what was going on in the department of Marine under the Conservative governments from 1869 to 1896!

Reference was made a moment ago to favouritism and partisanship. Were I willing to go over some of that evidence, I might bring to light some interesting facts. Is there not, for instance, a protracted correspondence between the department and a high official, because the latter had made the grievous mistake of buying a knife from a Liberal dealer. We see in another part of the evidence that this same officer had received instructions from the then Minister of Marine, to take good care of his friends, because he needed his friends badly.

Let our friends on the other side consider their own case, and then let them taunt the Minister of Marine for trying to lay down rules for the better and more efficient management of public affairs; let them taunt him for dismissing negligent or dishonest men; let them taunt him for discovering defective features, dating back twenty years, legacies of the Conservative rule. All such reproofs cannot withstand the facts, which afford the most complete vindication of the Minister of Marine.

Called upon to take charge of that department, in the month of February, 1906, as early as the month of June of that same year, according to one of the principal witnesses examined, he sets down to work with vigour and energy to improve a system in existence since the glorious days of Sir Hector Langevin.

Deeds cannot be obliterated, in spite of hostile efforts, and the work accomplished by the Minister of Marine remains, in spite of all that can be done to cast a shadow over it. I would fear praising in-

adequately a work of such importance were I not aware that parliamentarians whose fund of information is large and whose opinions carry weight, brushing aside generalities with which I must be content to deal, will fully deal with the subject.

Following on the interesting statement which the hon. Minister of Marine presented to us this afternoon, as to the improvements and changes effected in his department, I may be allowed simply to recall that it is under the rule of the present minister that there was introduced a new system of book-keeping which ensures to the country, as we have seen, a large saving; that careless officers have been suspended; that a central purchase office, praised by Judge Cassels, was instituted; that a system of calling for tenders was adopted and patronage lists abolished.

The conduct of the minister on that occasion, as on many others, will have been for us of the younger generation of Canada, an object lesson in uprightness and energy.

Who is it, Mr. Speaker, who has helped the most in winning that economic victory whereby we are enabled to lead an independent life and to realize with pride that there exists a Canadian nation, an industrial and commercial nation, which has taken its place among the others by asserting what has been very aptly termed its economical independence.

Who is it, Mr. Speaker, if not the Minister of Marine, who has contributed in the greatest measure to ensuring to the business classes of this country the benefit of that great deed which has for its title the 'Franco-Canadian Treaty'.

You have read, Mr. Speaker, that statement of a writer particularly well informed as regards our country, in a book entitled 'Canada and its two nationalities'. The time is probably not far away when the development of the Dominion's resources will be on a great scale and possibly will bear comparison with that of its neighbour the United States. It is creditable to us that such a comparison should be made, and the mere fact of its being possible is in itself an argument.

Indeed the hon. Minister of Marine in providing so thoroughly for the improvement of our ports and our great river St. Lawrence —having perceived that there lies the key to our future success as a business people, and that since it reaches into the heart of the country, we are bound to deepen it to the innermost point, so as to carry the ocean as it were to the threshold of the Western country—has frightened that giant of producers, the United States, and more particularly New York.

In view of these gigantic works and useful reforms, it might have been expected that the opposition would look beyond their ordinary range and spare their criticism to the man who had accomplished such things. However, in the light of the discussion which has taken place this evening, I see that they expect the minister to have like themselves, the power of effecting miracles ; and in the same way that they have succeeded in changing into wine boxes bearing a different brand, they expect the Minister of Marine to change the character of the men which the Conservative party had in their service, and whom the Liberal party inherited from them.

Accordingly, I shall vote against the amendment of the hon. member for St. Anne's (Mr. Doherty), in the first place, because it appears to me as misty as the cloud of suspicion, to which it refers ; then, because its adoption would entail considerable expenditure, interfere with the management of the various departments, and as stated in yesterday's 'Patrie,' a paper which has always been outspoken in its support of the member for St. Anne's, because the stand taken by the Minister of Marine will have its effect on the other departments, and a most beneficial one, and lastly, because, to my mind, we are in a position to attain the same object by other means. Careless or dishonest officers in other departments, should there be any, knowing what treatment they may expect as a result of any wrong-doing, will take means to conceal the truth from any commission of inquiry, and thereby will prevent any such commission from getting at the facts.

No doubt criticisms will be forthcoming. Partisan newspapers and speakers. well known to hon. gentlemen on the other side, will cast aspersions on honest men, who are bound to vindicate their reputation for the sake of their family, of their province, of their country. However, such criticisms will always have the same effect on the people, that great judge. An insight into the nature of their verdict may be obtained from the fact that in October last the Conservative organization found it impossible to obtain the signatures of twenty-five people in the county of Rouville to start an opposition to the Minister of Marine ; not at all, as stated by the hon. member for Cape Breton, because he is a French Canadian, but because he has remained faithful to the great Liberal principles of honesty, dignity, sincerity. Another fact to be taken into account is, the impossibility of finding in the province of Quebec, while under the leadership of the Minister of Marine, more than twelve wise men, who following in the footsteps of those people mentioned in the gospels, are sent here and flush with indignation at the sight of wrong-doing, which they themselves or their leaders are responsible for.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE (North Ontario). Mr. Speaker, the Civil Service Commis-

sion, appointed in May, 1907, was composed of three business men of the highest character. As they were appointees of the government, it is to be presumed that they were favourable to the administration; but their scathing arraignment of the Department of Marine and Fisheries made a further investigation imperative. Their report was full of serious and grave charges. In consequence of that report, Mr. Justice Cassels was appointed on April 6, 1908. He is a gentleman held in the highest esteem and respect wherever he is known. At great expense of labour and time, he inserted the probe a little deeper into the affairs of the Marine and Fisheries Department; but, unfortunately, the worst disclosures were not revealed until after the general elections were held. The result of that investigation by Mr. Justice Cassels was to verify the disclosures of the Civil Service Commission. Now, there has been a great deal of discussion as to what the real scope of the commission should have been. On this side of the House there is but one opinion, namely, that a free hand should have been given to Mr. Justice Cassels to inquire into the Marine and Fisheries Department, not confining him to the years from 1904 to 1907, or to any special years or any particular subject. The conception of his duties by the Hon. Mr. Cassels was very limited and circumscribed. According to his own idea, he was merely to investigate the contracts entered into during the years from 1904 to 1907, and ascertain the prices that were paid, the current market prices, and the discounts, if any. His attitude towards the officials of the department is thus expressed in his own words, as found on page 1723 of the evidence:—

> As far as I am concerned, I am here to protect these officials in every possible way. I do not want to see them guilty if it is possible to acquit them.

In my opinion, that was not the proper attitude in which to approach the investigation. He should have gone into it as an investigating judge to find guilty any who were guilty. At page 7 of the report, he also says:—

> My desire has been to exculpate and not to incriminate.

According to the scope of his commission, I submit that Mr. Justice Cassels' inquiry should have embraced the names of the beneficiaries of the excessive prices. No one in this House imagines for a moment that the contract and supply men who received such excessive prices, kept those excessive prices for themselves. Another branch of the inquiry that would have been beneficial, would have been the part certain members of parliament, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself, had in these transactions. It is extraordinary that no members of parliament were called to give evidence in that investigation, although the names of some were repeatedly mentioned during the course of the investigation. I submit that the inquiry should also have extended to all the spending departments, particularly those which are unfavourably mentioned in the report of the Civil Service Commission, namely, the Militia Department and the Public Works Department. But notwithstanding the limited scope of the inquiry, notwithstanding the fact that the hands of Mr. Justice Cassels were tied, notwithstanding the fact that he himself had a circumscribed notion of his authority, and of the scope of his commission, he disclosed a mass of seething, reeking corruption in that department, which it will take a long time to remove, unless the most heroic remedies are applied, and that immediately. What was the effect of that disclosure on the government? I submit that it has only been superficial. Apparently, they are callous, giving the impression to the country that every large spending department of the government is permeated with the same evil. What has been the action of the government in consequence of that report? Two officials superannuated. The deputy minister, who, the hon. member for Elgin told us, was guilty of such irregularities, has been superannuated—no punishment meted out to him. The next official, Harding, is superannuated, although, according to the evidence and the report, he had financial transactions with contractors dealing with the department, and was concerned with the destruction of papers of the department and with false entries made in books, in order to protect him. This is the net result of the government's action on that report: two officials are superannuated; nine officials are really dismissed, twelve other officials are dismissed, with an intimation that they may be re-appointed if they apply for reinstatement. I ask if this is all the action that the government intends to take after all the expense and trouble and time that have been incurred in this investigation? Is this the limit of the government's efforts? They are not stayed by considerations of mercy or sympathy, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries might say; but I submit that the real consensus of opinion in this House and in the country is, that they are stayed by considerations of self-preservation. They dare not punish the officials as they deserve according to the findings of Mr. Judge Cassels to be punished, and I think that the utter failure of the government to mete out condign punishment to those officials, will meet with the disapprobation of the country and certainly should not satisfy the demands of this House.

Now, I desire for a few moments, to consider the results of the investigation, and what they prove. They conclusively prove: first, that the officials were negligent, pliant, dishonest, and in some cases capable of stealing, second, the necessity of extending the investigation into all the spending departments; third, that members of parliament and officials of the Liberal party are implicated; fourth, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is personally implicated by the evidence adduced, directly and by implication. I am not going, at this late hour, to occupy the time of the House, by going extensively into the evidence; but I wish to refer to the evidence on page 1358, where Mr. Melvin states that he paid money to Mr. MacNamara, the storekeeper; to the evidence of Mr. Longard, on page 1421, where he states that he supplied a hot-water boiler for Mr. Parsons' house; to the evidence of Mr. Thompson-Schmidt, on page 1452, where he states that he borrowed money from one of the contractors, and to the evidence of Mr. Joseph Ferguson, on page 1397, where he says he got large sums of money from contractors and supply men. Senator Choquette admitted on behalf of his client, Mr. Gregory, that Mr. Gregory had received 5 per cent on $24,831. That admission will be found on page 1046 of the evidence. On page 1388 it will be found that a witness, Mr. Merlin, admitted that employees used to help themselves out of the stores of the department.

By Hon. Mr. Cassels:

Q. You mean to say that all the employees there used to go into the stores and help themselves?—A. They could if they liked, it was open enough to do so.

Consequently there was no proper supervision in connection with the management of the Marine and Fisheries Department. On page 1,277 Mr. Macaulay admitted that he made false entries in order to square the accounts of Mr. Harding, and Harding was one of the officials whom the government has superannuated in consequence of Mr. Justice Cassels' report.

The result of the investigation shows the necessity of extending it into the other departments. It is remarkable that there were no contracts, that the contractors made the prices themselves, that the men who furnished the supplies did not have the prices fixed for them but fixed the prices themselves. No wonder the prices and the profits were excessive. It is only reasonable to assume that if the prices and profits were excessive in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the same thing prevails in the other departments and these also should be investigated. For instance we find that Mr. Alliston Davie of Quebec, testified—see page 872—that no prices were discussed:

Q. Now, here is an account amounting to $7,795.70, and this is certified to by him in the same way. Prices just and reasonable. This in November, 1906. Now, just look at that account and tell me whether or not the prices were ever riscussed between you and him, or between you and any other official of the department?—A. No, sir, they were never discussed.

A. No, prices were never discussed with Mr. Gregory or any other official.

George Wooten, on page 1410, said he received 10 per cent or so over the retail prices, thus showing the excessive prices paid by the department. A. N. Melville, on page 1359, said that he was paid from 10 per cent to 25 per cent over the ordinary retail price. On page 1447, Mr. Stevens, who gave evidence regarding Howell and Company's accounts, said that their accounts amounted to $28,000 with the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the three years, and that no prices were fixed before hand, and that in fixing the prices they added profits to the amount of about 50 per cent. They added that to the cost. He was asked:

Q. Added on to the cost about 50 per cent profits, is that about right?—A. That may be a little high. I would not like to swear it is right.

On page 1429 Mr. Langard said that he might have received 50 per cent profits in his dealings with the department. On page 1737, Ernest G. Odell, a young man only 23 years old, a grandson of the notorious official, Gregory, said that he received as much as 100 per cent profit. This is his evidence:

Q. Your grandfather knew nothing about your arrangements I see? Then what profit did you and Mr. Ritchie get in the sales that you made to the department?—A. That was a private arrangement between Mr. Ritchie and myself, sir. Am I obliged to answer, your lordship?

Hon. Mr. Cassels.—Yes, I think so. It is important. It has been told already in Quebec. You had better tell everything; it is no use keeping back?—A. I made 50 per cent.

Mr. Watson.—That was your share of it. And how much above that did Mr. Ritchie get?—A. If I got 50 per cent, he must have got 50 per cent.

Q. That would make 100 per cent?—A. Yes.

J. J. Murphy, who had dealings with the department for three years amounting to $43,000, said he made 25 per cent over the closest retail prices. Here is part of his evidence:

Q. I take it from what you said that you found the department a very easy buyer?—A. Yes.

Q. In fact you got from the department much more than you got from other retail purchasers, 25 per cent?—A. Oh, no.

Q. Now then, just try and think; will you

say it was less than 25 per cent that you got in excess of your retail prices from the department—in excess of your closest retail prices?—A. Well, in some cases, but not in all.

Q. In some cases you got as much as 25 per cent?—A. But not in all.

Q. In excess of your closest retail prices?—A. Yes.

If this is a fair sample of the prices that prevail in the Marine and Fisheries Department and of the profits exacted by the contractors, the inference is irresistible that a similar condition of affairs must have existed in the other departments and that therefore the investigation should be extended to them also. We find that the same contractors who dealt with the Marine and Fisheries Department also had dealings with the others. A return was laid on the table yesterday, in response to a motion of mine, showing to what extent the supply men and contractors who had been mentioned in the Cassels' report as having had illicit dealings with the other departments. What do we find? We find, for instance, that J. J. Murphy who for three years had dealings with the Marine and Fisheries Department to the extent of $32,449.29 also had dealings with the Department of Public Works to the extent of $8,508.59. Is it not reasonable to assume that he obtained the same rate of profits from the Public Works Department as he did from the other? Jos. Samson, who had dealings with the Marine and Fisheries Department in the three years amounting to $22,158, also had dealings with the Public Works Department amounting to $3,369.59. Samson and Filion dealt with the Marine and Fisheries Department to the extent of $65,809, with the Public Works Department to the extent of $10,444, and with the Militia Department to the amount of $3,490. Napoléon Mercier dealt with the Marine Department to the extent of $3,471 and with the Public Works Department to the extent of $8,000. Terreau and Racine sold the Marine and Fisheries Department $8,000 of goods, to the Public Works Department $1,000, to the Militia Department $6,000, and to the Post Office Department $487. I desire to emphasize the fact that these men were those reported by Mr. Justice Cassels' report as paying illegal commissions and giving illegal favours to government officials. Jean Drolet sold to the Marine Department to the extent of $12,502, to the Public Works $1,287, and the Militia $21,782. Howell and Company had dealings with the Marine Department to over $20,000, with the Public Works Department, $1,000; the Polson Iron Works Company had dealings with the Marine and Fisheries Department to the amount of $150,493, with the Public Works Department $364,798.70 and with Militia and Defence $1,200.

These returns verify the suspicion in the minds of hon. gentlemen on this side that these contractors and supply men who were receiving extensive contracts and obtaining excessive, illegal, improper profits from the Marine and Fisheries Department, had dealings with other large spending departments, and it is natural to assume that the same evils, the same abuses, the same irregularities, the same corruptions, the same crimes existed in regard to the other departments as in regard to this. And, when the administration raises such a suspicion, it is but right that they should clear themselves from the suspicion by granting the investigation called for by the terms of this resolution.

Another reason why this investigation should be extended to the other spending departments is found in the statements of the Civil Service Commission. One of the hon. members on the other side who preceded me said that there were no other departments brought into condemnation by the Civil Service Commission. I dispute that and will quote the report of the commission in support of my contention. At page 37 of the Civil Service Commissioners' report, you will find these words:

> Your commissioners regret that they have been unable to investigate the condition of things in some of the other departments. But to do the work with any pretensions to thoroughness would take much more time than would probably be agreeable to the government.

No doubt it would.

> They have been able to go over only a very small section of even the Marine and Fisheries Department.

Yet, after going over only a small part of one department, they bring in this scathing arraignment. They speak of two other departments, and this is what they say :

> Organization, discipline, zeal for the public service and regard for economy are all conspicuous by their absence. Money is wasted in small things as in great because no one seems to have any motive to do otherwise.

In reference to the Department of Militia and Defence, this is what the commissioners say :

> In conclusion, your commissioners have to point out that the expenditure has grown in a little over four years from three and a half million to six and a half million; that the permanent and headquarters staff have increased to the number of about 220; that in addition to the general system of high pay the favoured men of the militia service of Canada draw pensions not only for themselves but for their wives and children; that the staff is sufficient for a corps of one hundred thousand men according to the evidence submitted; that the permanent corps are under three thousand men; that the desertions have been one in three; that the number of militia trained in the annual camps is about 40,000 men.

Your commissioners have not gone deeply into the question of stores purchased for the militia service as there is no means by which they could appreciate whether the amounts payable for sub-target guns or for Ross rifles are proper and just, but according to the evidence the contract for the Ross rifle was prepared by the counsel employed by the company and no security was exacted.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). Which was absolutely untrue. I explained that to the House.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I would suggest to the hon. minister (Sir Frederick Borden) that if this is absolutely untrue, he should not raise any objection to the investigation into his department. In reference to the Public Works Department, the report of the commissioners says:

The expenditure of the Public Works Department in 1903-4 was, in round numbers, $5,000,000 and this is to be increased during the coming year, according to the estimates recently brought down, to about $11,250,000. In looking over the system adopted in this department, it will be found that, with the exception of a very few instances, all the officials both in Ottawa and outside are not under the Civil Service Act.

And this is the point to which I wish to direct the attention of the House.

In certain cases there may be overpayments of wages such as the notorious instance which was brought to light about a year ago when a clerk of works appointed by political influence was found to have sublet his work to another person at a much lower rate.

If that is a fair sample of what is going on in the Public Works Department, it behooves this House to extend the investigation further into all the great spending departments. Now, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the report of Mr. Justice Cassels, page 78:

According to the evidence, a saving of about one hundred thousand dollars per annum would be effected in the Marine and Fisheries Departments alone by the change. Are there not other departments administered by the government which could be dealt with in the same manner?

The change referred to is the abolition of the patronage system. Here is an open suggestion that the other departments should allow the investigation to be extended to them and so have them put into a position to effect a saving too.

Would it not be feasible to appoint a board of, say, three competent men, assisted by inspectors, conversant with ruling market prices, to act as purchasing agents for all the departments?

Another result of the investigation was to show that Liberal members of parliament and officials of the Liberal party were implicated in the illegal and grossly improper transactions in the Marine and Fisheries Department :

Q. Yes. Did you speak to anybody else?—A. It seems to me I spoke to Mr. Russell, when he was a member, Judge Russell.
Q. Yes. Did you speak to anybody else here?—A. I don't think. . . .
Q. I understand you got that.

This has reference to an order.

from Mr. Roche or Mr. Carney?—A. Mr. Roche, I think.
Q. Mr. Roche or Mr. Carney gave you that specific order?—A. Yes.
Q. What was it for?—A. Ventilators.

If we refer to page 1410, we find that some of these supply men getting excessive profits and large returns from the Marine and Fisheries Department contributed out of these extra profits to the election expenses of candidates.

Q. Then, what about those extra profits;—now, try and think; some sort of distribution made of those extra profits, Mr. Wooten?—A. Not that I made.
Q. No, not of your profits?—A. I could not tell you, Mr. Watson.
Q. The profits of others?—A. I could not tell your, sir; I do not know.
Q. But don't you, and some others with you, participate, not in your own individual profits, but in one way or another in the extra profits that are made?—A When I take on a district I generally pay for it out of my own pocket. Do you mean in a political way?
Q. I do not say a political way.

Here we have the natural result of the system of granting extra profits to these supply men. During the elections they 'take on districts' and finance them out of their own pockets.

Q. Now, is that as far as you can go, because I was expecting you could go further than that; that is the reason I am asking you. The question, is that as far as you can go—I am putting it directly—that is, that you know of an understanding that these firms and houses that put on extra prices are afterwards to pony up,—some of them—you know what I mean by the expression—to some others?—A. I don't think,—but I think if I was getting some big patronage and there was an election on and my side was running, I think I would subscribe pretty well, you know.
Q. Out of those extra profits?—A. Yes.

Then, at page 1462, Mr. Harry C. Stevens being under examination.

By Hon. Mr. Cassels:

Q. I suppose in plain English the members recommended you for a profitable contract?—A. They would not.
Q. They recommended what turned out a profitable contract?—A. They would not.
Q. And then when an election came on the committee came and asked for contributions?—A. Yes. And what is between the members and the committee we know nothing about.
Q. I understand. You are supporters, and they wanted you to subscribe, and you were

subscribers. That is the story?—A. Yes. That is what I wanted to convey.

Again, at page 1462, Hon. Mr. Cassels takes up the question, and the examination proceeds as follows :

Q. What do you wish to say?—A. In our work with the department we have no competitors, and the recommendation of the members was all we wanted, and we worked on that basis.

Q. Did you pay the members anything?—A. No.

Q. Did you pay to any fund?—A. Political fund?

Q. I don't care, any fund?—A. Not for the members.

Q. Well, what for?—A. I think we have been, we may have put a little in for legitimate expenses, but I don't care to answer anything about it.

And that opens up a prolific field. Had the investigation gone a little further, had the scope been a little broader, a great deal more would have been disclosed than was disclosed in Judge Cassels' report.

There is one other matter to which I desire to direct attention. Not only did the members of parliament nominate the patronage list, but they actually dictated the man on that list who should get the contract. Not only did they dictate the man on the patronage list who should get the contract, but they actually went so far, the department fell so low, that the members of parliament were allowed to dictate the prices of the articles that were sold to the department by the different supply men. On page 1426, Mr. Longard gave his evidence with reference to members of parliament dictating prices:

Q. Then the line of business, I suppose, has been the same since 1896. Perhaps this would cover the condition of affairs as applicable to you as well as to some others. I see by a memorandum here contained in an official file from the department at Ottawa this note: 'Mr. Carney, member of parliament, requests that 30 barrels of linseed at 65 cents raw and 68 cents boiled and 2 tons of sheet lead at 7 cents per pound be purchased from Messrs. William Robertson & Son. The oil and the lead might be purchased and kept in store as the price is low, but it cannot be paid for until the estimates pass this session.' That has the initials W. W. S. That would be Mr. Stumbles. This is a memorandum he made for the deputy minister according to the original file. Now, does that illustrate the nature of the interviews and transactions between you and the members?—A. I cannot say it does.

Q. But of the same character?—A. I cannot say the same character.

Q. What was it then, please? That is dated 17th December, my lord. Then what was the character of the interviews between you and the members bearing upon this question of ordering and supplying goods?—A. Just to recommend us for a particular job that was going on at the time.

Q. Did either of the members speak to you about prices?—A. I don't remember.

Q. I see, that is the way it is, you don't remember. Now, according to this memorandum you see, one of the members defined the prices. Has that been done with you sometimes?—A. I cannot say.

Even counsel for the government found to his great surprise that actually members of parliament were defining the prices at which goods should be sold to the department by different supply men. Then I think the result of the investigation shows conclusively, both by direct evidence and by implication, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had personal knowledge both by direct evidence and by implication. Now, the report of the commissioner is full of instances where goods were bought without tender, and I think it is a fair assumption to say that where the minister departs from the recognized business methods of conducting his department he must be held responsible for the evil results that follow. I will not take up time by quoting from the evidence that is in my hand, showing where thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of goods were purchased by his department without asking for tenders. Another thing for which the minister must be held responsible, is paying excessive prices for patented goods. Patented goods costing $150 were sold to the government for $4,500 in defiance to the Patent Act. That is a statement made by His Honour Mr. Justice Cassels, based upon the evidence. Then another piece of evidence that I think directly affects the minister who was the head of the department at that time, was that in respect to the Halliday contract. The witness, Mr. Van Felson, being examined stated that he had written to the head of the department many times, but nothing was done towards liquidating this claim. Now, in the light of subsequent events the minister's failure to reply to those letters was significant. Was the head of the department delaying payment of that Halliday account? Was he purposely playing into the hands of the deputy minister, because we find Mr. Van Felson swears in his evidence that before the Halliday account was paid he had to pay $3,000 to Boudreau, an official in the department, and that Boudreau told him that $3,000 had to be divided up with somebody in the department. If that is the case, I say the circumstance is most significant. I do not know whether the present minister was head of the department at that time or not, but if he was at the time that money was paid over, I think the evidence is such as to fix responsibility upon him, and should have compelled him to go into the witness box and disavow any connection with the distribution of that $3,000.

Mr. TALBOT. Is it not a fact that Judge Cassels, in his report, distinctly

says that the report of Van Felson against Boudreau was never proved, that he never gave any evidence to the effect that he paid the $3,000.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I agree with the hon. gentleman that Mr. Boudreau was exonerated in a half-hearted manner in the report. But at the same time, Van Felson was a gentleman of undoubted integrity, and he had no motive whatever to go into the witness box and swear falsely that the $3,000 was paid by him to Boudreau. Mr. Justice Cassels in his report remarks that he could not see any motive for Van Felson, a perfect stranger, going into the witness box and falsifying himself with regard to that $3,000.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. gentleman must admit that Judge Cassels says positively that Van Felson never proved that he paid that money.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I think when Van Felson, a disinterested party, went into the witness box and swore to a statement of that kind, it was up to the minister to go into the witness box and swear that so far as he was personally concerned, he had no connection with it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the hon. gentleman is going very far when he said I should be held responsible for that. Those things happened in 1905 when I was not minister of the department. The hon. gentleman has just said that I should be held responsible for purchases made in the department, because no public tenders were called. Public tenders have always been called for since I have been a minister.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I am speaking of the evidence that was adduced before Judge Cassels. I did not say that the present minister was head of the department when this payment was made; I said that if he was head of the department at the time the $3,000 was paid, it was his duty, to relieve himself from suspicion, to disavow any connection with that payment, because Boudreau, an official in the department, told Van Felson that he had to divide that with somebody in the department.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am very sorry that my hon. friend should make an allusion of that kind. I never had anything to do with that matter.

Mr. EDWARDS. My hon. friend said, whoever was head of the department at that time.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, he said, if the hon. gentleman was then minister, he should be held responsible.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE Now, the minister says that goods were not bought without tender. I will refer him to the evidence of Mr. J. J. Murphy, page 1829:

Q. Now, with regard to that, out of the $20,000 which you had sold to the department during those three years, you had tenders, or public tenders had been asked for about $5,000 worth ?—A. Yes, sir.

So that out of $20,000 worth there were only $5,000 in respect of which tenders had been asked. At page 1824 it appears that J. W. Woods Company sold to the department $11,492 worth and that of this only $230 was tendered for.

Q. You are right, $11,492. And outside of $230 worth, according to your own statement for the balance you were never asked for tenders, prices were never fixed, you sent in your account, and got paid?—A. In some cases we did.

I do not see how the minister can say that tenders have been asked for in view of the evidence given before Mr. Justice Cassels.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was not during my time.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Another question of which the present Minister of Marine must have knowledge is the Johnston matter. Mr. Johnston, according to Mr. Justice Cassels' report, is to blame in connection with two matters. At page 48 of his report Mr. Justice Cassels says:

Captain Johnston, of the steamship 'Lady Laurier,' has to discharge himself from blame in respect to two matters brought to light in the evidence adduced at Halifax.

First, in respect to the receipt by him of the sum of $1,550, apparently paid him on account of so-called salvage service performed by the 'Lady Laurier' and the officers and crew for the steamship 'Hestia'.

The second, in respect to a sum of $400 received by him for services performed by the 'Lady Laurier' and by the officers and crew of a somewhat similar character in aid of the steamship 'Mount Temple".

I understand that Capt. Johnston was never called on to give evidence, that he was represented by counsel, that he retained in his possession the money so received and yet the minister has nothing to say in connection with his case. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite stated that every man found guilty of irregularity in Mr. Cassels' report has been dismissed from the service. I believe that Capt. Johnson is still in the employ of the government, that he has been reported guilty of two irregularities, the first being the retaining of $1,900 of the people's money. Has that money been obtained from Capt. Johnston?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. If my hon. friend is stating that to the House he should give some evidence to support it. I say the finding is absolutely incorect and there is not a line to corroborate it.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. It is extraordinary to hear the hon. gentleman attacking his own commissioner's report. I am quoting from the findings in Mr. Justice Cassels' report on the evidence adduced before him.

Mr. TALBOT. You are doing nothing of the sort.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Hon. gentlemen opposite accept his findings when they suit them but reject them when they do not.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does my hon. friend think the captain of a government vessel should not be entitled to salvage dues?

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Mr. Justice Cassels says it is a most improper charge.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am asking the opinion of my hon. friend.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I agree with the opinion of Mr. Justice Cassels.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister believe that a government steamer in the service of Canada paid by the money of Canada is doing its proper duty towards Canada when it allows its officer to demand and take and keep salvage?

Mr. BRODEUR. The rule in England in the Admiralty, where the rules are very severe, is that an officer is entitled to salvage dues.

Mr. FOSTER. If an agreement has been made, clear and definite, that he is not to do it, does the minister think the captain should pay no heed to the instructions of the department and keep the money in his pocket?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Those are not the facts at all.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I understand Capt. Johnston has written to the department that he had the money and was going to keep it and has dared the department to do anything. Is that corect?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think there is such a letter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a question of some importance whether the captains of government steamers are to be allowed to retain salvage. The rule in the British Admiralty is that the captains are entitled to salvage dues.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They are settled by the Admiralty Court and in this case there was an express contract between the Crown and the owners of the salvaged vessel.

Mr. BRODEUR. As to the use of the vessel itself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, and that implies the services of the crew.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a different question from the salvage dues to the officers and crew of the vessel.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, the salvage is one indivisible thing and it is distributed in each award by the Admiralty Court; a portion goes to the owner, a portion to the captain, a portion to the crew, according to their respective ratings.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not the rule followed in England.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I beg pardon, it is.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Admiralty rule is that the captains and crew are entitled to salvage dues and the government claims nothing for the use of the Admiralty vessel itself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Precisely. The hon. gentleman is not instructing us as to anything new. In Great Britain they have a rule which prohibits the Crown from making any claim in respect to the services of the vessel and there the Admiralty Court even makes an allowance to the officers and crew. But here there was a distinct contract.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. There was no service under that contract.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid I shall interfere. This discussion is most irregular, the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) has the floor.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. It shows the laxity of the department when such an official can write in such a dictatorial way, and say he has the money and purposes keeping it although the officials of the department have stated repeatedly in the correspondence that he has no right to the money. I read from page 1342 of the evidence:

> Q. And now then, the whole subject being before Your Lordship as commissioner here, I find endorsed upon that original memorandum, which I have last read, this further statement: 'You may make'—and the statement is over the initials of the minister of the department, my lord. 'You may make the claim against Pickford and Black, and we do not recognize as part of what is due to the department the amount that was paid to Captain Johnston'—it is either 'without' or 'against.' I cannot make out which—'the authorization of the department.—L.P.B.'

In the memorandum signed by the Minister, 'L.P.B.,' he states that it is without the authorization of the department that Capt. Johnston had that money.

In reference to the question of salvage and the right of Capt. Johnston to the money I quote from page 50 of Judge Cassels' report:

Captain Johnston was represented by counsel. He was not examined.

Another extraordinary case where an official was not examined, although he was represented by counsel:

In my opinion he was not entitled to claim salvage without the approval and consent of the department.

I do not think language could be plainer than that statement that Capt. Johnston, in the opinion of the Hon. Mr. Cassels, was not entitled to salvage. The report continues:

I think the conduct of Captain Johnston in retaining this money is without justification.

Speaking of the 'Mount Temple' Judge Cassels says:

The sum of $400 was paid to him and retained by him. He had no right to keep this money.

I shall abide by the opinion of Mr. Justice Cassels, and I think the department which appointed him should also rely upon his finding and proceed against Captain Johnston and make him return the money. The failure of the minister to prosecute, although the funds of the department had been misappropriated, shows acquiescence in the criminal acts committed, and makes him to that extent responsible. I submit that the accumulation of evidence against the minister fixes the responsibility upon him, and in order to refresh the memory of the hon. gentleman, I desire to repeat the facts in connection with the investigation which in my opinion fasten responsibility upon him. First, that goods were bought by the department without tender; patented goods were bought at excessive prices in defiance of the patent Act; men were kept in their positions and some of them like Captain Johnston promoted when they were guilty of irrgularities; that the minister was written to several times in regard to the Halliday account but paid no attention; that that account was delayed for nine months before a settlement was made by the department, and that $3,000 had to be paid to Mr. Boudreau an official of the department before it was paid.

Mr. TALBOT. That is not true.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I am taking the sworn evidence of Van Felson that $3 000 was paid before the account was settled, and that Mr. Boudreau told him that before that account would be settled there had to be $3,000 paid and divided between Boudreau and some one else in the department. The next thing that fixes responsibility upon the minister is the increase in the staff during October, and that the minister knowing that Captain Johnston had kept $1,900 of the public money improperly, failed to prosecute. The question is: what is the responsibility of the minister and the cabinet. Under the principles of the British constitution there were two courses open to the first minister, one being to ask for the resignation of the responsible head of the department, to reorganize the department and to let the blame rest where it should rest, namely, on the head of the department. The other course was for the Prime Minister to retain in the cabinet the head of that department and to shoulder the responsbility. I submit that in England the responsible head of a department which had fallen into such disgrace would not have been retained in the cabinet for 24 hours. No government in the old country would be able in defiance of public opinion to retain a responsible minister of the Crown whose department had been so discredited. It has been proven by incontrovertible evidence that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is a mass of jobbery and corruption and crime. This has been proven and reported upon by Mr. Judge Cassels, and notwithstanding, it would appear that the government is determined to defend the Minister of Marine at all hazards. Whether that be a case of choice or necessity I know not, but my own opinion is that it is a matter of necessity because the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, conscious that his department is no worse than others, is not prepared to be made the scapegoat of the administration. He has his back to the wall and he tells the others that they have to stand or fall together, and so he refuses to resign or to relieve the government from responsibility. The Minister of Marine in his defence stated that he should not be held responsible, and he gave as a reason that he was only continuing the system that had been inaugurated by his predecessors. All authorities on the question of ministerial responsibility fix the responsibility first on the minister himself and secondly on the cabinet as a whole if the minister remains in the cabinet and is defended. I quote from Mr. Todd's parliamentary government volume 1, page 628, 2nd edition.

As a necessary consequence of the division of the Civil Service into political and non-political officers, and of the acknowledged supremacy of the members of the administration over all the subordinate employees, it is required by our parliamentary system that every branch of the public service should be represented, either directly or indirectly, in the Houses of parliament. This duty is performed by the political heads who are themselves solely responsible for every Act of administration down to the minutest details of official routine.

In the face of such a high authority how can the Minister of Marine hold up his

officials hands and say they are clean, and that he is not responsible. Todd, page 472, volume 2, speaking of the responsibility of ministers of the Crown to parliament, says:

Notwithstanding the modern rules of parliamentary government whereby responsibility is attached to the whole administration for the acts of the several members of which the same is composed, the ancient rule that the constitution of this country always selects for responsibility the individual minister who does any particular act continues to hold good, and is directly applicable in cases of personal misconduct for which the collective administration decline to be answerable.

Speaking of the collective responsibility of the ministers Todd says. Todd, vol. ii, p. 477, 2nd edition:

The true doctrine on this subject was afterwards enunciated by the Earl of Grey in the following terms: the essence of responsible government is, that mutual bond of responsibility one for another, wherein a government, acting by party, go together, frame their measures in concert, and where if one member falls to the ground, the others, almost as a matter of course, fall with him.

But the application of this principle would be often partial and insufficient for the ends of justice were it not for the exception implied in Lord Derby's definition and which admits of a definite and unqualified responsibility being exclusively attached to a minister of the Crown who is proved to have done anything which renders him personally liable to the censure of parliament or to punishment by legal process.

In view of that authority, the responsibility is upon the administration for the acts of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. And what does the government propose to do? I submit that their action in superannuating two head officials, dismissing nine others, and dismissing 12 others with a string to their dismissal, is not sufficient in view of the serious charges made against the department. For the sake of the Civil Service and for the sake of the country do they purpose inaugurating any reform? I do not believe that the poor officials in the Marine Department are alone responsible for the woeful lack of moral stamina in the service. As was eloquently said by the member for Elgin (Mr. Crothers) it is not at the bottom but at the top we should look for the lack of moral stamina which prevails in the public service of the country. I believe, Sir, that in view of the evidence brought out by the Cassels investigation this House should extend the investigation to all the other spending departments of the government, and adopt the resolution moved by my hon. friend from St.Anne (Mr. Doherty.).

Mr. L. A. A. RIVET (Hochelaga). Mr. Speaker, I do not purpose in the course of the few remarks I intend making, to answer—and I say it without wishing to be offensive—the scrap-book oration of the hon. gentleman from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe). In my humble judgment, in spite of the numerous quotations with which he has favoured us to-night, he has not succeeded in advancing a single argument to justify this House in passing a condemnation upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or upon the Cabinet of which he is a member, or in voting for the resolution which has been placed before you by the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty). I do not propose either to defend the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The hon. minister showed, this afternoon, in the most remarkable manner, that he is quite able to defend himself and the administration of the department of which he is the head. But my object in rising to-night is simply to place myself on record, in order to show my appreciation of the most excellent work which the hon. minister has performed for his country, and especially for the great port of this country, which I have the honour to represent in this House, since he has been entrusted with the responsibility of a minister of the Crown. Before proceeding any further, Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate most heartily the hon. member for St. Anne, on the fairness and moderation which have characterized the address which he has delivered in support of his motion. I may say that I have known that hon. gentleman for many years, and I expected that while he might feel it to be his duty to offer the resolution which he has submitted to-night, he would do it in a manner that would be consistent with the tone of our debates and the dignity of this House. Looking back to the record of this House for the last year, and remembering the discussions which took place last session, when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was trying to get his estimates passed, and when the hon. members opposite felt it to be part of their duty to resort to obstructive tactics, I think I am justified in believing that if the hon. member for St. Anne had had a seat in this House at that time, instead of joining in the chorus, he would have entered a vigorous protest against such conduct. However, I regret that I cannot congratulate the hon. member for St. Anne upon either the logic of his motion or the greater part of the address which he has delivered in support of it. The whole of his motion, as well as his argument in support of it, are based upon the assumption that because some wrong-doing was found to exist in some of the departments of the administration the other large departments, which he has not even named, must be subject to suspicion, and that, in order to lift the cloud of suspicion which overhangs them, this House should appoint a

commission, which might be called a fishing commission, in order to ascertain whether these suspicions are well-founded or not. This is the whole argument of the hon. gentleman, and I believe I am fair to him in stating that he has not advanced another argument to justify the position he has taken in this House upon this question.

In all fairness I must say that the hon. member for St. Anne has exonerated the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries from any blame, so far as his personal honour is concerned; and in giving expression to that sentiment he is certainly reflecting the sentiment not only of all of the members on this side of the House, but also of those who had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the minister's policy, his method of administration, and his patriotism. He is also expressing the sentiment of the whole country, which, in the last general election demonstrated their approval, not only of the administration, but most particularly of those members of the administration who have been most signally attacked by the opposition, either in the press or on the hustings.

In regard to the matter under discussion, there are two questions which have to be considered: First, a question of fact; and second, a question of law, constitutional law—a question of ministerial responsibility. As to the question of fact, everybody admits that there was in the Department of Marine and Fisheries a condition of affairs that was certainly regrettable, and that it was the duty of the government to apply the proper remedy. I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to argue that the condition of affairs as disclosed by the report of Mr. Justice Cassels, was calculated to cast suspicion on the department, when that very commission was appointed as a step towards applying a remedy. I do not understand why our hon. friends opposite are insisting on so many conditions, in view of the fact that the hon. minister has accepted the conclusions of the commission and himself has applied the remedy.

As regards the question of ministerial responsibility, I am at a loss to understand the logical connection between the acts of some officials who were appointed under the late administration and the administration of the minister. The minister certainly had every right to believe that these officials were worthy of their trust, since hon. gentlemen opposite had given them, during their 18 years' administration, their fullest confidence and had never lifted a finger to remove one of them from office. I am at a loss, therefore, to see what logical connection there can be between the acts of these officials and the conduct of the head of the department. But if there were circumstances which justified the appointment of Mr. Justice Cassels as commissioner, those circumstances are entirely lacking to justify the appointment of the commission asked for by the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty). There is no doubt responsibility in this matter, but what is the responsibility with which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may be charged? It is the responsibility of having attempted to do, and having succeeded in doing, what none of his predecessors ever attempted, namely, to reform his own department. In this connection, I quite agree with my hon. friends opposite that there is responsibility to fasten upon the minister, but not responsibility of a nature calculated to reflect injuriously upon him or upon his colleagues. Some of the reforms inaugurated by the minister have been mentioned by some of the preceding speakers. The hon. minister himself, speaking in his own defence, said that during the three years of his tenure of office he had made some improvements, not only in the ordinary management of his own department, but also outside his department, in the line of bettering our system of transportation and in a general way seconding the efforts of nature and extending to the St. Lawrence route the advantages nature intended it to enjoy, and which are destined to make it the navigation route par excellence of the North American continent. But with that modesty which characterizes him, he did not tell the House that, of all the Ministers of Marine and Fisheries, he is surely the one who has done the most to improve our system of transportation by water and to put our River St. Lawrence in a condition which makes it the rival route of New York to-day, and will to-morrow make it the superior of that route in every respect. Speaking particularly as the representative of a division which forms part of the great metropolis of Canada, I consider it my duty to say that in Montreal there is but one voice in admitting that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries has done remarkably well in putting the River St. Lawrence, and the port of Montreal in particular, upon a first-class footing. My hon. friend the minister quoted some of the resolutions passed by the board of trade and other commercial bodies of Montreal, but he did not say that to-day it is universally admitted in the commercial and financial circles of Montreal that the present government, and particularly the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, have done more for the people of this country and the port of Montreal than was accomplished in any previous regime.

Speaking in a language with which I am not very familiar, I cannot help but feel that I am wearying the House and shall consequently not make any lengthy remarks. But referring again to what has been accomplished by this government with

regard to navigation, I shall take the liberty of quoting the report of the Hon. Mr. Justice Cassels. On page 9 of that report, Mr. Justice Cassels says:

The improvements of the navigation of the St. Lawrence and the upper lakes has been the subject of consideration by various administrations that have held office since confederation. In 1900 a more vigorous policy was adopted than has been pursued to the present time.

Well, in 1900, by the grace of God, a Liberal government was presiding over the destinies of this country, and because of that fact, a vigorous policy was adopted in order to make the River St. Lawrence and our general system of water transportation the best in America. There is another reform which has been effected by this government, and for the initiation of which we must give credit to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Those who were in this House three years ago will remember that I had the privilege of advocating a reform which, in my opinion, was intimately connected with the future of Montreal. I said that the time had arrived to introduce into the management of that port a new system which would give impetus to the various works undertaken in it and would place that port upon a footing it had not then reached, owing to the laxity of its former management. And I had the pleasure of seeing that a few days after the hon. minister, understanding the requirements of the situation and feeling that the time had arrived to infuse a new spirit into the management of the port, introduced a Bill whereby the old management was done away with and a new management substituted, more in harmony with the situation and the conditions in the port.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have the evidence of the commercial men, and financiers of Montreal, whether Liberal or Conservative, that no reform was ever made calculated to so greatly advance the progress of the great metropolis of Canada. And perhaps I may be permitted, in passing, to pay a deserved tribute to the new commissioners who have been appointed under the guidance of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the noble work they have performed. I am in a position to declare, under the responsibility that attaches to my declaration as a member of this House, that to-day the port of Montreal is in a position to compete with American ports, and especially with the port of New York. I may be charged with taking a narrow view of this question, and advocating only the interest of the city of Montreal; but, as I have said, this is not a local question or one to be treated from a selfish or narrow standpoint of local interest, but from a broadly national standpoint. And, as I have said, the interests of the port of Montreal are undoubtedly bound up with the interests of all Canada. We members must all recognize, whether we be from Quebec, from Toronto, Halifax, or St. John, that we must equip our national port—if I may be permitted to use the expression—in a first-class manner, if we want to compete in a successful way with the port of New York. Well, Sir, this is no new thing. Everybody has seen in the newspapers that, not long ago, the railway companies of the United States decided to reduce their rates to New York in order to enable the New York route to compete with the St. Lawrence route, because last year the grain traffic, instead of taking the route to Buffalo and New York, took the St. Lawrence route by way of Montreal. But, in spite of this reduction, we are in a position to compete successfully with the port of New York, and I believe that if Montreal has been placed on such a footing, it is due largely, if not wholly, to the wise policy, the noble efforts and the far-sighted administration of this government under the initiative of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The fact has been referred to in this House that, owing to the improvements made, the rates of insurance have been reduced by a total of about $200,000. Everybody understands that, if the owners of steamers are able to save so much simply on the rates of insurance, they are immediately put in an advantageous position as compared with their rivals of other countries. Everybody knows that to-day great improvements have been made in the channel between Quebec and Montreal. Some people may say: 'You speak always from the standpoint of Montreal.' I do not wish to be charged with a selfish spirit. If I were not convinced, as I am, that the interests of Montreal are the interests of the whole country, I would not stand up in this House and advocate discrimination even in favour of my own city.

In view of the attacks which have been heaped upon the methods of administration of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I thought it was my duty, as I think it the duty of every member, whether he comes from the province of Quebec or not, to stand up in this House and—to use the expression of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Ecrément), to say a little on his behalf'. I believe that everybody who knows the minister will agree with me when I acquit him of any wrong-doing or even bad intention. At the last election, as some of the speakers have said, a compact was entered into between the administration and the electors of this country. They had gone before the people and had told them that, in view of the attacks and criticisms levelled against the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the government had appointed a commission which would investigate and probe to the bottom every charge made against the department, and, should the report of His Lordship Judge Cassels

pass condemnation upon any official in the government that official would be dealt with. The electors listened to that proposal and extended their confidence and support to the present administration. And now, when the first opportunity presents itself to go into the recommendations of the commissions, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does his duty, and redeems his pledge to the people by dismissing these officials—very much against his feelings. As he said this afternoon he has been in receipt of pathetic appeals from mothers and wives. But in the conscientious discharge of his duties towards the administration and the country, he dismissed all who were found guilty of wrong-doing. We have fulfilled our contract with the people. And what have hon. gentlemen opposite to say? I say that they stand up there one after another, trying to open a case which, to my mind, is closed forever. They are not sincere, because, when the government appointed Mr. Justice Cassels, the opposition as well as the government supporters felt that the appointment was a worthy one, and that the country could trust Mr. Justice Cassels' findings. But now, because those findings do not go as far as their wishes—the wish being father to the thought—they place themselves in the position of a judge and try to render a verdict which the judge has not rendered, in order to satisfy themselves and their sympathizers that the government is not worthy the confidence of the country. Now this is the position, and it is a position which justifies the representatives of the electorate in placing their confidence in the members of the administration, and especially in the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

It was said by the last speaker (Mr. Samuel Sharpe) that now, surely, the minister ought to resign. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because, during the three years of his administration he has performed his duty, a thing which the head of that department during the Conservative regime had never done. The hon. minister must resign, because he enjoys the fullest confidence of the country, and particularly of his native province. He must resign, because, in the last election, the opposition, though well organized, could not find 25 men to place a candidate in the field against him. The minister must resign, because he has proved to be a worthy leader of his own province. The minister must resign, because to-day there is only one voice to testify to his sterling qualities, to his noble character, to his honest purpose, to his patriotism, to all those qualities which make a man worthy to represent his constituents in the councils of the nation. The minister must resign, because to-day we are just as proud of him as we were yesterday, and just as willing to follow him and to serve our country under his direction. Sir, in conclusion let me say that I have read carefully the motion which has been placed in your hands, I have listened attentively to the addresses which have been delivered in support of that motion, and sitting as a member of the popular jury, I must come to the conclusion that no argument has been adduced which would justify me in giving a verdict in favour of the motion now before the Chair.

Mr. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie). One of the last remarks made by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Rivet), who has just taken his seat, was to the effect that he had carefully read the motion which is before the House. Of all the remarks uttered by that gentleman that was the most surprising to me, because, throughout the entire course of an address lasting I believe over an hour, it was the only remark that bore any possible relation to the words of the motion at all. I regret that, owing to the lateness of the hour, and owing to the fact that to answer the hon. gentleman would require me to disregard utterly the motion itself, it will be impossible for me to give much attention to his address. As to the gentleman who preceded him, the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Ecrement), who spoke in French, I regret, with my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) that I was unable to understand his address. I regret it all the more because, though not able to understand it, I was able to appreciate the music of his voice and accent, and the apparent eloquence of his language.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has exhibited some remarkable qualities during the present session. I must congratulate him on the marvellous facility of intellect and the bewildering dexterity of mind that enable him to come to almost any conclusion that may be congenital to him, or satisfactory to his conscience, utterly irrespective of the facts. On April 30, almost a year ago, when his department, in conjunction with other departments, stood charged before the country with the most serious delinquencies, when he himself, as part of the department, stood charged with a lack of conscience, when his department stood charged with being utterly wanting in a directing head, as far as the commissioners could see, the minister saw fit to come before the House and tell of the hard work he had done in his department, to recount the undertakings he had carried out in the St. Lawrence river, and up in the neighbourhood of Port Arthur. No doubt he conceived that that was an answer to the charge of the Royal Commission. And when the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) saw fit to state that the resolution as it stands does not call in question, and does not make a question in this debate,

of the character and integrity of the minister himself, the minister saw fit at once to come to the conclusion that the member for St. Anne, speaking for this side of the House, had acknowledged the integrity of the character of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as head of that department. Surely that was a delightful contortion of the mind, that was a beautiful piece of reasoning. The Minister of Marine has also come to another conclusion very satisfactory to his conscience. He comes before this parliament, and before we were in session more than a week, he assured this House that he had received a certificate of character, not only from the hon. member for St. Anne, but from this commission. He assured this House, and it is now on record, that he came out with his skirts clear from the report of Mr. Justice Cassels. Now it is indeed a beautiful piece of reasoning for the minister to come to the conclusion that his skirts are clear by an investigation through a commission which was forbidden above all things to investigate anything about him at all. The hon. member for Richmond also says that it can no longer be said that there is any charge against the minister, or any suspicion that can be levelled against him, because, he says, the minister is cleared by the report of Mr. Justice Cassels. But the hon. member for Richmond made that statement in face of the assurance of the Minister of Agriculture, in face of the assurance of the Attorney General of this country, in face of the assurance of the Minister of Marine himself, and of the Prime Minister himself, that Mr. Justice Cassels was forbidden to investigate any of the conduct of the minister of that department, but was restricted in his investigation to the underlings. Surely, it ill becomes a minister to look for a certificate of character to a commission that was forbidden to investigate anything that might throw any light on his own transactions in the department, or upon his own connection with the delinquencies that existed. We have heard about drowning men clutching at straws, but the anxiety of the Minister of Marine and his followers to obtain a certificate of character for their chief certainly bears a very strong resemblance to that picture. The minister in his defence practically repeats the speech he delivered in this House on April 30, 1908. He goes back and tries to show that the system which is now so much abused by this government was in vogue under Conservative administration. That argument has been very frequently combatted in this House and I do not think it can be combatted too strongly. It does seem to me that the country, and I think most members of this House, are tired of it. Surely the Minister of Marine, surely members on the other side of the House do not pretend to say that a system that fits one time will fit all times. Surely they do not pretend to say that the successors of the Conservative party for all time to come are to be bound within whatever limits the Conservative party, 20 years ago or 30 years ago saw fit to be bound; surely they would not say that their successors in office for years to come, that their political successors shall have a circle drawn around them and be confined within the narrow limits by virtue of the present administration; surely they will allow some scope for the evolution of political morality and for improvements that will take place. It does not seem to me that it is a sufficient answer to this House and the country that the use of a patronage list in 1886 is a justification for its use years afterwards; surely they ought to make some allowance for the progress of time, surely they must admit that the times have out-grown that system. Supposing they do not admit that, it is not so much the system that is attacked, it is not so much the system that brings disgrace on this government and discredit on its members, as it is the abuse of the system. The abuse of the system seems to have taken root within the last few years. The abuse of this system has not been traced back by Mr. Justice Cassels nor indeed by the previous commission beyond the days of this government. Surely, therefore, they cannot hide behind the fact that the system existed to shield themselves from the consequences of their abuse of that system.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) very rightly suggests that he should not be held responsible for the sins of his predecessors. Personally it would be unjust to hold him responsible. But the Minister of Marine, in common with other members of this government who were members of the government when the minister's predecessor, Mr. Prefontaine, held that portfolio, was responsible for the discrepancies of the Marine Department at that time. I need not take the statements of Conservatives in support of that doctrine of ministerial responsibility, but shall refer to the speeches delivered by prominent Liberals in 1891 when the late Hon. Sir Hector Langevin was charged in this parliament with misconduct in his own department. They will find that one of the strongest constitutional lawyers in this conutry, the late Hon. David Mills, speaking on behalf of the opposition of that day, was very emphatic upon this point. Before quoting his words, let me briefly state the circumstances: The late Hon. Sir Hector Langevin was charged with serious misconduct in connection with the Department of Public Works. Specific charges were made against him. The matter was submitted to a special committee of this House. Two reports were presented to this House, a minority report and a majority report. The majority report specifically

and unequivocally acquitted Sir Hector Langevin from anything in the nature of active participation or any connection with the irregularitites found to exist in the department. The minority report also went so far as to find that they had not evidence to connect Sir Hector with any improper transactions. The two reports coincided in that particular, but the minority report went on—and I draw the attention of the Minister of Marine to this particularly, because they are the words of his colleague in this House, the late Hon. David Mills, and the Hon. Sir Louis Davies of the Supreme Court. At page lxxxii of the Journals of the House of Commons of Canada, A. 1891, appendix No. 1, they say :

Except the desire to please and obey the minister at the head of the department, we cannot discover any motives which would induce these engineers to assist in defrauding the public in order to put money in the pockets of Larkin, Connolly & Co.

Therefore, the ground that these men considered sufficient to connect the head of the department with the frauds perpetrated by those beneath him was that they could conceive of no other motive except that they wished to please and obey the minister at the head of the department. If that ground was good then it is good today, and if it is good now it distinctly implicates the head of the department and puts him on his defence. If the same circumstances exist now as existed then they should lead to the same conclusion.

Speaking in the light of those findings of both the majority and minority reports of those days, Mr. M. C. Cameron, then member for Huron, speaking in the House of Commons of Canada, used the following words at page 5824 of the 'Hansard':

A member of parliament, a former political friend and supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, has, for three hours arraigned the policy and the conduct of the hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to their administration of public works, and yet upon the ministerial benches, behind them and on each side of them, there is not a man who has courage enough to rise in his seat and defend the position of the government. Hon. gentlemen will remember that this is not an assault solely upon the late member for Quebec West or an assault solely upon the late Minister of Public Works. It is an assault upon every hon. gentlemen who was the colleague of the Minister of Public Works while he was a member of the present administration. They supported and sustained him, and if they know anything about parliamentary, constitutional rule, they must know perfectly well that each one of them is just as responsible as the late Minister of Public Works. I am astounded at the Minister of Justice, and the Minister of War, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Minister of Finance, and above all the Secretary of State, should remain silent in their seats. Are they going to plead guilty to the charges levelled against them?

That is to say, Mr. M. C. Cameron, who was at that time put up by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the government to argue the constitutional aspect of this case as it affected the individual responsibility of the other ministers of the Crown, was made to say and did say that they all shared the responsibility for the guilt even of officials of the department on the ground only as stated in the minority report that there was a reasonable inference that these acts were done either in obedience to their wishes or their orders. As the hour is late I beg to move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 12.20 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, April 2, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 121) for the relief of John Grant Ridout.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke, Essex.

Bill (No. 122) to incorporate the Cabano Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I beg to move that on Tuesday next the House go into Committee of the Whole on the following resolution, which His Excellency the Governor General recommends to our consideration:—

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Post Office Act and the Civil Service Act and to provide as follows:—

That in the outside division of the Post Office Department the salaries of messengers, porters, letter-carriers, mail transfer agents or box collectors shall, in grade A be at the rate of $1.75 per day, in grade B at the rate of $2 per day, in grade C at the rate of $2.25 per day, in grade D at the rate of $2.50 per day, in grade E at the rate of $2.75 per day; that the salaries of the fourth-class clerks shall, on appointment, be $500 with annual increases of $100 up to $700; and that if the salary of an stamper and sorter or fourth-class clerk is at present less than $500, it shall forthwith be increased to that minimum.

Motion agreed to.

MANITOBA BOUNDARIES.

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL. I beg to give notice to the right hon. the First Minister

that on the earliest opportunity I shall take up the Manitoba boundaries question.

SUPPLY—THE CASSELS COMMISSION.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply, and the amendment of Mr. Doherty thereto.

Mr. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Portage La Prairie). When the House adjourned last night, Mr. Speaker, I had just concluded some references to a debate that took place in this House in 1891, and had quoted from the remarks of one of the supporters of the right hon. gentleman. I had shown that the Liberal party then subscribed to the doctrine that the sins of any one department were attributable to the entire government, that is to say that the Cabinet and the members of the Cabinet collectively were jointly and individually responsible for the delinquencies in the administration of each and every department. I wish to commend that view to the members of the government to-day and to ask the Minister of Marine and the Prime Minister if that doctrine has any application in this instance, and if, when the Minister of Marine asks that he should not be held responsible personally for the faults of his predecessor in office, he will not admit that, as a member of the Cabinet during the time his predecessor was in office, he and the other members of that Cabinet were equally responsible for the appalling abuses of the patronage system, which existed under their direction and control. What is the answer of the government to the charges made? The right hon. the Prime Minister, during the last election, replied that no member of his administration had been charged with any crime. The right hon. gentleman appears to have been converted to a new doctrine since the days of 1891. Now, it appears, he considers himself entirely irresponsible and his colleagues as well, until someone rises in the House and charges that any member of the government has been guilty of theft or some other crime. Let me remind the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that there are other crimes against public policy besides that of theft. There are other errors of public administration which call for public condemnation besides the taking of money directly from the public coffers or winking at its being taken. If members of the government have been in office during years in succession and have failed to detect theft, if they have failed to exercise that supervision, that organizing, disciplinary and directing power which good government demands, that is a crime against the constitution deserving the condemnation of this House. The only reason that I can see which can be accepted as any kind of a logical defense is that this resolution is a want of confidence in the government and therefore the party opposite have to vote against it. Sir, if the results of the investigation by the Hon. Mr. Justice Cassels are such as to warrant further investigation, then such further investigation should be made.

If therefore I succeed in showing that these reports are such as to warrant further investigation, then, according to the reasoning of my hon. friend the hon. member for Richmond, Nova Scotia, (Mr. Kyte) there is sufficient ground to vote want of confidence in the administration not only in the House but throughout the country. The First Minister told us that the commissioner found no fault with the members of the government. I claim that the report of the Civil Service Commission found direct fault with members of the government, it was the most powerful indictment that has been levelled against this government since it came into power. That fact was admitted by more than one honest Liberal speaker in the last election. Was there no indictment against this government and the minister in the finding of the Civil Service Commission that there was a lack of conscience in the Marine Department, and in the allegation that there was no visible directing power presiding over that department? If there was no allegation in the entire report of the Civil Service Commission against this government why was the report of that commission practically suppressed by this government? 'The duty of the hour' was distributed by the Liberal party throughout every constituency but we could not buy a copy of the Civil Service report for $100. If the Liberals can take comfort out of that report, as they tried to do yesterday, why was it not utilized by them in the last campaign? I think I can prove that although Mr. Justice Cassels was manacled hand and foot in that investigation still there is matter in that report which constitutes an indictment against the head of the department. Is it no indictment for Mr. Justice Cassels to find that the minister as head of the department permitted the purchase of diaphone fog signals at $4,600 each which cost $230 and that he permitted this price to be paid in direct contravention of the Patent Act which provides that only a reasonable price shall be charged for any patented article? Further than that, giving every possible latitude for the extraordinary profits which accrue to the inventor of a patented article, Mr. Justice Cassels finds that the minister would have been justified in justice and in the discharge of his duty as a responsible minister if he had refused to pay more than $840 for those diaphones. Is it no indictment or does it reflect any credit on the head of the department that a price six times what should have been paid was given for these articles? Is that

not a charge against his department even if it were done when he was not at its head? Is it not a charge against the government that they condoned a system that permitted Mr. J. W. Wood to sell goods valued at $11,492 in three years for only $230 of which tenders were called? Is it not a charge against the minister or his predecessors that Mr. P. H. Murphy was permitted to secure $20,000 worth of business in three years all but $4,500 without tenders? Is that the proper supervision and the proper direct control indicated by the commission, the supervision which this country has a right to expect from the responsible ministers in its pay and employ? The Minister of Marine has told us before and during this debate that he came out clear from the Cassels investigation. Will the Minister of Marine tell this House that his conduct was in any sense under review by Mr. Justice Cassels in that investigation? I will give him time to do so now, if he will make a statement. I notice the Minister takes no advantage of the offer, he sits in his seat and he admits that in no sense whatever was his conduct under review by Mr. Justice Cassels. Let him never again, let no man behind him in this House state here or elsewhere that the minister's skirts are cleared by the Royal Commission. If in any way whatever, directly or indirectly, inferentially or otherwise, the conduct of the Minister of Marine was under review by Mr. Justice Cassels it was his duty as Minister of Marine to have resigned before that investigation and not to have presided over the department whose head was under review. He knows his conduct was in no way under review. It is an appalling spectacle to have the minister proclaim as by-play in this country that he was cleared by a commission which had nothing to do with his own conduct at all.

The answer that the government and the government supporters have made to this resolution is that they were successful in the last election. If the members of the government would investigate the returns of the last election, they would not believe that there was much force in that argument. I would not attach much weight to the argument even if they had been elected by a large popular majority. We all know as has been pointed out, in language whose eloquence I regret I cannot emulate, by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) that the prime minister utilized those extraordinary powers he possesses of appealing with force and effect to the passions and prejudices of the people of this country and utilizing that power in the last campaign through the press even more than the platform, a victory was secured that surely reflects little credit on him. What was that victory? An analysis of the figures shows that a majority of the Liberal party over the Conservative party was a fraction of one per cent, some 16,000 votes out of a total of over 1,000,000, and some 25,000 votes were cast for Socialists, Independents and Labour candidates, so that the Liberal party actually secured a minority of the votes cast in the last election.

Furthermore the Minister of Marine repeats with confidence in this debate what he stated in the first debate of this session —and his obedient followers echo his remarks—that he was elected by acclamation. He did not tell the House just how that trick was done, he did not tell the House that the Conservative party prepared a nomination paper for his opponent and secured 25 signatures, but that by some means two men were induced to withdraw just before the nomination was put in. I submit that if the Minister of Marine has immediately surrounding him and behind him and underneath him in his own constituency the class of employees he has in his department, it is easy to understand how the trick was performed which resulted in his election by acclamation.

Coming now to the resolution itself, we find that it calls for a further investigation into the other spending departments of the government. One speaker for the government professes not to know what these spending departments are. Well, it will not be hard for him to find out if this resolution is carried calling for further investigation. Now do the facts brought out, does the evidence brought out, do the findings as stated by Mr. Justice Cassels, warrant a further investigation? That is the primary question before the House. One hon. member who opposed the resolution stated that we wanted the investigation because we were not satisfied with Judge Cassels' work. I want to remind that hon. member that the only member of this House who has made any complaint whatever or cast any reflection on the findings of Judge Cassels, was the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) who appears to be the first, or second, or third support of the Minister of Marine himself. Never in this debate, and never in this House, has the finding of Judge Cassels, as based on the evidence, been questioned by any member of the Conservative party. It is because we are satisfied with the great results, relative to the equipment which was allowed Judge Cassels, that have accrued from this investigation, that we want the inquiry resumed. When we consider that before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and before the government permitted Judge Cassels to get at his work at all, they manacled his hands, they manacled his feet, and they took good care that no investigation should

proceed far enough to involve themselves. Considering these restrictions and limitations, it is really little short of marvellous the effect that has been produced by Judge Cassels' investigation and report. Why, here at the eleventh hour, right on the eve of this debate, the Minister of Marine goes through his department, and he reads out a few, not of the black sheep but of the black lambs, and he dismisses them from office; surely something has been accomplished by that. I read in the papers only yesterday that also, on the very eve of this debate, also on this, the eleventh hour, the Minister of Public Works sends a circular throughout the country and warns all those in the employ of his department that they must hereafter not pay excessive prices to tradesmen, that they must hereafter not accept any bribe or any loan or other favour from contractors. Surely these results are worth having. Surely it is worth while to bring these gentlemen to a state of consciousness as to their high duties to the people they represent. Surely these results are worth the whole cost of the investigation, and many times over. That investigation has furthermore accomplished the great result of bringing other members of the Cabinet to a fuller sense of their responsibility, and it has awakened throughout the country a sense of the duty of the people to hold members of the government to their responsibility. Surely these results call for a continuation of the good work. Surely the members of the government and the Prime Minister will respond to the appeal of Mr. Justice Cassels, and enter upon a course that will further enlighten public opinion and bring public opinion to a true sense of its responsibility, and ministers to a true sense of their own responsibility.

Now sir, what reason can be found, what reason within the realm of common sense can be adduced, by any hon. gentleman against such further investigation? No reason has been adduced. There is not a man in this House who will rise and put on his thinking cap and assert that a single reason has been advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is no reason to say that because the Minister of Marine has continued the Conservative policy of deepening the St. Lawrence, has continued the policy of improving the waterways of this country in other parts, therefore the good work that has been done in this department should not be extended to other departments. Surely it was a travesty upon the name of reason itself for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to advance such a hideous argument to the people of this country, and it is no less a travesty on reason, but rather a reflection on the intelligence of this House, that the argument advanced by him should have been the one argument reiterated by his subservient followers throughout the course of this debate. I stand here and I say that throughout the course of this debate not a single member of the government side of the House has come really to the kernel of the point at all, and shown that actual good would not be accomplished by extending the good work that has been begun, but was stopped so soon.

Now the question, I say, is whether the good work that has been accomplished so far does not warrant a continuation of the investigation. The Minister of Marine has referred to the success of his party in the last election. Another speaker has referred to the slogan of the Liberal party in the last election, that he thought was largely responsible for the government being returned to power, and that was the slogan repeated throughout the press and on the platform, 'Let Laurier finish his work.' Now the First Minister, speaking on various platforms throughout Ontario, as reported by his organ the Toronto 'Globe,' promised the people that if they would return him to office he would finish his work; he promised that he would find out who the black sheep among his followers were and weed them out of the party. Now, Sir, the First Minister, in order to give a proof of his good faith in that regard, started right at the city of Ottawa and he weeded out Mr. Fraser, who was then candidate for election in this city. Further than that he has not gone; further than that, I want to state and I want to charge, that he has done nothing whatever toward finding out the black sheep amongst his followers, much less weeding them out. He has weeded out a few of the little lambs of his flock, but so far as his political followers are concerned, no step has been taken, visible at all events, that could be considered even a pretext of investigating who are the black sheep amongst them. Now this resolution calls upon the government to go on and fulfil the pledge they made to the country in this regard, to allow the good work to go on, and to let Laurier finish his work. If they do this all is well. We are satisfied with the results accomplished, though we deplore the nature of those results; but we are satisfied that they are more than commensurate with the equipment allowed Judge Cassels. But if this resolution is rejected by the government then they will give the people of this country every opportunity to find fault with them again for breaking a very important pledge made in the last campaign. This is my final appeal to them: Let this resolution go through. If a further investigation is held, no harm will be done; but if they refuse a further investigation, they will be remiss in their duty to the people of this country.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg). The observations which I intend to address to

the House this afternoon will differ somewhat from the remarks made by speakers who have preceded me, and will perhaps treat more in detail some of the features of the report presented to parliament by the Civil Service Commission, as well as by the Cassels Commission. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Meighen) has ventured to criticise me for having questioned some of the findings of Mr. Justice Cassels, and it was intimated by one of the speakers last night that I was bound to accept the report of Mr. Justice Cassels simply because he was an appointee of the administration which I support. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to submit to such an opinion being forced upon me. I surely do not consider Mr. Justice Cassels or the Civil Service Commission infallible or immune from error and I am sure that neither Mr. Justice Cassels nor the Civil Service Commission would expect me to do so. I think both reports are open to criticism, that each made mistakes, but still it does not necessarily follow that I wish to impeach the motives of either. The report of the Civil Service Commission and the report of Mr. Justice Cassels have gone a considerable distance in weakening my belief in the wisdom of appointing commissions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. And the reasons perhaps which I have in my mind are not the reasons which hon. gentlemen opposite have in their minds. The report of the Civil Service Commission contained many manifest errors. They allowed themselves, through their carelessness, to reach improper conclusions. They made references, for instance, to the Department of Militia and Defence, without the slightest pretence to a knowledge of the facts which they were discussing. They made findings against the Department of Marine and Fisheries without having made the least effort to acquaint themselves with the facts, and, in many respects the findings of that commission are, to my mind, the findings of three fussy gentlemen who were anxious to report something of a sensational character and were not very anxious whether or not they were in a position to justify their findings. There is another feature of the findings and the procedure of the Cassels commission to which I wish to refer and that is, that in many cases witnesses who were not officials of the department and who appeared before Mr. Justice Cassels were denied counsel, and I submit that in many, many instances witnesses were done a grave injustice. I always did have considerable sympathy with my hon. friend for North Toronto 'Mr. Foster) for being refused counsel on the occasion of the insurance investigation and I would have believed that an injustice had been done him were it not for the fact that at the conclusion of that investigation he publicly himself declared that he had been properly treated by the commission. I think, Mr. Speaker, the Cassels inquiry was certainly——

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, my hon. friend means that I am to take that last assertion in a somewhat Pickwickian sense? Otherwise I may say that I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The Cassels inquiry——

Mr. FOSTER. I say I did nothing of the kind, and I think my hon. friend will have to retract it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I do not wish to misrepresent the position of my hon. friend, but, speaking from memory, I thought that during the discussion of that inquiry in this House a statement made by the hon. gentleman expressing his thankfulness to the commission and counsel, Mr. Shepley, was read. I may be mistaken in that, but it is not of very much importance. Now, I say that the inquiry——

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand that my hon. friend accepts my word on that?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Yes, I do——was a very extensive one, it was a very severe one, and as I have said already the cross-examination of witnesses, other than those who were officials of the department, was exceedingly severe and, in many cases, unfair and resulted in placing upon the records statements that I do not believe were actually correct. The commissioner also, did not consider himself restricted to the terms of the order in council appointing him. He in his wisdom, and I find no fault with that, roamed beyond the powers granted him by the order in council appointing him, and the investigation was sufficient to disclose irregularities and the public interests were amply satisfied by the scope of the inquiry. What was proven? Irregularities on the part of officials were proven. They had been dismised. Incompetency and lack of capacity on the part of certain officials was also amply proven. Some have been dismissed. I think it is quite possible that incompetency has been shown regarding other officials in the service of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and I think the minister might very well take into consideration certain evidence respecting other officials. The findings of the Cassels Commission also disclosed the regrettable fact that the bribery of officials was not an uncommon

thing. Those who were guilty of accepting bribes have been punished or censured in some form or another. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Doherty) who moved this resolution yesterday, that we should be more inclined to censure the man who gives the bribe than the one who receives it. We should be fair and lenient, I think, in our view respecting the practice of receiving bribes. It is a fact, although the mover of the resolution will probably question it, that in connection with shipping the giving of gratuities, in this case called bribes, is not an uncommon practice and it may be that a great number of the officials who did accept these bribes believed them to be mere gratuities and that they were justified in accepting them because they were simply acting in accordance with a practice common to maritime ports. There should be a uniform standard or code respecting the giving of bribes. It is not an uncommon thing in commercial life. We must not have one code respecting bribes for the guidance of civil servants and another for bank managers, for the managers of trust companies and other people. We must be fair about these matters. I admit thoroughly that these disclosures were most unfortunate and I am sure that members of parliament and Canadians generally will hope that we have seen the last of them. The commissioner's report also disclosed that excessive prices were paid for goods. Now, I think that has been magnified altogether out of its true proportions. For instance, regarding the purchases made at Montreal, I think that, beyond the Merwin purchases, the evidence amply justifies the conclusion formed by Mr. Justice Cassels that on the whole the prices were fair, and they were, in fact, the ordinary prices. He also makes the same remark concerning the purchases made at Sorel. There is no evidence of improper or excessive charges at St. John, New Brunswick. There is very little evidence of excessive charges at the port of Halifax. True there is some, but it does not amount to a great deal. As far as the evidence taken at Quebec is concerned, it certainly amply justifies the finding of Mr. Justice Cassels that the charges there were exorbitant and unfair.

Well ,what is the Department of Marine and Fisheries doing to remedy this matter of excessive charges? Some time ago, and before Mr. Justice Cassels commenced his inquiry, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) appointed Mr. Doutre as the purchasing agent of that department, and Mr. Doutre's duties, so far, have been so well discharged that upon the record we have the commendation of Mr. Justice Cassels. Mr. Doutre himself gave evidence to the effect that a great saving would be made by reason of his being placed in charge of this portion of the department's business. That is what the department has done to remedy this difficulty. Now, I admit that many of these practices to which reference has been made were irregular and indispensable. But let us be fair; the carrying on of the details of government is conditioned by circumstances which do not obtain in private business, and on many occasions in the future we shall find disclosures of improper conduct on the part of officials and of those who are selling goods to the departments. This, of course, requires vigilance on the part of the minister and his officials. But I am in the judgment of the House when I say that it can never be expected that any minister, or any official, or body of officials, will be able, at all times and on all occasions, to see that any department's business is so transacted as to be utterly beyond criticism.

Now, the resolution before the House asks that this inquiry be extended to other departments. I say that resolution is illogical; it is not supported by reason, for it is based upon the assumption that if irregularities occur in one department they necessarily must occur in another. If all human conduct and transactions were based upon that reasoning, one can readily see to what ridiculous conclusions we should be led. This resolution should not be supported, because there is no accusation or suggestion of wrong-doing as against any other department. It is true that the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) said, in a moment of counterfeited wrath last evening: 'When the heads of the government are guilty of grand larceny, how can it be expected but that the members of the Civil Service will be guilty of petty larceny?' But I suppose we can regard this merely as political sound and fury signifying nothing, and not intended to prove anything. Another reason why the resolution should not be affirmed is that the proceedings before the Public Accounts Committee during the last four or five years do not disclose irregularities of the magnitude or number of those in the Marine and Fisheries Department. And nothing that has occurred before this committee justifies anybody in making the assertion that inquiry should be made into other departments. The suggestion is further made that this inquiry should be granted because some of the contractors having dealings with the Marine and Fisheries Department and found guilty of irregular and improper practices have dealings with other departments. Supposing that this is absolutely true, does it follow that any other department must concur in this resolution and submit to an inquiry? What was the purpose

of the inquiry in connection with the Marine and Fisheries Department, if the other departments were not intended to receive some lesson from it? The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) referred to the fact—which I noticed only a few moments ago in the Montreal 'Gazette' of this morning—that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has issued a circular urging the officers of his department to observe great care and caution in making purchases on behalf of the government both as regards price and quality. They are also cautioned against the acceptance of gifts or favours of any kind from persons having dealings with the department. I naturally assume that the heads of all the other departments must take cognizance of the evidence disclosed during the Cassels' inquiry, and they must take cognizance of the names of the contractors dealing with the Marine and Fisheries Department and found guilty of improper practices, and must be, to some extent at least, guided by that evidence. Again, I say this resolution should not be confirmed, because, after all, what this country requires is that the irregularities prevailing in the past in the Marine and Fisheries Department should cease, as to that department and all others. The country is more interested as to the future than as to the past; and I submit that no good ground whatever can be given for supporting his resoluion.

Now, there are a few things in connection with the Cassels Commission report, with which I wish to deal, perhaps at some length; and possibly I may weary the House, but there are matters referred to in this report which have been the subject of discussion in this House for many years, which have been discussed frequently and persistently by gentlemen of the opposition, which have been constantly referred to in the press, and have found their resting place in the political campaign literature,—matters which relate to the policies of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and which, I believe, should be discussed. In dealing with these matters, I propose to take them up almost in the order in which they appear in the report of Mr. Justice Cassels.

One of the severest strictures made by the Civil Service Commission in its report two years ago was in connection with the administration of the Lighthouse Board. I think it was in consequence of this particular branch of the Marine and Fisheries Department that the commission of that day made the remark that some people were serving two masters, Scripture to the contrary notwithstanding. Now, this is a very important feature of the work of the Marine and Fisheries Department, and I think that the little time I shall take in discussing it will be justified. The Lighthouse Board was constituted a few years ago, and consisted of the deputy minister, Mr. Gourdeau, Mr. W. P. Anderson, Commander Spain, Mr. J. F. Fraser, Mr. Hugh Allan, Montreal, representing the Canadian Federation of Shipping, and Captain J. W. Troupe, of Vancouver, representing the Canadian Pacific Railway shipping interests on the Pacific coast. The Civil Service Commission, in dealing with the Lighthouse Board, severely censured them. They say this :

> Between June, 1905, and June, 1907, this board approved of and passed applications for new and improved aids to navigation amounting to $1,691,813. With the voting away of this vast amount of money the responsible minister had nothing to do. He was simply asked to initial the minutes of the different meetings of this most powerful but irresponsible board. The effect of this state of things is disastrous. It means practically the removing of all responsibility from those to whom extensive powers of administration and expenditures are granted.
>
> When one realizes the enormous pressure being constantly brought to bear on the government of the day in favour of grants and bounties of all kinds, from one end of the country to the other, it would surely seem to be a most unwise thing to create a board with extensive powers which can be and are used in sympathy with this universal outside pressure, and without being accountable to anybody.
>
> The two outside members of this board simply represent the shipping interest, which is their own. They cannot serve the country and themselves equally well in the same matter. The other members of the board are government officials, who, whatever their standing may be, personally or officially, are not independent of political influence or departmental pressure. They are in no proper sense qualified to fill such a position of trust as a seat on this Lighthouse Board should mean—where the most absolute sense of justice, with complete independence, is called for; with a keen desire to administer the people's money with the utmost economy and good judgment, and with all personal considerations sunk.

Mr. Justice Cassels, in dealing with the findings of the Civil Service Commission, commends the improvements in the aids to navigation on the River St. Lawrence. He finds that an injustice was done to the Lighthouse Board by the Royal Commission; that the Lighthouse Board is merely advisory; that the statement that the minister is not responsible is not in accordance with the facts; that the representatives of the shipping interest on the Lighthouse Board were improperly charged by the Royal Commission with serving their own personal interests. I concur most heartily in the finding of Mr. Justice Cassels in respect to the Lighthouse Board. I say that the Royal Commission exhibited gross and unpardonable carelessness and stupidity in making the finding they did, and neither I nor anybody else in this

House can be too severe in condemning their criticisms regarding that board. Inasmuch as very prominent and eminent citizens of this country, such as the Messrs. Allan of Montreal, have been condemned by this report, I think it is only fair that anything they had to say in answer to those charges should be made a matter of public record, and I ask the House to bear with me while I read some of the evidence given by those gentlemen at Montreal before the Cassels Commission. Here is some of the evidence given by Mr. Hugh Allan:

Q. The Civil Service Commissioners, so-called, made some inquiries and a report, and in that report passed upon the functions and the performance of the duties by this board of which you are a member, and the usefulness, or rather the uselessness of your board? —A. Yes.

Q. I should like to know from you just in a word, what you deem the chief functions of the board?—A. Well, the object of this board is to discuss the recommendations that are sent in to the board by various bodies; and in some cases recommendations, as far as the river and gulf of St. Lawrence, and the coast from Belle Isle to St. John, New Brunswick, embracing the whole of the Bay of Fundy, are concerned, have been made through the Shipping Federation of Canada, an association of shipping men in Montreal comprising all the regular lines of steamships that come to this port, with the exception of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. These recommendations have to a large extent, if not altogether, been based on an inquiry that was held, I think, in 1900, by the then minister of the department, at which the captains of all the regular lines running through the St. Lawrence were asked to give their views with regard to the improvements required in aids to navigation which had become, to a large extent, obsolete, and not at all suitable to the changed conditions that then prevailed and which have since, of course, grown immensely. These recommendations have all been endorsed by the Shipping Federation, have been passed upon by them, and after being passed at their meetings, have been forwarded to the Lighthouse Board for their consideration. In like manner the recommendations of the people on the Pacific coast —I am unable to say exactly what their organization is called, but it is practically the same as ours: that is to say Captain Troupe, I think, is the chairman, and all the interests out there are represented, and he calls them together, and they discuss what is required, and any improvements that commend themselves to this board are forwarded to the Lighthouse Board for their consideration. Sometimes individuals write to the minister or the deputy minister, or some member of the department, and they are put on the docket, and discussed, and if they commend themselves to the board, then they are passed, and if not, they are rejected. That is the mode of procedure at the board, and I may say that at that board a very full discussion is always had as to the advisability of every item before it is passed, but it has always been understood that these were recommendations when passed to the minister.

Q. Then the question has arisen out of the report of the Civil Service Commissioners as to whether or not the action of the board was independent, whether it was not merely the making of record of the views of the shipping interest, including the views of individuals who had personal interests to promote?—A. That is absolutely without any foundation in fact.

Q. No foundation for it?—A. No.

Q. How could such an idea arise? Apparently it was in their minds and their report is based upon it?—A. From what happened at the board meetings there was no reason why any one should come to such conclusions, and I can only imagine that such a conclusion would be arrived at by people who wanted to find fault and could not give any reason for finding fault. I think it is the most fortunate thing that ever happened for the shipping interests of this country that that board should have been established as it was. I think that anybody that knows the first thing about navigation, or shipping interests if he does not know anything about navigation, cannot have gone from Montreal to the sea, or from the sea to Montreal, without having forced upon his attention, even as a passenger in a steamer, what tremendous strides have been made in navigation and how much good has been done. Take merely the most elementary or the most striking instance; to-day the largest steamers can navigate between Montreal and Quebec by day or by night if the weather is clear, if there is no fog or something to prevent them, and they could not have done that before these lights were established. To talk about this being a thing to be deplored in any way is perfectly ridiculous, absolutely ridiculous; I cannot use words strong enough to express my surprise that any body of men should ever have said such a thing.

Q. The report says, 'And it certainly has not added to the general efficiency of the Marine and Fisheries Deparment.'—A. Well, my experience is that the formation of this board has been the occasion of other organizations in the department being formed whereby the whole service has been systematized in a way that it never was before to my knowledge. There may have been in the internal Department of the Marine and Fisheries a body of men who looked after the thing, but I never heard of it, and now the shipping interests are advised of everything of importance; we keep in touch with the officers of the department in regard to everything. If a light goes out it is reported to our pilots and we report it to them. Not only is the lighting better, but the control of the lights is infinitely superior to what it was before.

Q. That report continues—

'Figuring as an impartial and skilled tribunal, passing upon all demands for government money under the plea of necessary aids to navigation, they can do so without the slightest sense of responsibility, for they absolutely incur none.'

What do you say to that?—A. Well, I call that a miserable insinuation. If a body of men consisting of the principal officers of the department, that have served their lives in the department, and have shown their work that they have done, and if representatives of two interests, such as the shipping interest of the St. Lawrence, representing an enormous

number of vessels and an immense tonnage and great value, are men that are supposed to stoop to acting without any sense of their responsibility. I am very sorry for the people who would think so. I think the business community of this country has not fallen that far. We have always had in this country, we have now, and I hope we always will have a very different moral tone from that.

He is then asked as to the value of recommendations made by the board, and he says:

As I said before it has enabled ships to continue their voyages, and therefore from a shipping point of view it has made the route more economical. The insurance of cargoes also has been reduced, and will, I hope, continue to be reduced, but, of course, insurance companies, like every other business people, have to recoup themselves for losses in the past and their reductions have been gradual from year to year until they get down to a point where they consider they have gone as far as they can go and that will be gauged by the results of the steamers navigating the St. Lawrence route. If there are accidents they will have to recoup themselves for the accident, but by guarding against those accidents, we will finally reduce the insurance to the lowest possible point.

Then he is asked:

Q. Then in connection with the functions, the performance of the duties of the board and yourself as a member of the board, did anything ever come to your knowledge as evidence of dishonesty on the part of those officials or of any other officials of the department?—A. I never heard anything of it.

Q. The commission to his lordship calls for a report as to acts of dishonesty on the part of any official?—A. I have no knowledge of any.

In this evidence, which is available for the examination of any hon. gentleman, Mr. Hugh Allan, I think, absolutely justifies the increased expenditures made by the Lighthouse Board. He states, regarding the conduct of officials, that he always found them attentive to their duties, discharging them properly, and that in no instance in his experience did he know of any member of the Lighthouse Board or any official in connection with it doing anything that might be termed improper. The evidence of Mr. Hugh Allan was confirmed by that of Mr. Andrew Allan and another gentleman representing the shipping interest of the port of Montreal. Now, my only reason for referring to this is that a very considerable portion of the increased expenditure of the Marine and Fisheries Department has been in connection with aids to navigation.

I presume that one of the matters which the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Crothers) had in his mind last night, when he charged this department with gross extravagance, was its expenditure in aids to navigation, but I am sure every good Canadian must feel proud of the fact that the Department of Marine and Fisheries inaugurated a progressive policy in respect of the navigation of the St. Lawrence and elsewhere. This House, I am sure, will justify every dollar of that expenditure as being entirely in the interests of the country. The findings of the Civil Service Commission were grossly and manifestly unfair. They reached conclusions without having called for any testimony or information from the members of the Lighthouse Board, and they presumed to make findings without having put themselves in possession of the facts. It was suggested further by the commission that some of the officials in the department and some members of the Lighthouse Board were given to serving two masters, Scripture to the contrary notwithstanding, and they insinuated strongly also that these officials were in receipt of gratuities or something of that character. Well, the findings of the Hon. Mr. Justice Cassels are in direct opposition. There is no portion of the evidence taken by him which would justify any charge of misconduct or irregularity on the part of any of the officials of the Lighthouse Board.

The next matter to which I wish to refer is the question of the Willson gas buoys, to which Mr. Justice Cassels refers on page 12 of his report. I am not referring to this matter because of any findings against the department by Mr. Justice Cassels. On the contrary, his findings are in every respect favourable to the department and to the gentleman who manufactures and sells these buoys. But I am inclined to discuss this matter for another reason, and that is that Mr. Justice Cassels dealt with it in an altogether different way from that in which he dealt with another subject of a kindred nature, namely, the diaphone fog signal. He found that there was no evidence of any improper expenditure by Mr. Willson or his employees to reward any of the officials of the Civil Service and promote the interests of the company. He found that the buoys are unquestionably of great value. He was furnished with a statement showing the cost of production of the buoys, and he found that the reasons given in support of the contention that these costs should not be made public were well founded and he declined to make any further public disclosure. I would like here to read the statement quoted by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) last night as a reason for inquiry into the other departments. That hon. gentleman quoted from remarks made by the hon. member for Grenville and Leeds (Mr. J. D. Reid) some two years ago in this House in which he referred to these particular buoys. And the passage he quoted was the following:

Up to about two or three years ago, we had the Pintsch gas system by which we had a permanent light on the gas buoys. It was changed then to the acetylene gas system.

I have not the slightest hesitation in saying, as I see from the Auditor General's Report, that the government have spent in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000 in the fiscal year of 1905 in making these changes, that there has been a very considerable rake-off, say from 25 to 50 per cent. Some one is getting that rake-off.

That was the statement made by the hon. member for Grenville and Leeds more than two years ago charging dishonesty on the part of departmental officials, and pretending to know sufficient to justify his making use of the term 'rake-off' and stating even the commission given government officials. But the finding of Mr. Justice Cassels completely disposes of that statement. Well, on statements just as ridiculous, the government are asked to consent to the appointment of another commission to make inquiries concerning the operations of other departments. Returning to Mr. Justice Cassels' report in this connection, what I cannot understand is that Mr. Justice Cassels should have adopted a certain procedure in the case of the gas buoys and another procedure in the case of the fog signals. In the case of the Willson buoys, he decided that it was not necessary to make public their cost. But in the case of the fog signal, he made a contrary ruling and obliged the manufacturer to go into the cost. In the case of the Willson buoys, he held it was not a matter of public importance what profit was made by Mr. Willson, but he found that it was matter of importance what profit the Canadian Fog Signal Company makes. In the case of the Willson buoy he did not invoke his interpretation of the patent law as against Mr. Willson, but he does as against the Canadian Fog Signal Company. I cannot understand this diversity in ruling upon two matters of a very kindred nature. I am inclined to think that his rulings in connection with the Willson gas buoy were the proper ones, and that those made in connection with the Canadian fog signals were not. They certainly could not both have been right.

Hon. gentlemen opposite for many years have had a great deal to say respecting the sale of these buoys to the department. It is a matter which we heard of frequently during the last election and which we often heard of in this House, but strange to say hon. gentlemen opposite, though threatening to investigate this matter in the Public Accounts Committee, have never ventured to make the final plunge and demand an inquiry. It was openly stated that Mr. J. F. Fraser, the commissioner of lights, was undoubtedly profiting by the many purchases of the department from Mr. Willson. The commissioner found there was no justification for this, also that Mr. Willson did not make any expenditure to government officials for the purpose of securing orders for these gas buoys. He also found that there is nothing in the evidence to justify the charge of excessive prices, and his finding with respect to all the purchases made from Mr. Willson, entirely frees the department from any censure in that direction.

Doubtless the purchasing of these buoys involved increased expenditure by the department, but in a word, I say it was a necessary expenditure, it was in the interest of navigation, and all men interested in shipping or marine matters in this country will justify the purchase of these buoys from Mr. Willson. There is no doubt that the cost of equipping the river St. Lawrence and other portions of our coast line with these gas buoys meant that the department would be obliged to pay a higher price than they were paying for the Pintsch buoys which they had been in the habit of purchasing for some years before. But while the cost of the Willson buoys was greater, it was a more efficient buoy, and the department and the country could well stand the increased expenditure. I submit that it is eminently satisfactory to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, to the members of the government and to the friends of the government to find that Mr. Justice Cassels, after an exhaustive inquiry into the whole matter, finds that the prices charged were not excessive, that the buoys were a great aid to navigation and their use was in the interest of shipping, that there was no improper conduct on the part of any member of the Lighthouse Board, who recommended the purchase of these buoys, and that no official of the department was guilty of any improper conduct in connection therewith. I say, these findings are satisfactory to the government and to the friends of the government, because, for several years, hon. members oppositive have been crying graft, and charging improper and extravagant expenditure in conection with these purchases. The next matter which I wish to take up is the findings of Mr. Justice Cassels concerning the Canadian Fog Signal. The question that he was considering was whether there had been a 'lack of conscience' in connection with this expenditure of the department by dishonesty on the part of the officials. From this point of view, he refused to allow the company, whose business was under consideration, to be represented by counsel. I am instructed that the Canadian Fog Signal Company asked to be heard by counsel. Mr. Cassels refused this. It does strike me that this was somewhat unfair. If Mr. Justice Cassels thought it proper on his part to inquire as to the cost and as to the price of the Diaphone Fog Signal, it was only proper that he should permit the owners or manufacturers of this pat-

ented article to be represented by counsel if they wished. In the case of the Canadian Fog Signal Company Justice Cassels however, comes to the conclusion that there was no 'lack of conscience' on the part of the officials, and that the whole course of the business of this company with the government had been absolutely regular and honest. Incidentally, he considered the question of manufacturing cost and the price as to which the manufactured product was sold to the government. I submit that, having decided to go into this, he should have gone further and permitted the Canadian Fog Signal Company to give evidence as to the elements of value that went to make up the cost of this manufactured article, and to explain the apparent discrepancy between the actual manufacturing cost and the selling price to the government. And, if that had been done, there would not have been shown the apparent discrepancy which we find to-day upon the records. The Canadian Fog Signal Company are the patentees, owners and manufacturers, of a sound-producing device as an aid to navigation and known as the Diaphone Fog Signal. Mr. Justice Cassels finds that this device is a great aid to navigation. This instrument was highly spoken of by Mr. Hugh Allan, by Mr. Andrew Allan and other gentlemen representing the Montreal shipping interest, in giving their evidence before the commission. Mr. Justice Cassels finds the cost of the device to have been $220, a figure that has been mentioned two or three times by hon. gentlemen opposite without explanation, one would not be surprised at finding hon. gentlemen opposite or people outside of this House criticising—as they might criticise with some degree of fairness—the great discrepancy between the cost and the selling price. Mr. Justice Cassels finds that the royalty paid on this machine was, on the average, $400, and he allows a profit of 100 per cent on the fog signal costing $220. Thus, he finds the total cost to the department should be $840, whereas the department to-day are paying $4,600 for this instrument. Now, I say that that finding is incorrect, it is not justified by the evidence. I say that the inquiry of the commissioner and the counsel representing the department on this occasion did not elicit, and did not attempt to elicit, sufficient facts, and the finding is therefore unfair and unsatisfactory. These instruments must necessarily be purchased from this company in the future, if they are purchased at all. I trust the Department of Marine and Fisheries will not refuse to purchase more of these fog signals—seeing they are such a great aid to navigation—by reason of the finding of Mr. Justice Cassels. I have made the statement that that finding was incorrect, and I think I can prove that in just two or three words. Let me premise my attempt to prove this by making the statement, that in only one year did the department buy any great number of fog signals from this company. The average number of sales in every year but one, was seven. Putting the profit at the figure named by Mr. Justice Cassels, viz., $220, the total profits for the year would be $1,540. When I tell the House that the evidence discloses the fact that the Canadian Fog Signal Company paid the government alone $500 a year for the use of their testing plant at Toronto, and when I say that the cost of fuel for operating this testing plant alone was, for some years, over $250, I have shown that more than half the alleged profit was absorbed, even without reference to any other fixed charges of the business. And, in stating these figures, I think, I amply make good my statement that the finding of the commissioner in this respect was absolutely valueless. Certain statements were filed by the Canadian Fog Signal Company as exhibits, during this investigation, and I wish to put on record one or two. One statement showed the receipts and disbursements of the company from October, 1902, to 1908, a statement prepared by Messrs. Barber and Gardner, chartered accountants, and by them certified. This statement shows that the total amount received by the government was $676,000 during all these years. It shows disbursements of $530,000, leaving a balance of $140,000 to be distributed as profits over the same six years, leaving available for dividends, this statement says, $22,600 per annum. This company also filed a statement showing their fixed charges per year, and I wish to put on record a sample statement for the year ending September 30, 1907, showing what were their fixed charges.

Storekeepers' wages	$ 624 00
Offices and workshop rent	1,925 04
Electric light	55 08
Telephone rent and long distance	259 87
Miss Mathews	624 00
Mr. Wadsworth	1,200 00
Stationery, printing, typewriting, books, magazines	128 53
Packing boxes, lumber, &c	84 53
S. L. Gibson	1,500 00
Office furniture	30 00
Patent fees	46 50
Cartage	118 72
Advertising	368 90
Insurance and taxes	166 65
Telegraph	136 06
Patterns	482 34
Jigs, tools, gauges, &c	95 38
Development and testing	2,080 40
Testing boat—	
Salaries: 1 engineer, 1 wheelman, 2 deckhands (6 months)	1,140 00
Expenses for 6 months, 4 men, 30c. per day each	240 00
Depreciation, 10 per cent	1,200 00
Power account at eastern gap	93 76
Travelling expenses—S. L. Gibson	270 89
	$12,870 65

Now, the commissioner apparently paid no attention to these statements filed by the Canadian Fog Signal Co., showing what were their fixed charges, and the finding, therefore, that this instrument should have been sold for $840 to the department, is I say, absolutely at variance with the facts, and I think very little apology can be made for the commissioner and counsel for making such an error. The company also filed statements showing that for the year ending September 30, 1906, their profits were $8,244, or at the rate of 16½ per cent; for the year 1907, their total profits were $32,743.99, or a profit of 40 per cent on the amount received; for the year 1908, the profits were 20 per cent on the amounts received. These profits are, of course, more than the profits which industrial concerns usually require; but I submit and I am sure any fair-minded member of the House will agree with me, that proprietors of a patented article having a limited sale, are entitled to a profit somewhere in the region of that which they received during the several years I have mentioned, namely, 20 to 40 per cent.

There is another feature I wish to mention here in connection with this Fog Signal Co., and I am referring to it solely that it may be placed upon the records; it is a statement showing a comparison of the cost of operation of the English siren which the government had in previous years purchased, and the diaphone at Father Point, Que.:

Comparison of operation of English Siren and 3' Diaphone at Father Point.

		Cost per year of oil for power purposes only.
The English siren required for its operations 3-12 H.P. gasoline engines, each using 2 gallons of gasoline per hour. At 600 fog hours per year and 20 cents per gal for oil, the cost was..	Siren.....	$720
The length of blast was 2½ seconds per minute.		
The diaphone now in operation requires 1-12 H.P. engine, and at the same figures the cost for power oil is..	Diaphone.	240
The length of blast is 8 seconds per minute.		
If the diaphone blast had been kept at 2½ seconds, the cost of oil would be only $75 per year..	Diaphone for same length of blasts..	75

The actual saving is $480 per year and is sufficient to pay a standard 3 feet diaphone outfit in less than 10 years. Had the blast been kept the same length the annual saving would have been $645, which would have paid for the diaphone outfit in about 7 years, and a complete new plant with diaphone in 12½ years.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN.

Now, Mr. Northey, one of the persons interested in the manufacture of this fog signal, presented to the commission a statement which gives considerable information respecting the sales of these diaphones, and I wish to read a few clauses from this statement, as it will correct some of the errors which the commission fell into:

When the general business of the Northey Company, Limited, was sold in 1902, I retained the fog signal business, including the basic patent for the diaphone with four other patents purchased in the early part of 1902. My personal experiments and development of the diaphone resulted in the issue of the further patent to me in July, 1902. Before the diaphone was developed the Northey Company had furnished siren plants to the government, at that time the most efficient signals known.

In addition to the first patent issued to me in July, 1903, I applied for a patent in Newfoundland in December, 1903, which was issued in February, 1904. This was acquired by the Fog Signal Company by the agreement of April 13, 1904, covering also all developments, all Newfoundland contracts and all Canadian government contracts to instal plants in Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Justice Cassels neglects to take notice of the fact that the instrument which Mr. Northey sold to the department was not the instrument which he purchased from the American patentees. True, that was the basic patent, and he was still paying a royalty upon it, but he improved that instrument by three or four patents which he subsequently took out himself. It was the basic patent that he bought from some gentleman in the United States and which he improved and sold to this department. Mr. Justice Cassels altogether failed to take that into consideration.

Mr. BOYCE. What was the price of that fog signal sold to the government, and the cost of production?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The average price was $4,600; the actual cost, taking no account of any other consideration, according to Mr. Justice Cassels, was $220. Now, the diaphone before accepted, had been inspected a number of times by the then minister, and by officers of the Marine and Fisheries Department. This statement goes on to say:

The price tendered for the instrument, as would be apparent to any one, was not being based upon the cost to manufacture, looking at the size of the instrument and its general appearance. Its value was never considered in this way, but on the contrary, on the basis of its value as a new and important scientific invention.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is unfair for hon. gentlemen to urge that the selling price of an instrument of this kind should be determined by the actual cost of manufac-

ture. Mr. Justice Cassels finds that the actual cost of the machinery and labour is $220. Supposing the inventor had devoted 25 years of his life to the development of this machine, supposing he had spent a million dollars in its development, are not these two elements to be taken into consideration in fixing the price of this machine? Is it not absurd to find that no other consideration was invoked in ascertaining what should be the price except the actual cost of the metal involved in the instrument. The statement goes on to say:

The character of the invention shows that the price is reasonable. It is admitted that the diaphone, as Col. Anderson put it in his evidence before the commission, is the best fog alarm in existence to-day. It marks a distinct advance in inventive science. Its character was explained to the Royal Commission on Lighthouse Administration in England, 1907, by Lord Rayleigh, scientific adviser to Trinity House, i. e., the British Lighthouse Department. In both the diaphone and the siren there are elongated apertures through which air is admitted periodically. In the siren these apertures are opened and closed by a revolving drum which passes over them. In the diaphone it is a piston which moves backwards and forwards and so alternately covers and uncovers the apertures. The great improvement of the diaphone is in its penetrating power, evenness of pitch, and by the application of certain principles of sound which produce consonance between the diaphone and the horn or resonator.

The commercial value of the diaphone is not to be measured by the cost of the materials and labour that will be required to make the instrument. The cost is excessive, as suggested only when the cost of materials alone is considered, but we contend that it is absurd to say that there should be only a profit of fifty per cent on actual materials and labour. This can best be illustrated by the difference in weight of the plant and instrument between the siren and the diaphone. The less effective siren and its plant weighed 9,280 pounds, the diaphone has a shipping weight of only 87 pounds. If the cost of the material is to be the criterion, then the less effective instrument should be entitled to over one hundred times the suggested price of the diaphone. What we contend is that the instrument which with less plant takes the place of the cumbersome instrument which weighs one hundred times as much is on every ground entitled to a higher price than the one it supersedes.

Now, this statement proceeds to make a comparison of the prices paid by the British government for the siren which this government previously used. The diaphone is, in every respect, a superior instrument. The initial cost is very little more and the annual cost of maintenance and operation is so much less that it more than offsets any difference in the original cost. Mr. Justice Cassels also proceeds to criticise the officials of the department for not knowing the patent law of this country This strikes me as being a peculiar finding, particularly when it is known that only a few months previous to the time of this examination, the Supreme Court of Canada held, confirming a judgment of the Exchequer Court, in a certain action which was brought in the Exchequer Court by Mr. Justice Cassels on behalf of a client, that a patent could be infringed or lost by reason of the owner refusing to sell. Now, the intepretation of the law, as propounded in this case, was a matter of only recent occurrence. The decision given by the Exchequer Court and affirmed by the Supreme Court was in an action which was brought by a certain client on the advice of Mr. Justice Cassels, then Mr. Walter Cassels. It seems to me that it was unfair to say that the officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries should have known the patent law, and should have known that it was not what Mr. Justice Cassels thought it was just a few months before that. I must hasten on because I find I am taking more time than I intended. But, I wish, very briefly, to refer to a few matters, and one has reference to the purchase of certain silverware by Mr. Coghlin. I will not take time to read the evidence, but I would ask hon. gentlemen, at some time, to read the evidence given by Mr. Coghlin before the commission and also the evidence of Mr. J. M. M. Duff given at Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. Which Mr. Coghlin is it to whom the hon. gentleman refers now?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Mr. Coghlin, sr., the gentleman who sold the goods.

Mr. FOSTER. That gave the evidence?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Yes. The son also gave evidence. This matter has been referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite as an evidence of improper dealings on the part of some departmental officials. There are some curious facts in connection with this transaction. There is no doubt Mr. Coghlin was obliged to refund to the department $1,100 on account of this purchase. This is the way he puts it:

A. In connection with that I may tell you the Auditor General and the deputy minister imposed upon me, absolutely imposed upon me. They summoned me up here to ask me some questions and they said, 'You have overcharged us on these invoices.' I explained matters to them as best I could from memory and they were not satisfied. Then I said, 'What will you be satisfied with? I don't want my name to be made public in this connection, I am not doing this sort of business.' I said, 'How much will you want'? They said so much. I said, 'Give me a cheque,' and I made it out there and then. On inquiry when I got back to the office I found I had not only returned my profit, but $400 or $500 more than the profit I made on the transaction.

Later on Mr. Coghlin says to Mr. Justice Cassels:

The Auditor General was over zealous.

I always was inclined myself to think, after hearing the evidence of this gentleman in the Public Accounts Committee, that there was something in explanation of it, and I think that in all probability he did give the true explanation there. He did not want to have his name used in the newspapers as having charged excessive prices for these goods, and so, to escape this criticism, he made this refund of money. At the inquiry in Montreal the commission, very properly, I think, appointed an expert accountant to examine many accounts, and this gentleman's name was J. M. M. Duff. I wish to read a few words from the evidence of Mr. Duff respecting the Coghlin purchase:

Q. And as a result what did you find?—A. I saw the original invoices of the goods purchased, I verified the amount of duty and freight paid from vouchers, and I found the charges to the government, I verified the amount of that from the blue-book, and the result is that I find after taking off the refund which Mr. Coghlin made the firm received the sum of $2,320.92 for the goods in question, and they cost them in actual cost laid down on the floor of their shop, $2,043.89. Besides that $2,043.89 there would be other expenses, such as freight to deliver the goods in Quebec and cartage and various things, small items.

By Mr. Watson:

Q. What was the percentage of profit in this transaction?—A. It looks to me as if they made no profit at all after giving back the $1,100.

Q. After giving back $1,100?—A. Yes.

Q. The $1,100 would be about what profit?—A. The $1,100 would be giving them about 40 per cent.

Q. 40 per cent?—A. Yes.

Q. That is a large profit?—A. Well, on some things it would be; not on that class of goods.

Q. Not on that class?—A. No, not extraordinary.

There is an explanation which I think must be accepted by the House concerning this matter. I think it is a very fair explanation and affords another instance to show how easy it is to have the actual facts perverted or not truthfully and in detail presented to the House or to a committee of the House. Mr. Duff examined the accounts of one concern in Montreal which sold to the steamer 'Arctic,' at the time of her expedition to the north, some $12,000 worth of goods, and the accounts were very severely criticised in this House and before the committee appointed to inquire into the purchases made for the 'Arctic.' But in this sale of $12,000 worth of goods for the steamer 'Arctic,' Mr. Duff found that the total profits were less than $500.

I wish to refer briefly to two or three other matters and one is in connection with Captain Johnson, of Halifax. At page 48 in this report, Mr. Justice Cassels makes this finding:

Captain Johnson, of the steamer 'Lady Laurier' has to discharge himself from blame in respect of two matters brought to light in the evidence adduced in Halifax. First, in respect to the receipt by him of $1,550, apparently paid him on account of so-called salvage services performed by the 'Lady Laurier' and the officers and crew for the steamship 'Hestia.'

I say that finding is not correct. There is nothing in the evidence to justify it, and it is most inexplicable how the commissioner came to make such an error. Let me preface my statement by two or three explanatory words. On the 12th of May, 1906, the steamer 'Hestia' was picked up off the Nova Scotia coast in a sinking condition. She was overtaken by the steamer 'Lady Laurier' and towed to Shelbourne roads. The towing took about half a day. The 'Lady Laurier,' after towing this stranded steamer to the shore, left her there and proceeded on her work. Later on, acting on instructions from the department, the 'Lady Laurier' was sent to the scene of the stranded ship with instructions to stand by until she was floated. In the meantime the Halifax Tow Boat Company was engaged to raise the steamer. The only service which the 'Lady Laurier' performed was to tow the sinking vessel to shore and stand by three or four days while she was being raised. The crew of the 'Lady Laurier' worked in assisting the salvors to raise the 'Hestia' and the Halifax Tow Boat Company paid the crew—not Captain Johnson—for work performed by them. Later, according to the evidence, the underwriters made a gratuity to Captain Johnson and the officers of the ship and I wish to read a letter respecting this matter sent to Cunard & Co., of Halifax, from an underwriters' association:

I confirm cable sent you to-day as per copy inclosed advising the payment to your credit with Messrs. Williams Deacons Bank, Ltd., of the sum of 200 pounds, the agreed amount to be allowed as gratuities to the captain and officers of the 'Lady Laurier.' You will no doubt arrange promptly for the captain of the 'Lady Laurier' to receive the equivalent of 150 pounds as his share of the amount, and will in conjunction with the owners' agents apportion and distribute the equivalent of the remaining 50 pounds among the officers.

It will therefore be seen that that $500 was paid by Pickford & Black, the agents of the 'Hestia' for labour performed by the crew of the 'Lady Laurier,' and merely for services rendered, and that $750 was paid to Captain Johnson by the underwriters as a gratuity and $250 to the other officers of the 'Lady Laurier.' In addition $350 were paid by Pickford & Black for damages done the 'Lady Laurier.' Therefore the findings of Mr. Justice Cassels are not correct. The hon. the leader of the opposition was under the same impression as Mr. Justice Cassels,

because he said last night that the 'Lady Laurier' was under contract at the rate of $400 a day to perform a certain service. I can understand anybody being misled by the evidence unless he went into the evidence thoroughly, but I cannot understand the commissioner making a mistake after the matter was explained to him thoroughly, even although he and Mr. Watson, the counsel, apparently did not wish to get an explanation from several of the witnesses. Captain Johnson of the 'Lady Laurier' received a message from the department to assist in towing the wrecked steamer. The Halifax Tow Boat Company objected, but nevertheless there was an understanding that if no other tow boat was available the 'Lady Laurier' was to do the towing at $400 per day. But she never did the towing.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why was that service not performed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. For the reason that it was performed by the Halifax Tow Boat Company and it was against the policy of the department to allow a government boat to engage in towing if private individuals were ready to do it. Surely Captain Johnson was entitled to the money he received. I think I can safely say that the commander or the crew of a merchant ship is obliged to render salvage service and may claim salvage. If you look on the gratuity of $750 as salvage, I say under our Canadian Shipping Act, Captain Johnson could have recovered that sum as a matter of law. If he was not entitled to it as a matter of law, I think he was a matter of custom. There is precedent for it. On the 10th of July, 1895, a letter was sent to H. W. Johnson, the agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department at Halifax:

> I have pleasure in informing you that by order in council of the 30th ult, the sum of $250 has been allowed you out of the amount of salvage of the wrecked steamer 'Amsterdam,' in recognition of the valuable services rendered by you and the extra labour performed in connection with this matter. Signed on behalf of the deputy minister.

Here is a case in which by order in council the agent of the department at Halifax received $250 and the man who was superintendent of lights occupying at that time the same position as Captain Johnson does to-day, was paid $500. I say that by custom and by law Captain Johnson was entitled without any departmental regulation prohibiting the same.

Then, there is the case in which Captain Johnson received $400 in connection with the wreck of the 'Mount Temple.' A little over a year ago one of the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers called the 'Mount Temple' went ashore near Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, with a large number of passengers on board. On the morning of the disaster I made it my business to go to the Marine and Fisheries Department to urge that the 'Lady Laurier' be sent to the scene, but the department had already sent the steamer. Under instructions from the department, Captain Johnson made three trips from Halifax to the steamer and rescued six or seven hundred passengers. While there he naturally observed the conditions of the wreck. The Halifax Salvage Association undertook the floating of the ship, and eventually succeeded in floating her. During their operations, which occupied several months, Captain Johnson rendered to the Salvage Association, they say, very valuable advice, and gave them the benefit of information he was able to give by reason of the facts that he was an experienced seaman and had visited the wreck and observed the condition of the ship on three occasions; and when they eventually recovered their salvage, they gave $400 to Captain Johnson, as a gratuity, and not, as it would appear from the findings, for the services rendered by the 'Lady Laurier'. Now, the very most that can be said of the acceptance of this payment by Captain Johnson is that it may be an act perilously near being censurable. The payment was made to Captain Johnson for services rendered outside of his official duties, and not as superintendent of lights, as the commissioner says.

I feel that I cannot close without saying a word or two upon the findings of the commissioner respecting the charge made against Mr. Boudreau, the accountant of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The commissioner in his case finds the Scotch verdict of not proven. This I think is very much to be regretted. There certainly is no evidence of guilt on the part of Mr. Boudreau, and why the commissioner, after hearing the evidence, should feel justified, in his capacity as a judge, in finding the verdict he did is something I cannot understand. If Mr. Van Felson could not explain clearly every incident in connection with that alleged payment to Mr. Boudreau, the commissioner should have found that Mr. Van Felson was the guilty man. There is hardly an element of evidence in the whole case to justify the shadow of a suspicion against Mr. Boudreau, and I think the finding of the commissioner was both unfortunate and unfair. He should, in clear and unmistakable terms, have acquitted Mr. Boudreau of any guilt in that connection.

There are a great many other features of this report which I would like to discuss, but I find that it would take considerable time, and much to my regret I must conclude my remarks. As I have said, irregularities have been disclosed in the Marine and Fisheries Department. The commissioner, in the concluding portion of his re-

port, asks what are the remedies for the amelioration of the conditions found to exist, and he makes four very sound and fair suggestions. The first is that the department should have capable and efficient officials. It is perhaps not fair to make any remarks concerning some of the officials who have been retired; but I cannot help saying that while I entertain for the late deputy minister the most kindly feelings personally, having always found him a kind and agreeable official to have public business with, at the same time I cannot understand how many things could have occurred if he had exercised more than a technical responsibility as a deputy minister. It is impossible for a minister of a department, with his time divided by political, parliamentary and executive duties, to have control of the details of his department. Ministers come and go, and I think every minister should always make sure of having in his department a good, able, strong man as deputy minister, one who can resist the aggressions of men who operate by corrupt influences, men who at times appear to be friends of the administration, but who are too anxious to do things which easily discredit it. Mr. Justice Cassels also recommends that efficient officials be properly paid. I think that is an excellent recommendation. The government cannot obtain competent men to discharge the public business of a department unless they are prepared to pay them salaries somewhat corresponding to what their capacity and ability would obtain in outside markets. He further suggests that payments to those dealing with the department should be made promptly. I think this a very timely suggestion, and I trust that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will hereafter see, if possible, that there are not long delays in making payments to those who are the creditors of the government.

In conclusion, let me say that the Department of Marine and Fisheries has for some years been the target of voluminous criticism from hon. gentlemen opposite. It has been a delirious and unbridled criticism. Hon. gentlemen have been very ready to whisper the good points of the administration of that department, and to megaphone the shortcomings of every official of the department. However, this is a good occasion for friends of the administration to be frank with the government and with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Transactions occurred in that department which were censurable. There has been inefficiency on the part of officials in the department as well as in the outside agencies. Friends of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries expect that he will make it sure that such things cannot occur again, and the friends of the administration will expect every minister to make sure that similar transactions cannot occur in other departments. I have sufficient confidence in the private and official integrity, in the capacity and ability as a departmental administrator, of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to believe that he will leave nothing undone to correct any irregularities which have characterized his department in the past. From my own personal knowledge, gained by close personal contact with him during the last few years, I am sure has has always been actuated by nothing but the strongest desire to give to this country a progressive and clean administration.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with more than usual interest to the speech of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean). I wondered what line of argument he would adopt and it has been interesting to follow his argument. I do not want to spend too much time upon that argument, for in the larger part of it he was in a far distant and foreign country and I do not propose to follow him in those, to him agreeable excursions. The hon. gentleman has of late lost faith in commissions. I wondered what had brought that about. Evidently he has no good will for the Civil Service Commission or for the Cassels Commission. I will leave the House to form its own judgment as to the reason for his somewhat sudden change of opinion. For a young man it seemed to me that he went a good distance when he characterized the three gentlemen who served on the Civil Service Commission as three fussy old gentlemen. Sometimes, you know, the youth thinks that he knows it all and he is not quite well enough on in years to prevent other people seeing that he thinks he knows it all. It is not so much a fault for a young man to think he knows it all but sometimes it is a great indiscretion to let it be publicly known. I almost think that the veteran gentlemen who formed that commission will still live in fair enjoyment of this world's pleasures and opportunities and will still be fairly well thought of by their not very small circle of old and tried acquaintances, even after this thunderous and ponderous condemnation of them which has been made by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean).

The hon. gentleman (Mr. A. K. Maclean) went on to show reasons which appealed to him why this resolution should not be carried. I want to criticise just for a moment in all kindness and yet as trenchantly as possible his objections to it. He thought the resolution proposed was illogical and unintelligent. If the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) were here I would sympathize with him for this cutting criticism of the outcome of his public and

legal knowledge and standing. But how is the resolution illogical and how is it unintelligent? If my hon. friend will read it he will see that it is couched in plain English and says what it means. He may disagree with its meaning but in what sense is it illogical? First it says the Civil Service Commission was appointed and that it made certain strictures. Secondly as a result, and I think this comes in logically, the second commission was appointed and the second commission, even according to my hon. friend, has proved that the suggestions made by the first commission were in large measure true, and that the conditions were even worse than the first commission indicated. Now, these two statements are not illogical, neither are they unintelligent. The third statement follows from these two. If from a partial investigation in one department there has been all this beneficial exposure, it seems a fair and logical inference to make that if the probe had extended to other departments dealing with the same people we would have equally beneficial results from further investigations. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, who have an eminently logical mind, that you cannot in any way agree with the hon. member for Lunenburg that this is an illogical and unintelligent resolution. I do not ask you to express a ruling in the matter, but I submit that my hon. friend failed to advance good reasons why this resolution should not be carried. What was his first reason? That the resolution is illogical and unintelligent. I have dealt with that, I think, satisfactorily. He says that it is not necessary to think or it is not thinkable that because certain things occur in one case then under similar circumstances they may occur in another case. I have always understood that similar forces under similar circumstances, will produce similar results. It seems fair to argue that with similar forces at work in other departments, under similar circumstances, there will be similar results. The argument is irresistible. What has gone wrong with the mental machinery of my hon. friend from Lunenburg this afternoon? Usually he does not put himself in such a box as that. Something must be the matter, up late last night, here with the rest of us? He says also that another irresistible reason why this should not be gone on with—and I commend this to the hon. member for St. Anne—is because there have been no suggestions of evil in any other department.

Honestly, let me ask my good friend from Lunenburg to revise that statement of his. Has he been in this House for the last four or five years, and not only in this House but in the Public Accounts Committee of this House, only to come to us from the very thick of the fight of these discussions to tell us that there have been no suggestions of evil doings in other departments than that of Marine and Fisheries? Why, these suggestions have been so frequent, so insistent, so startling, they have been with us whilst we have slept and whilst we have been awake. So common have they been that the constant practice in dealing with them has made of my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) a most successful blocker. Has not the hon. gentleman heard these suggestions, and has he not fought them—manfully, I admit, and according to his lights though on bad grounds —in the Public Accounts Committee? Time and time again he and his valiant brothers in arms—one of whom, we hear, is to be translated to a sphere which will involve him in no more such contests—have stood against these suggestions of wrong-doing. Does not he remember how these three valiant brothers in arms, himself being one, have held the bridge, day and night, against the suggestions—and more than suggestions—of wrong-doing in other departments that were made in the Public Accounts Committee? Surely, as I have said, something has gone wrong with my hon. friend's upper storey, or he would never have made such an assertion as that which he made to-day.

The last reason he gave why this resolution should not be supported is that, while the same contractors are at work for the other departments that were at work for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, yet it is idle to put that forward as a basis for this resolution. The same malign influences of bribe-giving and of getting by means of bribes that which cannot be got by honourable competition, the same contractors and the same system may exist in the other departments that have been shown to exist in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but that, we are told, is no argument for this resolution. If we must reach a conclusion, and if we are to be led by logical process, surely the conclusion must be that the evils that existed in the Marine and Fisheries Department are likely to exist in other departments also. Why not? Is it because the men of the Marine and Fisheries Department are of different natures from those of the Public Works Department? That is unthinkable. We cannot subscribe to such a view, nor do I believe that my hon. friend really thinks that his objection is a valid one. To me, the logic of the case leads all the other way—that the men in the Marine and Fisheries Department are not worse than those in the Public Works, and that, as some men in the Marine Department have been bribed, have fallen, have forfeited their positions as the result of exposure after examination, men in similar employ in the Public Works Department are not necessarily im-

mune from such influences, though the necessary conclusion of my hon. friend's argument is that their immunity is complete. When the microbe is abroad, it is just as apt to attack a person working for the Minister of Public Works as to attack one working for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

These are the four reasons according to the hon. member for Lunenburg, why we should not press our resolution. I commend them to you, Mr. Speaker, to this House, to the gentlemen of the press, and through them to the people of this country, who, I am sure, will value them at their worth. Having exhausted his reasons why this resolution should not pass, my hon. friend took his excursion ticket, and, leaving behind him the last vestige of the question we are discussing, went abroad into a long and interesting disquisition upon the theory of fog signals and their working, their price, and their excellence; he went up and down the St. Lawrence route, and told us how much better that route was than in 1896. He might have made the argument stronger, perhaps, and the explanation more lucid, if he had gone back to 1867 and showed the great advances made in the St. Lawrence navigation from the time of confederation. But what was the hon. gentleman's logical conclusion—and let me present it to my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) who has a logical brain. Here is the argument: Because an instrument is good, you must not examine into how that instrument was bought and paid for; because the improvement of the navigation of the St. Lawrence is a desirable thing, you must not examine into the methods by which that desirable thing is attained; you must not consider extravagance, because, forsooth, some good has been accomplished. Do we believe that? Does my hon. friend from Lunenburg himself believe it? I do him the justice of thinking that, when he looks at his speech in 'Hansard' he will see that all this had nothing to do with the question in hand. It is all in line with the glorification club which has sprung into existence on the other side and which seeks diligently to find good things to say in order to draw attention away from things which are very much the opposite. And so, we have presented to us the excellence of the St. Lawrence route, the great power of the diaphone, the fine light of the gas buoy, and the fact that a treaty has been made between Canada and France—all these things have been trotted out in this argument in order to prove that we should not have an investigation into these other departments. I do not think it necessary to labour the argument. As Mr. Justice Cassels said of a case which was brought before him, and after but little evidence concerning it had been taken: 'Let us pass on to something else; there is no use in beating a dead horse.'

Now, if I come to a logical conclusion—and I hope my hon. friend will admit that I can make a fairly good approach to a logical argument—let me try to show the trend of his argument this afternoon and its necessary deduction. He has spent three-quarters of an hour and more trying to show that Judge Cassels made a faulty, inadequate and, in some cases, an absolutely vicious investigation, and came to absolutely wrong conclusions. Yet he told us that great good had resulted from this investigation. Well, I think that the only thing left for the hon. member for Lunenburg is to move in this House that some other gentlemen be appointed by the government to go over the work that Judge Cassels did so badly and do it better. If so much that is good has been attained in spite of the faulty method, and bad deductions, and wrong conclusions, of Judge Cassels, then for pity's sake let us put a better man on, go over the ground again and get still more good results. But the richest cream of the whole on the can of milk was this, when my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean), with grey hairs streaming over his ample brow, with the marks of age and great experience everywhere upon him, sits in judgment on Judge Cassels' opinion with reference to Admiralty law; and then, after he has sat down on it, suddenly wakes up—if he has waked up yet—to the fact that the Prime Minister sitting just ahead of him has appointed Judge Cassels as judge in appeal in all Admiralty cases in this Dominion of Canada. Putting all these things together, I am going to sit right down close by Judge Cassels in this business, and not take any part in the excursions that my hon. friend has invited us to take this afternoon. I advise him not to take these excursions. Sometimes when you are improperly guided and your impulses are not quite to be relied upon, in strange countries and foreign lands you get into difficulty before you know it, and I am afraid that my hon. friend's excursion into Admiralty law has led him into one of those dangerous and unknown places.

I am not going through the course of questioning and answering and conclusion with reference to Captain Johnston's case. Would the minister tell me whether Captain Johnston is still in the employ of the government?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then he has an officer who has absolutely snapped his finger in the face of the department and in face of his instructions, put money in his pocket, and has kept it there until this day. Why has he been kept there? Is it true that he has been promoted?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Why has he been promoted? Is this the stern chastisement that was to purify and make better the department, and strengthen its discipline, when the commander of one of the high admirality ships says: 'A fig for your orders and your instructions!' I am afraid that discipline is very much threatened in my hon. friend's department, and soon, to lack of organization, lack of direction and lack of conscience, we will also have to add lack of discipline. For how can the master and servant walk together unless they be agreed in the way of instruction and carrying out of instruction? Well, we will leave that for the future.

My hon. friend—and I take the argument here just because he made it—has declared that there ought not to be and that there is not any reason for going into the other departments; that what may have occurred in one is not likely to occur in another. I asked the other day the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he had yet appointed his deputy minister. He said he had not, he had an open mind, he had not decided. Well, there is another point that I wish to bring to his mind. He vaunted himself yesterday for having destroyed the patronage system in his department. Does he mean the system, or the patronage lists? Which is it? When he took the extraordinary care of getting his own paid advocate, hired by himself, to introduce into the records of the commission a statement that he had done away with the patronage system so as to gather strength for himself, although it was absolutely foreign to the investigation—when he did that, what is the communication that he sends? Judge Cassels is misled, I think, in making the statement that he has done away with the patronage system. Here is the return to the order, going beyond the scope of the commission and which was obtruded for an obvious reason by Mr. Watson who interrupted the regular work and said:

I desire, my lord, in connection with the matters that have been before your lordship as commissioner in this investigation, to state what I referred to before your lordship at the last sitting at Quebec city. I stated to your lordship at that time that I understood the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had taken official action in abolishing the patronage list. I merely want now to follow that up and to state that I desire to place before your lordship, the official notice and statement that I received from the deputy minister, by direction of the minister, showing that that is the fact and that the patronage list has been permanently and absolutely abolished in this department. I will put that upon the record.

Here is the statement sent by Mr. Stanton, assistant deputy minister, to the following effect:

I am, by direction, to inclose for your information a copy of the Hon. Mr. Brodeur's memorandum to the acting deputy minister, dated the 4th instant, instructing that the patronage files and lists containing names of firms which have been recommended to the department from time to time, are to be disregarded in future.

That is the whole of it. The minister can easily do away with the present files and patronage list and be a thousand miles distant from doing away with the patronage system. But the judge seems to have taken a wrong impression, and to have come to the conclusion that the patronage system was done away with by my hon. friend. Now let me say to him that if he has done or will do, away with the patronage system, fairly and squarely and wholly in his department, he will find no words of commendation more hearty from any one than from myself. But I asked him a question the other day, and I put a simple one to the Minister of Public Works, and I find that in each of their answers there are apertures through which you could pass a good sized automobile easily—it all depends on the will of the minister. The patronage system is done away with by my hon. friend, yet his acting deputy, Mr. Désbarets, went down to Halifax, and in the very heat of the election, put on, at the command of Carney & Roche, to aid them in their election, and admitted as such, a hundred extra men that the officers down there state were not necessary. 'Things that occur in one department are not apt to occur in another.' Are they not? What happened in the Intercolonial Department? The very same thing. August of last year saw 1,793 men temporarily employed on the Intercolonial, and the pay-list was $487,000. October saw 2,922 men employed, 1,200 more in a single month, and the pay-roll had gone up from $487,000 to $509,000. The next month the number went down to nearly the normal pay-list, to a little below the normal. In the province of Prince Edward Island the same thing took place on a smaller scale. In the Marine and Fisheries Department, in Halifax County, 92 men were on in August, and in October 288 men were on.

I say again what I have said a dozen times that if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had a head on him, eyes in his head and a knowledge of the department he must have known that that thing was going on. In the city of Halifax for past years back—I am not going to say how many—the patronage of my hon. friend's department has been almost absolutely in the hands of Messrs. Roche and Carney and the minister knew it and knows it—knew it and knows it because he mingled with these men. They were here during the session of parliament, he listens to their soft persuasions, and if these do not prevail he gives attentive ear to their menacing threats. But soft persuasion or menacing threat, one way or the other, they get their will. And the Minister of Marine and

Fisheries, but yesterday, paraded his ample skirts as the greatest reformer of the age. I saw the tinge of shame upon the cheek of my right hon. friend and, although one would have to have a mighty big imagination to assist his vision, I thought I saw it also on the cheek of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, when this Luther of party purity paraded himself yesterday as the great reformer. How cruel of my hon. friend! Why could not he have said that the government has reformed things? Why could he not have linked his colleagues with him? Is he the superior mind in reformation, the only one in the cabinet, as he appears to be the only one and to have been the only one who was perfectly oblivious to the corruption and knavery in the department over which he presided? These men have nothing to reform! but my hon. friend had a lot to reform. Has he done it? What was one of these reforms? Wonderful! He plumed himself that he had kept within his appropriation. Why, the law obliges him to do that. He would be convicted at once of lack of conscience if he did not do it. He would have come under the ban of the Civil Service Commission and of Judge Cassels as well. What a splendid reform! Have it painted, let it be put up where generation after generation can see it so that they can be told that in the year of grace, 1908, and in the reign of His Gracious Majesty King Edward VII., a great reformer arose in the Department of Marine and Fisheries and that the reform that he actually carried out was that this last year he had kept within his appropriation! Let me clinch this argument. If this sort of thing is done in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and if we have actually proved, out of their own mouths, that it was done in the Railway Department, is there not the very same necessity for an investigation into the Railway Department as there is for an investigation into other departments? I think there is. Let me go back a little farther. What is the whole effort, or rather the double effort, of hon. gentlemen opposite? The first one it to make it appear to the country that the government faced the occasion, was equal to the crisis, instituted an investigation into the working of the departments and punished the malefactors. Is not that what they tried to make us believe? Is not that the gist, is not that the tendency, is not that the purposes of their argument? What is the truth? The simple truth is that for weeks, months, years, we bombarded this government with suggestions, with intimations, warnings, facts, resolutions, Public Accounts investigations going to show that things were not well in the departments, and what reception did we get at the hands of these gentlemen? Did they ever allow one of our resolutions to pass? Did they ever grant us an investigation that we asked for? Did they ever fail to block as best they could an investigation in the Public Accounts Committee? Did they ever forward one of our investigations in this House? No. They met us with the statement: 'It is all froth and fury; there is nothing in it; the departments are all right. Peace, peace is the watchword and honesty is the motive. We cannot let you go into this because you are wasting time for nothing, and there is nothing in it. If this accident had not happened you would have had none of this debate here to-day, you would have had no Cassels' Commission and no probing of this department.' I want that to sink right into the heart of every man in this House and into the minds of the people of this country. I make the statement once more. If it had not been for the accident, unforseen and—oh, pity of pities—unprovided against by the Prime Minister, you would have had no investigation of this department, you would have had no Mr. Cassels and none of the report which we are discussing now. How do I prove that? The Prime Minister stood up in Welland or Niagara and said to the confiding, trustful people: How did the government meet these charges? This is how they met them. We had suspicions that things were not all right in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, we appointed a commission to investigate them, they found our suspicions justified; we appointed another commission, Judge Cassels, in order to find out the guilty persons. That is what we did. We did not wait for charges but we did that. What government could do more? That is nearly verbatim et literatim, what my hon. friend said, and every man who listened to him said: 'Laurier is a trump after all; he did not wait until they made charges before the House; he found out that there was something wrong in the department, he appointed a commission to trace that wrong, it was found that there had been bad practices, he put another commission to work to find out the bad practisers, and to pick the black sheep out from the white sheep before they would contaminate the whole bunch.' What are the facts? The right hon. Prime Minister refused every resolution, every plea, every argument for an investigation, every fact that we put before him and his government and would not allow us to investigate one of his departments. The Civil Service came to him for an increase of pay. They said: The cost of living has gone up and our salaries have not gone up in proportion. We want more pay. He procrastinated and there is where he fell into the hole. He did not want to meet the question with the knowledge he had as regards the cost of living, and the fact

that salaries had not been raised. Did not the right hon. gentleman know that the cost of living had increased? If he does not know it let him ask one of his officials and he will give him the figures in fifteen minutes. Did not the right hon. gentleman know that salaries had not gone up according as the cost of living had gone up? He had all the knowledge that he wanted, but he procrastinated and he procrastinated by resorting to the medium of a commission. Then he got a commission composed of Messrs. Courtney, Bazin and Fyshe, and he said to them: We are in a great hurry, go and examine into the condition of the Civil Service, the cost of living, their salaries, their system and report to us. Did he ask for any more? Did he tell them in his instructions that he had suspicions that things were going badly in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and would they be kind enough when they dropped into that department to look carefully into its administration? Look at the commission and see if it is there. Study my hon. friend's first angry statement when the commissioners' report came down, when he declared that they had gone into his department without asking his leave and whilst there had gone beyond the scope of their commission? Did he do so or not? Ask the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) who, with all his gallantry, in the full pomp and power of his military surroundings pitched into poor Messrs. Courtney and Fysche, and Bazin, hauled them over the coals and said they went where they had no business to go. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) clenched it all in his own constituency by quoting the words of the commission and giving his legal opinion that they had no right in the world to go into such an examination as they indulged in, in a spirit of mischief, in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. In this House he made the same argument. The commissioners during their investigation into the status of the Civil Service and the working of the system, took it into their heads to lift the lid a little bit from one of those boiling cauldrons in the Marine Department and, animated if not exhilarated by the stench that came from it, thought they would give a little bit of the perfume to the general public and they did it in their report. Then a critical condition of things arose, then there was peril and crises, then we had the three commissioners backing the opposition charges, then the country pricked up its ears, read the report of a Royal Commission, and the Prime Minister and the other ministers dared not go back of that. But they did not go any further and Mr. Cassels was absolutely restricted. In what way? In his commission what department was at stake? The department of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Who appointed the commissioner? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Who appointed the lawyers? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries from his own side of politics, in beautiful illustration of the firmness and thoroughness with which he had set his face against the patronage system. Liberal Conservative lawyers there may have been, perhaps just as good as those appointed, but the spirit of patronage was still there, the minister had not quite got the old Satan under and he appointed two Grits instead of one Grit and a Tory. So with his own commissioner, picked by himself, with his own counsel, picked by himself, with his own papers ladled out to these lawyers to set before the commission as they chose, with these lawyers following every bit of evidence watching for every ambush, the investigation proceeded, and when it came up close to a point where it was warm some one cried hot, hot, and they went off upon some other question. I will give one example. A stone-breaker whose name I think was Reid—not a broken reed but a Reid who broke stones—had a big contract, I think about $50,000, bringing up rocks to Sorel, crushing them in his breaker, and selling them to this munificent department. The investigation was being carried on, the lawyers sat there intent, looking for every clue. All at once the man in giving his evidence said: I had to get or I did get all my stone from the county of Rouville. If the ghost of the middle ages had appeared before these lawyers they could not have been more startled —and they did not follow up that clue. Mr. Power was said to have known a great many things about that famous Halliday contract. Mr. Gourdeau said that Mr. Power knew about it and could throw light upon it. It was understood that Mr. Power was to be called. Was he ever called? So I could take you through numerous instances in which they shut off just at the right time for fear somebody would be scalded by escaping steam. That was the genesis of the second commission, that was its method and scope and after all we got something out of it. Now these gentlemen have the shamelessness to pose before the people of Canada and say: 'We, of our own free will and accord, did not wait for charges, we sent a commission and a second commission hunting out the evil things and we have purged the departments of all the black sheep—nearly all the black sheep at least.' But my right hon. friend who made that solemn promise, did he implement it, did he make an examination in the other departments? My hon. friends say there is no reason why that should be done. What were the suggestions, what were the proofs, what were

the allegations, what were the concrete instances that were put before the Public Accounts Committee of this House with reference to the Department of Marine and Fisheries? What was the cry by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the right hon. gentleman? Nothing in it, you shall not have your commission, you shall not have your probing and examination. What is the cry to-day with reference to the other departments, the peculiar argument of the Minister of Marine? You should not touch the other departments. Why? Because you might blast reputations and you might hurt feelings and you might brand people as being dishonest. In heaven's name whilst we are to be humane-hearted, whilst we are to be sympathetic, have we ever yet heard a statesman plead that you should not turn a department wrong side out and fling it to the winds of heaven to purify it because you might find some portions of dust and vileness that you have to characterize as such? That argument is surely no argument. Oh what a feast it would have been for these 'three fussy old gentlemen' if they had just got inside of the Interior Department, if they had been at the coat tails of Mr. Fraser when he landed that most profitable transaction at the expense of the public, when they were on the scent of the land deals of the Burrows and the Adamsons and of those other numerous individuals who have grown rich out of the public franchises of this country, grown rich because the departments did not do their duty and officers of the departments were recreant to their trust. The right hon. gentleman himself has said that the 20th century is Canada's century. For what? For intelligence as to the conservation of our resources—and yet for years, the right hon. gentleman has seemed to be chiefly desirous of taking out of the control of the country in the shape of its finest franchises as much of our public domain as he possibly could and placing it in private hands. Take your Public Works Department: do you mean to say that no ragged ends have shown there? No man can deny it. What are you going to do, Mr. Prime Minister? May I ask you, just personally between ourselves, what you propose to do with reference to the men who have stolen money from the public treasury? You appointed Mr. Justice Cassels. You at any rate, when you appointed him, thought he was preeminently the man to do this work, and he has done it. What has he told you? He has told you, Mr. Prime Minister, that the man who bribes is more culpable and more dangerous than the man who takes the bribe. To-day Halliday, according to the judge's statement, has $6,600 of the people's money. Do you propose to get that from Mr. Halliday? The Drolets have paid out $9,000 and more in proved transactions, and the judge says that all of that comes out of the public till. Are you going to get it back into the public till? If not, why not? It is not your money; it is the people's money. The taxes of the people, piled up in the strong box, gave you that money, and you are the trustee to see that every cent of it is properly spent, or, if a man steals it, or takes it wrongly, to get it back from him. What are you going to do about it? Are you going to pursue Halliday and get that money back? Are you going to pursue Drolet and get that money back? Are you going to pursue McAvity and get that $35,900 back? When the names of the men who have been bribing your public servants, corrupting them, eating into the honour and manhood of your public service, and have been doing it greedily and systematically, have been exposed, are you going to proceed against them for that money? You do not seem to be getting much of a hustle on about it. That report has been before you for months. You have what you call the greatest Minister of Justice this Canada of ours has ever produced; what is he doing about it? You have a most distinguished and able and erudite Solicitor General; what is he doing about it? Why are not these two great powers, who represent the justice of the country in the interest of the people, getting their boots on and going out against these malefactors and getting the people's money back? Why don't you do it? Is it because you share in it——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. Just wait—for party interest and for party advantage? If not, why are you so modest about getting after the people's rights, you who are the trustees of the people's interests?

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

MANITOBA AND NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 81) respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

On section 1,

Mr. NEELY. I gave notice that I proposed to amend clause No. 1, but the law clerk informs me that the form of my proposed amendment is not just what it should be and suggests a change. If acceptable to the committee, I would like to change the form of my amendment. The effect is substantially the same.

Mr. LENNOX. Let it stand over and report progress.

Mr. NEELY. If members of the committee are anxious that no time should be lost in making this change, I have no objection to letting this amendment stand over until Monday. But I see no reason why the amendment should not be considered now.

Mr. CASH. I am not cavilling about letting the matter stand, but would like to know what this amendment means.

Mr. NEELY. Its effect is to strike out from the Bill that part which has reference to paragraph A, section 9, chapter 52 of the Statutes of 1893.

Mr. GRAHAM. What part of the line is that?

Mr. NEELY. That part of the Bill which refers to the old charter from York to Prince Albert.

Mr. CASH. And what is it the law clerk complains of?

Mr. NEELY. Just the form of the amendment—that is all.

Progress reported.

SUPERIOR AND WESTERN ONTARIO RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Superior and Western Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Conmee.

On section 1:

Mr. LENNOX—A number of gentlemen wish to be heard upon this Bill who cannot be here to-night. The Bill could not get through to-night at all events, so I move that the committee report progress upon it. There will be no loss of time on it. We have not much time to-night any how.

Mr. CONMEE. Has the Bill been distributed as amended?

Mr. LENNOX—I expect so.

Mr. CONMEE. What is the object of holding it up ?

Mr. LENNOX. It is not going to be held up. But the discussion could not possibly be completed to-night, and I am instructed that a number of gentlemen who want to speak upon it cannot be here at this sitting. There will be no loss of time by a friendly arrangement under which it can stand over. Of course, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) seriously objects, we will begin to discuss it.

Mr. CONMEE. I think the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) is mistaken as to the Bill. I do not think that this is the Bill concerning which he has been instructed. However, he can have his way this time.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the London and North Western Railway Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I am not personally aware whether the Committee on Railways carefully considered this Bill in relation to section 2. Section 2—in order, I suppose, to make absolutely sure that this parliament shall have jurisdiction over this railway, declares that the undertaking is to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. I can understand that a railway wholly within a province might be for the general advantage of Canada; it might be so located as to be likely to become part of a trunk line, or it might have connections which would make it very important and therefore of advantage to the Dominion generally. But I observe that, under this section 8:

> The company may lay out, construct and operate a railway of the gauge of four feet eight and one-half inches (a) from a point in or near the city of London, in the county of Middlesex, to a point in or near the town of Sarnia, in the county of Lambton——

This is a comparatively short railway and wholly within the province of Ontario, not connected with any trunk line, and, apparently, not to become part of any great system.

> —and (b) from a point in or near the said city of London to a point on Lake Huron, in the county of Huron, passing through or near the towns of Ailsa Craig and Parkhill, or either of them.

That also is purely local in its character. I am not quite sure whether or not it would be well for parliament to lay down the principle that as a steam railway company may be incorporated by this parliament, the very fact of it being a steam railway makes it a work for the general advantage of Canada. But it does seem to me that we ought to have some rule to guide us, we ought to lay down some principle of bringing these to the notice of the committee, because I am not aware of any railway charter which has been granted by this parliament which deals with an undertaking more purely local and provincial in its character than does this Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. The committee was perfectly cognizant of the character of this Bill, and considered the question I think very fully. The fact that it touches navigable waters at two points, I believe, weighed in the minds of the members of the committee; at any rate, after very full consideration the Bill was recommended and sent to the House. Nothing was overlooked, it was the fair judgment of the committee that it should pass.

Mr. CONMEE. Section 10 provides that the company may build and operate wharfs and other structures, and may operate steamers which naturally, in connection with this line of railway, would be steam ferries. As it connects with other trunk lines the operations of this company and the powers they are asking for, extend beyond the limits of the province.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not beyond the limits of the province.

Mr. CONMEE. Navigation must mean that, because there is no navigation in that section of the country except beyond the limits of the province.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is true that the representatives of the Ontario government appeared against this Bill and against the one preceding it. If we want to get on I suggest that we let this Bill stand, and when the other gentlemen are here we will discuss the two Bills together. The same principle is in both.

Mr. BEATTIE. This is not a local line at all, it is connected with several other lines that cross the St. Clair river. It is as much a railway for the general advantage of Canada as any other railway we have in this country. It will have connection with the Pere Marquette. Of course, it was contended that it did not go to the boundary, because it did not go to the centre of the river. That is a foolish argument. There is no line that goes to the centre of the river. It goes to the boundary of Ontario, just as any other line in this country. In fact all the vessels go up through Canadian water; the channel is through the Canadian part of the river. If the Minister of Railways wishes it to be held over, I have no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will put them both through at the next sitting.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE. THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 96) respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Cobalt Range Railway Company.—Mr. Hodgins.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 114) to incorporate the British Colonial Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 115) for the relief of Victor Eccles Blackhall.—Mr. Sutherland.

Bill (No. 116) for the relief of Annie Louise Coltman.—Mr. Turriff.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Bill (No. 119) respecting the Quinze and Blanche River Railway Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank.—Mr. Gervais.

SUPPLY—THE MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT.

House resumed consideration on the motion of Mr. Fielding to go into Committee of Supply, and the motion of Mr. Doherty in amendment thereto.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It never was my intention at any time to intervene in this debate, except in so far as it was necessary to state to the House the policy which the government intended to follow in this matter. The House has a right to know what is the attitude which we have taken, and the reasons therefor. The House is already aware of the attitude we have taken, and the House is entitled to know the reasons therefor, the motives which have impelled us to refuse to accept this motion. But before I proceed any further, if my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Anne, (Mr. Doherty) will permit me, I would offer him my sincere congratulations upon the manner in which he has presented this question to the House. I differ from him. I do not admit his premises, still less do I admit his conclusions, but I am in the judgment of the House when I say, after an experience of many years, that it was impossible to present such a motion, in a matter of this kind which involved some irritation, in a better or more dignified parliamentary style. I am sorry I cannot extend the same compliment to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). That hon. gentleman has made a speech that is very characteristic of him. It was clever—very clever—and, to a certain extent, perfectly unimpeachable, to a certain extent very fair criticism, witty, pungent, unobjectionable, but my hon. friend could not conclude his remarks without showing the cloven hoof. My hon. friend could not conclude his remarks without showing us the narrow side of his nature in all its naked deformity. My hon. friend, in the course of his observations, after, as I said a moment ago, having offered very pointed and fair criticism, ended up by addressing himself directly to me. He stated that certain persons whom he named as Drolet, Halliday and McAvity, had profited by their dealings with the department of Marine and Fisheries, had put in their pockets money which belonged to the people and then he struck an attitude and concluded by asking: Are you going to prosecute, and if not ,why not? Is it because you have shared in the proceeds? I have only to

say to my hon. friend, that, having enjoyed a prolonged life, I have never heard the man yet suggest to me that I had profited by the people's money.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the right hon. gentleman let me put him a question?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, sit down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I take this occasion to observe to my hon. friend that there is no man who is so ready to make insinuations——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, no man so ready to make insinuations and no man who will wince and whine so much when he receives a return blow. I have to say to my hon. friend that I never manipulated other people's money; I never manipulated trust funds.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. The rules of order of this House demand that no member shall say an offensive thing of another.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a plain rule of order. The right hon. gentleman——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman has put a statement into my mouth which I never made, and in his anger he refuses to allow me to correct him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. He prefers——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I am speaking to the point of order. He prefers to make an argument on that false statement rather than on a true statement——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. And then proceeds to insinuate something with reference to myself.

An hon. MEMBER. Did you share in it?

Mr. FOSTER. Did I share it? I will give my hon. friend his answer. Let him get up on the platform in this country——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. —and make the statement that I did and I will let him know whether I shared in it or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a second point of order.

Mr. M. CLARK. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a second point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The first has to be decided first.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, we will decide the first. The rules of order seem to be clear and plain.

Mr. CONMEE. Are there any rules in this House?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. CONMEE. If there are, they ought to be enforced.

Mr. FOSTER. Send him off upon his special train.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. CONMEE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CONMEE. The rules require that no member shall make offensive remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. Why all this excitement?

Mr. CONMEE. That is what I would like o know.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the point of order?

Mr. FOSTER. The point of order I have stated pretty plainly. I have not the rules. The Speaker knows the rules, or the clerk can turn them up. The rule of order is that no member of this House is allowed to say anything that is disagreeable to another.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CONMEE. You are the biggest sinner in this House on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister insinuated that I had manipulated trust funds. I throw it back in his teeth. No man in this House can make such a statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. CONMEE. Mr. Speaker——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, the hon gentleman (Mr. Foster) tells us that it is a rule of the House——

Mr. FOSTER. Is the right hon. gentleman debating the point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. I appeal to the House to maintain the rules. The Prime Minister has the right to speak to the point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. If he speaks to the point of order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman very coolly tells us that it is a rule of the House that no man has the right to speak of anything that is offensive to another.

An hon. MEMBER. Disagreeable.

Mr. FOSTER. Disagreeable.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Disagreeable. Is he willing to be judged by that?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well then he had better sit down quietly.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman had better speak to the point of order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is his memory so short he does not remember what he said two hours ago?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that is debating the point of order.

Mr SPEAKER. This point of order must be settled. I appeal to both sides of the House. This debate should be carried on with decorum and I beg hon. gentlemen——

Mr. FOSTER. If it had not been that the Prime Minister——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CONMEE. What is the point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. I fail to see that there is any reason for me ruling on this matter. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) raised a point of order but I fail to find a point of order. As far as saying anything disagreeable is concerned, I do not think we have any rule on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. My point is that the Prime Minister made an insinuation against me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. Made an insinuation that I manipulated trust funds.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I demand a retraction.

Mr. CONMEE. The Prime Minister made no such statement.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister made such a statement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Now, Mr. Speaker, that the point of order has been ruled upon——

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask that the right hon. gentleman retract that statement. He is amenable to the rules of the House and of common decency just as I am.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. And his followers will have to take their medicine.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, not yet.

Mr. FOSTER. This matter has come to a head now and we will have it tried out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. He has made an insinuation. This is the first time that the Prime Minister——

An hon. MEMBER. Take your medicine.

Mr. FOSTER. Let the Prime Minister—

Some hon. MEMBERS. You will have to take it.

Mr. FOSTER. Take it back.

Mr. GAUVREAU. Call for the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. FOSTER. Look out, the Sergeant at Arms might get you.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it would be better perhaps if we returned to the usual tone of moderate discussion. I certainly understood, perhaps I misunderstood, the right hon. gentleman, but I certainly understood him to suggest in the plainest possible way that the hon. member for North Toronto had been guilty of manipulating trust funds.

An hon. MEMBER. No, he never said that.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am perfectly willing—I am bound to accept the statement of the Prime Minister as to what he intended. Every hon. gentleman is bound to accept that and I would accept it at once. I would suggest that the words as I heard them either meant that or they meant nothing, and if the right hon. gentleman is prepared to state that he did not mean that, of course the House is bound to accept his word; but if he did mean that. I venture to think that in the interest of future good order in this House it would be desirable that the right hon. gentleman should withdraw that expression.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I am a pretty old member in this House. I have sat in the opposition, I have sat on the treasury benches. I have sat as a member of the House supporting the government and in opposition to the government, but I am not aware—and on this I place myself in the judgment of the House, hon. gentlemen on the other side as well

as on this side—that I ever said an offensive word to anybody. I have tried to carry on the debates in this House in a fair manner and in a polite manner also, I have tried to be fair and courteous to all sides of this House but, Sir, I am human after all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And when an hon. member tells me to my face that if I did not take any certain action, if I did not prosecute certain parties, it is because I am afraid of the consequences, and the alternative is because I have shared in the proceeds——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no, he did not say that.

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, he did.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What did he mean?

Mr. FOSTER. Now we have got down to common sense again.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh no.

Mr. FOSTER. I state here as a member of the House, I call Mr. Speaker to witness, because the speaker was on the point of order in one minute—if I recollect my words, they were like this—asking why it was not done: 'It is because you have shared'—and as I said the word 'share' the Speaker rose to call me to order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Is there any difference?

Mr. CONMEE. You repeated it——

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Keep your bull dog quiet over there.

Mr. CONMEE. Oh, you just keep quiet, we know all about your little firebrand. We will take care of that.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. Now there is a gentleman who sits there and insults me in sotto voce across the floor of the House.

Mr CONMEE. You started it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Sergeant at Arms should take care of him. The Speaker was just rising to call me to order when I finished my sentence exactly as I intended to do: 'for the party, for the interests of the party.' I call the Speaker's attention to that.

Mr. CONMEE. What is the difference?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And all the explanation which the hon. gentleman gives me is that after all he states I shared what? The profit for the party interest. That is to say, instead of putting it into my pocket I put it into the party pocket. Well, I do not accept any such retraction as that. I said I had never manipulated any trust funds, I had never touched any money either politically or otherwise, and there is no point of order there, we have the ruling of Mr. Speaker on that. Having said that I have only to say that I leave this matter to my hon. friend to settle, and I hold that he and I are too old parliamentarians to indulge in such language as he has indulged in this afternoon—but I say I never court a fight, but I am not afraid of a fight.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, will you allow me to read——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order, sit down.

Mr. FOSTER. —allow me to read rule 19?

An hon. MEMBER. Take your medicine.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is it a point of order?

Mr. FOSTER. A point of order.

Mr. GAUVREAU. Is it a new one?

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to be a little laughed at that there is such a rule of order, but if it is a rule of order it should not be laughed at, it should be lived up to. Rule 19 is:

> No member shall speak disrespectfully of His Majesty, nor of any of the Royal Family; nor of the Governor or person administering the government of Canada; nor use offensive words against either House, or against any member thereof.

The right hon. gentleman turned to me and in a voice and in language which it seemed to me was perfectly appreciated by every member in this House—that it was perfectly appreciated by every member on the other side was shown by the hearty applause which immediately followed—and said: 'I have never manipulated any trust funds.'

Mr. GAUVREAU. That is true.

Mr PATERSON. That is true.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. If there was any doubt——

Mr. HARTY. You called him the people's trustee before 6 o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. If there was any doubt in your mind or in the mind of any hon. member that if that sentence had any reference at all, it was meant to be directed to me, and to charge me as a manipulator of trust funds. I say that is offensive.

An hon. MEMBER. The cap must fit you.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman must in perfect right and obedience to the rule either withdraw the words or declare that they had no reference to myself.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend actually read this rule to the House:

No member shall use offensive words against either House or against any member thereof.

Yet the hon. gentleman within the last five minutes has forgotten that he asked me to my face if I did not prosecute Mr. Drolet, Mr. Halliday and Mr. McAvity because possibly I had shared in the money they had received for party purposes; and he means to say that these words are not offensive. He said that to me personally.

Mr. SPROULE. But there was no objection taken to it at the time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And now when I tell the hon. gentleman that I will not tolerate being insulted in this House, he becomes still more offensive. Mr. Speaker, I ask for your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. To my mind the words, 'I never manipulated any trust funds,' are not in themselves offensive words. They may be so by inference, but that is a matter that every member of the House can judge for himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I think it is in the interest of proper order in debate that there should be no misunderstanding on this point. I am not declaring one way or the other. I am only applying the rule. No offensive word can be used by any member; the rule is plain in that respect. The Prime Minister did not charge the hon. member for North Toronto with having manipulated trust funds. His exact words are not to that effect. I do not know that it is for the Chair to infer anything from the words. I have to take the words as they are actually uttered. The same rule might apply to the words used by the hon. member for North Toronto before six o'clock. When he used the words, 'Did the Prime Minister share.' I rose to call him to order; but when he added, 'for party advantage,' or something to that effect, this removed the personal aspect of his words. So that after hearing the explanations on both sides, I think the debate had better proceed.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; sit down.

Mr. FOSTER. As I interpret the Prime Minister's words, I think he ought to withdraw them.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The Prime Minister has the floor.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Here is what my hon. friend said this afternoon:

Mr. FOSTER.

Is it because you share in it——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. Just wait—'for party interest and for party adantage?' If not, why are you so modest about getting after the people's rights, you who are the trustees of the people's interests?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This, Sir, my hon. friend does not call offensive. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have only to leave the question to the judgment of the House, and having said that, I pass on to the subject of debate.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the right hon. gentleman retract those words. It is no argument to say that because I transgressed the rule, if I did, before six o'clock, that he should transgress it now. By inference the Speaker has ruled that the right hon. gentleman's words applied to me. To whom else could they apply?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I say it again: to whom else could they apply as they were uttered? I know what the English language means; I use it and I use it properly. If the Prime Minister, in the course of his argument, were addressing any one else, that would be a different matter. The right hon. gentleman applied the words to me, he meant to apply them to me, and I ask him to withdraw them.

Mr. SPEAKER. I can only repeat what I said before, that if those words had been applied directly to the hon. member for North Toronto, they would have been out of order; but I fail to see that they were applied directly to that hon. member. There is more than one member in this House, and I can only deal with direct imputations.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Speaker himself think, or does he not, that the right hon. gentleman was applying those words to some one else or to me? He was addressing his argument to me and to me alone. He meant to cut me and no other man at that time. I stand here and demand that the right hon. gentleman prove himself equal to the occasion and withdraw that insinuation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think it is necessary for you to answer the question submitted to you, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member for North Toronto, because the Prime Minister has answered it himself. He stated most explicitly, only a moment ago, in your hearing, that he had used those words in retaliation for a statement of the hon. member for North Toronto. Therefore he has most distinctly admitted, in your hearing and in the hearing of all of us, that he meant them to apply to the hon. member for North Toronto.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. It is impossible for the Premier to speak under these conditions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I have never sailed under false colours; I have never made an insinuation that I have not been ready to back up. If the hon. gentleman had not spoken as he did, I would not have spoken as I did, and I have no hesitation in saying that in speaking as I did I applied my words to the hon. member for North Toronto. I state that like a man; and now, Mr. Speaker, I am in your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must abide by the ruling I gave: offensive words cannot be used in debate I fail to see that these are offensive words in themselves. If they had been applied directly, they would have been.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire, Mr. Speaker,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Sit down. Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman has just now declared that he applied those words to me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I am here the first man who ought to set an example to the House. I do not disguise the fact—I am too much of a man for that—that I meant to apply my words to the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. You have said, Mr. Speaker, that these words applied to anybody were out of order, and I bow to your ruling, as it is my duty to do.

Mr. FOSTER. Then will you take back the words?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I obey the ruling of the chair, and I say to the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Foster) that I stand by my words, and when I have any charges to make, I make them and make them openly; but as I am outside the rules of the House, I shall not proceed further, but withdraw everything I said.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am bound to act according to the ruling of the chair. The chair has ruled that my words are not parliamentary, and I withdraw them. But my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Foster) must learn a lesson. He must learn not to treat other people as he has been doing. He has his own reputation to look after.

Mr. FOSTER. And is able to look after it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have here men who are not afraid to speak their minds. My hon. friend must know that there are two sides in this House and he cannot have everything his own way; and while there is no man more ready than he to throw insinuations, there is none who smarts so much when the lash is applied to himself. I have to say to my hon. friend from St. Anne's division (Mr. Doherty) that, while I give him great credit for his speech, he has been in one respect unfair to the government and myself personally. He said he had reason to believe that there has been no change in the department and that the same men who were guilty of giving commissions were still doing business with the government. He based this insinuation upon an answer which I gave some time ago to the House on a question put by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe). This question was asked by that hon. member:

1. Has the Marine and Fisheries Department continued to buy supplies, or give contracts to the individuals, supply men, or companies on whose behalf commissions, gratuities or interest were paid to officials of the department, as found by the Cassels Commission?

2. If so, what are the names of such individuals, supply men and companies, and the amount paid or to be paid to them since the receipt of said report by the government?

3. Have any other departments purchased supplies or given contracts to any such individuals, supply men or companies since the receipt of said report by the government? If so, why are the names and amounts thereof?

To this I made the following reply:

1 and 3. There may be cases in which it will be in the public interest to do business with some of the parties referred to. Each case will have to be considered on its merits as it arises.

2. If any particular names be mentioned the information will be given to the House.

Thereupon the hon. gentleman asked if that answer was not tantamount to saying: 'If you will just show us that you know all about it, we will tell you all.' That is not a fair deduction. My hon. friend had better leave that kind of deduction to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as such insinuations are more in his line. But to show how unfair his comment was, let me refer my hon. friend to another question which was put a few days ago, and to which I replied:—But first let me recall the reply I have just read:

There may be cases in which it may be in the public interest to do business with some of the parties referred to.

Implying that, as a general rule, we would not do business with these men. My

hon. friend said that in England, under such circumstances, no government department would have anything to do with a man who had paid commissions to any official of the government. And he contrasted that course with the conduct in this country. But the language I made use of showed plainly that we did not intend doing business with these men except in cases where we might have to do so in the public interest. For instance some of them might have the exclusive patents in certain things we absolutely require. What could we do under such circumstances? The same question was asked a few days ago by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe):

1. Have the following persons had contracts for supplies, &c., with the Department of Marine and Fisheries since the date of Hon. Judge Cassels' report, viz.: James Murphy, W. R. Blakiston, James Halliday, Allison Davie, J. B. Cote, Jos. Samson, Terreau & Racine, Jean Drolet, E. Amyot, Charles A. Parent, A. N. Melvin, Howell & Co.?

My hon. colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries answered:

No contracts have been entered into with the following persons by the Department of Marine and Fisheries since the date of Hon. Judge Cassels' report: James Murphy, W. R. Blakiston, James Halliday, Allison Davie, J. B. Cote, Jean Drolet, Elie Amyot, A. N. Melvin, Howell & Company, Jos. Samson.

Orders have been given to the following persons by the Department of Marine and Fisheries since the date of Hon. Judge Cassels' report:

Terreau & Racine, $164.04. This purchase consisted of grate bars, patterns for which are the property of the above-mentioned firm.

This is one of the cases I have referred to. We had to do business with the firm of Terreau and Racine because they were proprietors of that patent and we had to make use of it. That is what we meant when we said that, in certain circumstances, the public interest would compel us to deal with some of these men.

Coming to the motion of my hon. friend, I said we could not accept it, and the reason was that the very premises upon which it is based are not in accord with the facts. Let me call attention to the first paragraph:

The commission of 1907 in the course of their investigations into the conditions of the Civil Service having made incidental inquiry into the workings of one of the departments at Ottawa, characterized that department as wanting in organization, lacking in conscience, and some of the officials as serving two masters, Scripture notwithstanding, and also criticised other departments.

I ask my hon. friend how he can say in the face of the record we have before us, that the investigation made by the Civil Service Commission was only thorough in one department. Is it not a fact that it was thorough, not only in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but in all the departments?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I repeat, notwithstanding what may be said to the contrary, the commissioners themselves declare in their report that they made a thorough investigation of all the departments.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are some hon. gentlemen evidently who doubt my word. Let me read what the commissioners themselves say at page 46 of their report:

Your commissioners endeavoured to the best of their power to thoroughly sift the conditions of the civil service.

Can any words be plainer?

Possibly they have allowed their inquiries to extend rather beyond what might have been considered the limits laid down, but your commissioners are of opinion that to get at the full knowledge required to make a report their inquiries should be as extensive as possible. With this view they construed the reference as to efficiency and sufficiency of the departmental staffs as including in its scope the control of the appropriations granted by parliament.

In fact your commissioners could hardly have done otherwise considering how their attention had been directed to these matters by statements in parliament and in the public press.

On the face of this report, how can it be said that the investigation by the commissioners was not as thorough as possible. They felt that to do justice they had to go beyond the letter of their instructions, and they did so. Under such circumstances, how can my hon. friend say that the examination was not as thorough as it should have been. He proceeds to say:

That the Cassels Commission was limited in scope to an inquiry into implied official incompetence and dishonesty in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the report thereof with attached evidence amply sustains the charge of official negligence, wastefulness and corrupt dealing in that department, and affords ground for the conviction that similar methods prevail in other great spending departments.

My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean), speaking to the motion, declared that the language of it was very illogical, and I appeal to my hon. friend from St. Anne's division himself to agree that the language he uses and the deduction he makes are absolutely illogical. What is his premise, and what is his conclusion? His premise is that there was dishonesty in the Marine Department; that the officials there were proved to have been dishonest and to have taken bribes, and

his conclusion is that, therefore, there is ground for believing that there was dishonesty in other departments. That is the kind of logic in which the hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) indulges, but I should have expected better from my hon. friend from St. Anne's (Mr. Doherty). It does not follow because one man is dishonest that another man is dishonest also. The hon. member for St. Anne's has quoted scripture about a man serving two masters——

Mr. DOHERTY. I only quoted the commissioners in their quotation of scripture.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The commissioners quoted scripture, and my hon. friend quoted the commissioners, and I quote my hon. friend. But, now, I would like to quote scripture direct. Surely the hon. gentleman will remember a verse in scripture to this effect: 'To the pure all things are pure.' And I suppose it is a fair assumption that to the impure all things are impure. To the mind of my hon. friend from North Toronto, and a good many others, all things are impure. It is easy for a man to find others dishonest if he himself is not very sure of his own ground; but I would not expect that from my hon. friend from St. Anne's. The resolution goes on to say:

That in order to lift the cloud of suspicion that rests upon the administration of the various departments—

The cloud of suspicion! Where do we see that cloud of suspicion? I see it on the other side of the House, but not on this side. Surely, this is a perfect illustration that to the impure all things are impure. Well, I have only this to say: We are responsible to the parliament of Canada, we are responsible to the people of Canada. We cannot admit what is stated in this motion. If anybody believes what is stated in this motion, that there is in the public service 'official negligence, wastefulness and corrupt dealing,' it is not a commission of inquiry that should be moved, but a direct vote of censure. It is our duty to administer the affairs of Canada; it is our duty to manage the departments of the government. Our intention is to discharge that duty efficiently. If we do discharge that duty efficiently, well and good; if we do not discharge it efficiently, we are open to censure. If the departments are, as suggested, inefficient, wasteful and corrupt, it is our duty to remedy these evils, and if we do not discharge that duty we are open to the censure of the House. I deny that it is the right of the parliament of Canada to look into the administration; that is a thing which is the duty of those charged with the administration, and for the proper discharge of that duty they are responsible to the people. It would seem almost unnecessary in a matter of this kind to quote authorities, but I quote the authority of the English parliament on the point. On July 22, 1862, Sir George Bowyer made this motion:

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the grievances alleged to exist and complained of by the persons employed in the Post Office Department.

This was a motion to investigate the practice of a certain department of government. Mr. Gladstone, who was Prime Minister, spoke upon that question to this effect:

He said that his hon. friend exercised a wise discretion in not proposing to press his motion on the present occasion, for it was obvious that the appointment of a committee of inquiry at the present period of the session must be perfectly futile. He should have felt it his duty, however, at any period of the session to oppose the motion, which he regarded as being of a most dangerous character not only to the good order of the Post Office Department, but of the entire public service,

After having reviewed the question and discussed the grievances complained of, he went on:

He hoped if his hon. friend dealt with the subject again, he would be careful to give an accurate impression to the House. The question had been settled by competent authority —namely, the executive government. The executive government were ready to defend what they had done in the face of the House of Commons.

And so are we here. Mr. Gladstone concluded in this way:

If they thought the executive government were to blame, let them take the proper course and pronounce their censure upon the executive government, but he was satisfied that no worse policy could be adopted than for the House to take into its own hands the management of the public services.

Now, this is the authority on which we rely upon this occasion. We are responsible, as I have said, to the people of Canada. We are primarily responsible to the House. If there is reason to believe, as is charged in this motion, that there is wastefulness in the departments, and if we fail to deal with that matter and rectify the evils we are liable to censure. But we do not admit that there is wastefulness, that there is inefficiency. We believe, on the contrary, that there is reasonable efficiency in these departments. We are ready to go on with the administration of the country's affairs. If we are in error, we are liable to censure; we are liable to be turned out of office; but so long as we retain the confidence of the people we are ready to discharge every duty connected with the administration of public affairs. We have shown that we will do so. The hon. member for North Toronto says that we were

driven into making an investigation. I will not discuss that; I merely say that we have dealt with the matter. We appointed a commission to investigate and report. Not satisfied with the first report, we had a second investigation of the Marine Department. Why did we appoint that second commission for the special investigation of the Marine Department? Because the first commission, in its report, stated that there was 'lack of conscience' in the Marine Department. If they had charged a 'lack of conscience' in the other departments, we would have had a special commission to investigate those departments also. But the commissioners did not say that there was 'lack of conscience' in the other departments; they said there was inefficiency, lack of organization—matters of that kind which could be rectified by each minister in his own department, and which have been rectified by each minister. I have only to say, in the words of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean), that it is our duty to see that every officer of the public service does his duty well and faithfully, and it is our determination to do our duty in that respect to the fullest extent. Therefore, I ask this House to vote down this resolution.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I join with the right hon. minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in extending congratulations to the hon. member for St. Anne's division, Montreal (Mr. Doherty) who has moved this motion and supported it in a cogent, powerful and straightforward speech, which, it seems to me, ought to have commended the motion, not only to every hon. member on either side of the House, but to the members of the government themselves. I will not dwell upon the somewhat heated language of the Prime Minister at the opening of his remarks, nor to the very unfortunate incident which he brought about in this House. He told us in the end that he would set a good example. I think it is to be regretted that a gentleman in his position, responsible for the honour of this House, had not set a good example in the first instance. Now, the greater part of the time occupied by the right hon. gentleman has been taken up with that incident, and therefore he has afforded very little argument indeed, if you can dignify it by the name of argument, to hon. members of this House as a reason why this motion should be voted down. He has made statements of fact, and one of his arguments to which I will allude at once, because it is in my mind, is that no further investigation should be held because the investigation made by the Civil Service Commission of 1907 was a thorough one, and was stated by the members of that commission to be a thorough one. I ask my right hon. friend now whether he adheres to that statement which he made a moment ago, because if he does adhere to it, I will undertake to prove out of the mouths of the members of the commission themselves, in the words of their own report, that the statement made by the right hon. gentleman on that subject is absolutely unfounded and unwarranted. That was however one of the main grounds of his argument. I take direct issue with the right hon. gentleman on that point. Did he ever read the report of those commissioners, or if he has read it, is his memory so short that he does not remember the quotations from it which were brought to his attention only last year? Let me recall to his attention what was said by these commissioners, appointed by himself, as to the thoroughness of the investigation which they did make. On page 20 of the very report from which the right hon. gentleman quoted here to-night, what do I read:

> In dealing with this subject your commissioners have to submit that in a vast service such as exists at Ottawa, in the limited time at their disposal, it has been absolutely impossible for them to inquire fully into the efficiency of the officials in the several departments. There are probably, including labourers, some 3,000 employees at Ottawa. In the Department of the Interior alone there are 500 employees.

And this is the report of the commissioners who, according to the right hon. gentleman, made so thorough an investigation that he now asks his followers on the other side of the House to vote down the motion proposed by my hon. friend from St. Anne's (Mr. Doherty). I do not doubt they will vote it down. Any man in this House who can reconcile his conscience to voting for that iniquity, the Newmarket canal, may be expected to vote against a further investigation. Well, Sir, let us look a little further:

> It would take many months to examine the work of the Department of the Interior alone, and when so many officials are engaged in the several branches it would be hard to gauge with accuracy the extent, or character, or style of the work turned out by each.

Yet my right hon. friend appeals with every confidence, a well justified confidence, to his followers to vote down this proposed investigation, because there has already been a thorough and ample investigation into every department. Let us look a little further. Dealing with the outside service, on page 27 of the same report, they say this:

> Acting on this suggestion, as previously stated, your commissioners visited three places, and they only regret that the time at their disposal prevented them from pursuing their inquiries at other points. The information procured was most interesting and instructive, and even the chairman, who had spent nearly 40 years in the public service at Ottawa, had no idea of what constituted the

outside service until he visited the several localities.

Further on, referring to the Department of Railways and Canals, the commissioners say:

Your commissioners have not visited this department, believing that other departments required more immediate inspection.

Perhaps they did, perhaps they did not. I am not so sure of that. But at all events, this quotation will enlighten the House as to the thoroughness of the information of the right hon. gentleman as to the character of the investigation carried on by the commission of 1907. That is not all. Speaking of the Department of the Interior they say:

With its large staff of 500 employees at Ottawa, it would require months to thoroughly inspect the work and see that the several officials are properly employed.

The commissioners regret extremely that, with the short time at their disposal, they were unable to visit the Northwest, much as they desired to see how the land, and more especially, the timber sales are effected.

And it is because that investigation was absolutely sufficient and ample that the right hon. gentleman appeals to his followers to vote down this motion. Well, let us look a little further.

To do the work with any pretension to thoroughness—

I would ask especial attention to this language:

To do the work with any pretension to thoroughness would take much more time than would probably be agreeable to the government.

The right hon. gentleman, I presume, is convinced now that this was an extremely thorough and ample investigation, and that his argument to the House in that regard is absolutely justified by the report of the commission itself. Might I inquire now what the opinion of my right hon. friend is on that point, just at this juncture? Well, my right hon. friend refuses to satisfy what he would no doubt characterize as a too fastidious curiosity on my part.

An hon. MEMBER. To the pure all things are pure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am bound to say in view of that interruption, that I think the argument mentioned by the hon. member is much more cogent than that argument of the Prime Minister to which I am now addressing myself. Well, let us look a little further:

They have been able to go over only a very small section of even the Marine and Fisheries Department.

And the right hon. gentleman, within twenty minutes, has told this House, and on that ground has appealed to his followers to vote down this motion, that that was an ample, a sufficient and a searching investigation into all the departments, not into the Department of Marine and Fisheries alone, but into all the departments, including those that the commissioners did not even visit. Well, I imagine that my right hon. friend must have thoroughly satisfied his followers on that point in view of the quotations which I have read from the report of these very commissioners. This particular paragraph continues as follows. I will read the whole paragraph lest my right hon. friend may forget it, because, when one deals with so treacherous a memory as that of which he has given evidence to-night, it is well that the facts should be stated clearly. My right hon. friend will therefore direct his particular attention to this paragraph. I will read it again:

They have been able to go over only a very small section of even the Marine and Fisheries Department. If they had had time it would have been most desirable to have inspected the work of the department at the agencies—Quebec, Sorel, Halifax, St. John and Prescott — particularly Quebec and Halifax.

At page 42 they also declare that:

—there is no means by which they could appreciate whether the amounts payable for sub-target guns or for Ross rifles are proper and just, but according to the evidence——

I think that was contradicted afterwards.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not the part I have read, but the part I am about to read.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The part that you have read, too.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These poor commissioners seem to be most unfortunate. They were appointed by the government, they bring in reports to which my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) takes exception, as he did take exception this afternoon, and it appears that in this particular instance they have also made a mistake. Well, I am not concerned with the concluding part of the paragraph, as it has been corrected. I may say to the Minister of Militia that I was not aware that the first part of the paragraph had been in any way corrected.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I took a good deal of trouble to do it last year and I think it stands as I stated it last year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In what way?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That they had made a mistake.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, that is not the point. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will look at it again.

There is no means by which they could appreciate whether the amounts payable for sub-target guns or for Ross rifles are proper and just.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, well, I cannot supply brains.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no doubt that the intimation will be conveyed to them that my hon. friend will not undertake to supply them with brains and, if they were such commissioners in that regard as they have been described it may be deemed necessary to supply them from some other source.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Thank you, I have no doubt my hon. friend can supply them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I would not like to go into comparisons on that subject.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I quite agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As long as we are both agreed on one subject at least, perhaps we will proceed to discuss some other portion of the remarks of my right hon. friend.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Quite so. We both seem to agree that the commission require brains.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I am not here to-night, Mr. Speaker, to argue the point with my hon. friend, that he and his colleagues saw fit to appoint a commission which was destitute of brains.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I at once admit my responsibility and express my regret.

Mr. R. L BORDEN. Well, I think that not only the hon. gentleman but his colleagues as well have every reason to express regret at the appointment of that commission. As we once more agree we will return to the remarks of the right hon. gentleman. Let us consider for a moment the answer of the Prime Minister to certain remarks of my hon. friend from North Toronto. He said that there was an absolute rule of British parliamentary government that no investigation into administrative affairs should ever be undertaken by parliament or by any commission appointed by the executive. Why, Mr. Speaker, the whole history of British parliamentary government is full of illustrations of exactly the contrary doctrine. As to an inquiry for the purpose of regulating the interior workings of a department, matters for which the executive alone is responsible and responsible to parliament, there may be some force in what the right hon. gentleman has suggested. Parliament is not to take the administration out of the hands of the government. That and that alone is the result of the authority which the right hon. gentleman quoted to-night. But, as a matter of fact, the very rule which he has quoted was departed from when he appointed the Civil Service Commission of 1907. Therefore, he cannot surely quote now, in opposition to the argument of my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Anne, (Mr. Doherty), a rule which he violated only two years ago. Does he not remember the investigation into administrative affairs after the Crimean war? Does he not remember the investigation into administrative affairs after the South African war? I cite these two only because they occur to my mind at the moment; but the slightest examination of the authorities upon the subject would convince every hon. gentleman in this House that what I have stated to be the doctrine in that regard of British parliamentary practice is absolutely founded upon fact and precedent.

But, Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman went farther. No, he did not go farther, he simply made a comment upon the argument of my hon. friend from North Toronto as to the reasons why the men now holding moneys belonging to this government in their possessions are not proceeded against in the courts. If the right hon. gentleman was dissatisfied with the tone of my hon. friend from North Toronto, why did he not, after criticising that tone, as he had a perfect right to do if he felt so inclined, tell us the real reason why these men are not proceeded against? Does he think it a wholesome doctrine that political pull and political influence shall be sold or bartered, and have not some matters been made public in the press of this country which would seem to indicate that such things were taking place? We have been told by no less an authority than one of the hon. gentleman's colleagues that there is absolutely no remedy for it and the money can never be recovered back to the treasury of this country. Shall it come to pass that political influence shall be quoted on our stock exchanges as having a certain market value—because it might as well come to that if we are to tolerate certain matters which have transpired within recent years and have gone without redress and without any effort by the government to bring about a better condition of affairs. No mock indignation, no real indignation, no heroics will satisfy the people with reference to such matters.

The right hon. gentleman says that this motion is illogical. Well let him make it logical but let us have the investigation, let him take the lack of logic out of it, let him put logic into it, but let him give the inves-

tigation that public opinion is demanding and without which the people of Canada will not be satisfied that the right hon. gentleman is disposed to deal with the administration of affairs as they ought to be dealt with. We are told also that these influences operating in one department are no indication that similar influences may have similar results in other departments of the government. Are they not some evidence at least? Where does the right hon. gentleman stand to-day? Where do he and his colleagues stand to-day? To the absolutely cogent argument made by my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) no answer has been given across the floor of the House. The case presented by the hon. member for St. Anne is like the case of the Newmarket canal, it is absolutely undefended by the government. What position does the government take with respect to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries? I understand they have declared—and I am not quarrelling with their declaration—that the hon. gentleman had absolutely no knowledge of the inefficiency, the waste and the corruption going on in the department over which he presided. Let us start with that premise. To what does it lead us? Has the right hon. gentleman ever thought of that? Does he intend to suggest that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was less capable than his other colleagues. If he does not suggest that, then there may be going on in every one of the great spending departments of this government exactly the same waste, exactly the same inefficiency and exactly the same corruption as that which has been shown, as the result of that investigation, to exist in the Marine and Fisheries Department. That is an answer to the suggestion, for it was a suggestion, it was not stated in so many words, that there could be no maladministration and no corruption and no inefficiency without the ministers knowing it. Well the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not know it, we have started with that premise. Then exactly the same thing may be going on in every department of the government if the Minister of Marine is to be held guiltless of that which has been disclosed by the reports of these two commissioners.

How does the right hon. gentleman stand? He stands here with an inquiry begun in 1907 which has not been concluded. I have read extract after extract to show that that inquiry was never concluded. Why was it begun? We must assume, I presume, that there was some cause for undertaking it. Then if it was properly undertaken, if it was commenced for good and sufficient reasons, equally good and sufficient reasons, nay better and more cogent reasons, exist to-day for concluding that investigation than those which existed for its commencement. Therefore it seems to me that the right hon. gentleman has not made good his case in answer to my hon friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty).

What about the Department of Railways and Canals, which put on 1,100 temporary employees on the Intercolonial Railway in the month of October last? What does that mean? What about the Marine and Fisheries Department putting on 100 men in the Halifax dockyard in order that they might vote against myself and my colleagues at the election of the 26th of October last? Is there any connection between these two circumstances? If that sort of thing goes on in the Marine Department, if it is conceded by the officials of this government that those men were put at work solely on account of the elections, have we or have we not a right to believe and understand that of the 1,100 additional men hired on the Intercolonial Railway as temporary employees in October, 1908, a majority at least were put on for exactly the same reason? Under these circumstances it does indeed seem to me that the right hon. gentleman has made no defence to the motion of the hon. member for St. Anne.

He tells us in effect by his silence that the men who have bribed are to go free so far as criminal prosecution is concerned at least, and that the men who have been bribed are to be dismissed from the public service of this country, as indeed, of course, we all concede they should be dismissed. If the briber, who, as well as the man bribed, is amenable to the criminal law of this country, has committed an act which according to the report of the commission in this case was at least equally colorable with the act of the men bribed, why is it that the one man is punished and the other man goes free? Has the right hon. gentleman given any answer to that? He has not vouchsafed one syllable of answer in his address this afternoon.

I simply desire to say, in conclusion, that the motion of my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) is the logical, necessary result of the two investigations already held, an incomplete investigation in 1907, an investigation in 1908 which dealt with the affairs of only one department and dealt with only one paragraph of the commissioners' report. And now we ask why the government will not accept our motion to supplement what has already been done by carrying to its conclusion an investigation which the government thought it proper to begin in the first instance. Up to the present I repeat there has been absolutely not one word which in my humble judgment justified the government in refusing that further investigation. Does my right hon. friend think there is no suspicion abroad in the public mind with regard to the administration of other departments? Is he so pre-

judiced as to suppose that the people of this country will believe that men operating in other departments of this government, supplying different departments of this government, have been carrying on certain iniquitous practices in one department and have absolutely refrained from these practices in other departments? Will public opinion be satisfied by any statement of my right hon. friend, eminent as he is and experienced in public life, to that effect? I say no, a thousand times no. So far as party advantage is concerned, I would welcome the voting down of this motion by the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues; but for the future decency of public life in this country, to remove suspicion that is already too prevalent, to cleanse the departments if they need cleansing, I still hope that my right hon. friend will change his mind in that regard, that he will remodel this resolution, if necessary, and give to the people of this country that investigation into the affairs of the various departments of this government which ought to be given, in view of what has been disclosed in recent years.

Mr. EMMANUEL B. DEVLIN (Wright). Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer to the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) my congratulations upon the moderate way in which he has placed his case before the House. I am sorry that I cannot agree with the conclusions to which he came, and that I shall not be able to support his amendment which he has placed before the House. The amendment is to the effect that the commission of 1907, in the course of their investigations into the conditions of the Civil Service, made extended inquiry into the working of one branch only of all the departments in Ottawa, and criticised other departments, and it ends up by calling for a competent business commission to make an investigation into the working of all the great spending departments of the government. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the amendment had stated that where any specific charges are made against any particular department of this government an investigation should take place, I would have been very glad to have supported the amendment. If the amendment had said that the investigation should be held by a judicial commission, I would have supported it. I think the hon. member for St. Anne will agree with me that in matters calling for the examination of evidence—in matters of this kind, where witnesses must be examined and cross-examined by counsel, where legal technicalities may constantly arise—the only possible way of holding an honest and a wise investigation is to have it conducted before a judge. He will also agree with me, I think, that human nature after all is human nature, and that it would be hard to find a commission composed to say of three men, who would not be somewhat influenced by party feeling and party prejudice and perhaps by party passion; whereas his own experience upon the bench would teach him that the moment a man is called to the high, honourable and dignified position of a judge in this country, he leaves his political affinities at the door, and goes on the bench sworn to do his duty by his God and by his country.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we heard a very eloquent speech delivered by our very sensitive friend the hon. member for North Toronto (Hon. G. E. Foster). An abler debater than he is I hardly think exists in this country; an abler reasoner hardly exists in this country; but a man with a poorer memory I have not yet met. My hon. friend entertained us this afternoon with a ghost of the middle ages. Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that by chance I happened upon a certified copy of a report of a Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 21st of October, 1891; and if the ghost of my hon. friend's middle ages had appeared before me, I would not have been more astounded than I was to find that in 1891, when hon. gentlemen who sit upon this side were in opposition, charging the then hon. Minister of Finance, the present hon. member for North Toronto, and his colleagues with inefficient public servants, the hon. member for North Toronto, as Minister of Finance, stood up in the House and with his colleagues offered to the then opposition —what do you think? A competent business commission, composed of business men? No, Mr. Speaker, 'Scripture notwithstanding,' the hon. member for North Toronto stood up and said: 'If my conduct as an officer in the administration of this country's affairs is to be questioned by this parliament, if the conduct of my colleagues is to be questioned I, the Minister of Finance, will be the one to investigate it; if I am to be charged with any offence, or if the Civil Service is to be charged with any offence, I, the one charged, will examine into my conduct, and I will render the verdict which the country as a jury must accept.' This modern apostle of political reform was not satisfied with putting his name alone upon that committee, but he joined with it the names of two other gentlemen—not business men, Sir, but two of his colleagues; and I find—and I am very glad that that ghost of the middle ages is not here—that the two other names, accompanying the name of George E. Foster, were those of John Haggart and E. Dewdney, then ministers, who were to conduct the examination. This is a most interesting document; it is not ancient history, but it applies perfectly to the case. I do not think the hon. member for North Toronto will deny its contents. It reads thus:

The committee of the Privy Council, appointed to investigate and report upon the

cases of irregularity in the civil service as developed in the Public Accounts Committee, and to further report upon any similar cases in the public service, beg leave to present the following as their findings and recommendations in respect thereof.

And first as regards the Department of the Interior, your committee find from a careful perusal of the evidence and documents hereto attached:—

1. That the Civil Service Act of 1868 prohibited the payment, for extra services, of any sums of money to permanent clerks other than their regular salaries.

2. That from a period dating at least as far back as 1875 a practice began to grow up in the department under which occasional payments for extra work were made to permanent clerks in violation of this clause of the Civil Service Act.

3. That during the years 1882-1889 inclusive——

When our hon. friends opposite, then in power, were growing bolder,——

this occasional practice became frequent, and under it several permanent clerks received extra payments, either in the name of outsiders or fictitious persons

——you would hardly believe it,——

or through temporaty clerks, for work performed wholly or partly by themselves.

I shall not trouble the House by reading the whole of this report, but will go to the sixth clause:

That the whole sum, thus irregularly paid to permanent officials for extra work, amounted, as far as can be ascertained, to $9,017 from the year 1875 to date.

Will the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) tell me if that amount of $9,017 of the people's money which he, as Finance Minister, was supposed to have control of, was ever refunded to the government of this country?

An hon. MEMBER. Who was prosecuting?

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and his colleagues were the investigating committee, and what do you think that committee found as its conclusion?:

That the practice of giving extra work to permanent clerks in the department, in conjunction with temporary men, was not known to the present minister.

My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) was asked to resign his seat because certain officials in his department had obtained moneys which did not rightly belong to them or were not paid to them in the due performance of their duties. Well, here was the then Minister of Finance, the present member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) investigating into the acts of civil servants, and he found that certain employees in the service were receiving money through fictitious persons —moneys which they had not earned and which did not belong to them. Did that hon. gentleman then resign his seat? Were his skirts then clean? In some cases he and his colleagues did dismiss but in other cases they adopted a very peculiar course, and in these cases we find that this peculiar investigating committee recommended as follows:

That all those permanent clerks who, since 1880, have taken extra pay for services performed out of office hours, and those who authorized or certified to such payments be——

do you think dismissed, as the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries has done? No, Sir. Now, if the hon. the leader of the opposition were in his seat, how he would blush for the conduct of his hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Why, I see upon the countenance of the mover of the amendment, my good friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) that virginal blush—because he was not in his seat at the time—do you know, Sir, what the then Minister of Finance did? Did he imprison them? Not a bit of it. What did he do? He recommended that they be fined one month's salary. This apostle of political purity recommended that they be:—

fined one month's salary which shall be deducted from their present salary in the proportion

——they did not want to be too hard——

of one-half thereof from the amount falling due in each of the next following two months.

Then they came to a very hard case and were a little stricter with it. I do not think it necessary to mention the name; but in the case of another party, it appears:

That he applied in 1886 to the deputy minister for a bonus of $500 as a remuneration for work done after office hours,

——the minister did not resign——

in keeping up his regular office duties, which were at that time pressing; that the deputy minister declined to recommend the bonus but hinted at a recommendation for promotion and intimated that the work he had done would be mentioned in support of the same; that the clerk in question then arranged with another one, who was a temporary clerk, to use his name for getting a portion of what he thought he was entitled to for working overtime, and in the name of that temporary clerk drew $73 on an account certified by himself; that he received also a present of $20 from another temporary clerk who was paid on his certificate.

Presents were going in those days. What did the committee recommend? They recommended that the party in question:

be reduced to the minimum of his present class and suffer the consequences of his suspension to the date of this report.

There was no question of dismissal. And this report is signed by Geo. E. Foster, John Haggart, and E. Dewdney. I do believe in playing the game but in playing it fairly. If that was the proper constitutional course to follow in 1891, I fail to see why, upon suspicion, and upon criticism, the money of the people should be expended in investigating all the departments of this government. Sir, the Cassels' commission cost this country $55,000. That could have been expended in the interests of the farming classes. That would have helped the labouring classes. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not satisfied with taking from the pockets of the farmers and the poor people $55,000, and giving it to judges and lawyers, but they want to vote for a proposition which will take a million dollars of the people's money, and take it in order to obtain what? To obtain what hon. gentlemen opposite have obtained through the investigation—the opening of the doors of some homes and the throwing out upon the roadway of the poor bread-earners of these homes. That is what they have obtained, Sir.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN. Hon. gentlemen opposite may smile, but I ask if some of these hon. gentlemen themselves, being placed in the way of temptation, have not fallen? I ask these hon. gentlemen if when, perhaps, almost starvation faced them, they were offered a hundred dollars, would they not accept it? After all, we must be fair. We took, perhaps, excessive means. We took the course suggested by justice and reason; we found that one department of this government was charged with offences, and we investigated it. And hon. gentlemen opposite are criticising every day. Do they want us to go further with that investigation? I think it is absolutely unnecessary.

Now, I do not think I shall feel justified in detaining the House at greater length——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to like the reading of certain reports—but I hardly think that the hon. member for North Toronto would pardon me if I did not refer to some of the language which he used, and which some hon. members seated here last session heard him use, with respect to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I have sat in my place during the last few days expecting that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), would be men enough to stand up and utter the same words, the same manly words, that were uttered by the hon. member for St. Anne's division, and declare that they believed that personally the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was an innocent man. Where is that hon. member who, last session, prior to this investigation, said that the name of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries reeked throughout this country? He is not in his place to-night to stand up and give credit to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the reforms he has accomplished. What shall we say of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in view of the language he used last session in speaking of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I quote from page 3990 of 'Hansard' of last year:

> Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) makes the statement that I have been in the habit of taking money from the public chest, and using that money for my own purposes and have been obliged to refund a part of that money. That is the charge he has made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this sensitive man who does not like to hear offensive language used against himself, yet who uses more disagreeable language than any other hon. member had not the courage to stand up and say: 'That is not what I said, that is not what I meant to say.' But here is the mean insinuation used by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster):

> You are pretty close to it.

That is the charge the hon. gentleman made against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—that he had kept for his own purpose for months money that he had no right to keep. Is that a charge, or is that an insinuation? And, Sir, he had not the manliness to do what the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) nobly did to-night, but he kept his seat and said: 'You are pretty close to it.' I feel that I am in the judgment of the House and will be in the judgment of the country by voting against the amendment as it is proposed. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), very ingeniously said: 'Change the amendment in any way you like, provided you give us an investigation.' The hon. leader of the opposition knows full well that by constitutional practice and parliamentary rule no amendment can be offered to an amendment such as that before the House, because it is in the form of a vote of want of confidence in the government. Had an amendment been possible, we might have moved, as we would have moved, that whenever there was a direct and specific charge against any department we would afford an investigation. And, Sir, in conclusion, I say that when any hon. gentleman opposite has a charge to make against a department of this government and makes that charge, as constitutionally he should make it, upon the re-

sponsibility of a member of this House, then this government certainly will give a thorough and true investigation, and I will be the first to support them in taking that course.

Mr. WM. PRICE (Quebec West). My hon. friend from Hull (Mr. Devlin), seemed to have no argument against the amendment, but he has a great deal to say about the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). The hon. member for North Toronto is well able to defend himself, but it seems to me rather absurd that so many members attempt to cross swords with that hon. member. I find that I have practically no arguments to rebut; I have heard simply nothing against this amendment. What I did hear was that Conservatives before 1896 did the same thing. I can only answer as, I believe, a member of the British House of Commons did, 'I am glad to see that the Liberals of this day are now as advanced as the Conservatives were in 1896.' One would suppose that in thirteen years we should make greater advances than that. One would suppose that, by this time, we would drop this tu quoque argument and bring forward solid arguments before the House. It is tiresome, indeed, to a business man to come to Ottawa and to listen to this sort of thing in place or argument. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) told us yesterday that the responsibility for the state of affairs in his department as shown by the report of Mr. Justice Cassels rests as much with his predecessors as with himself. He goes as far back as 1867. This may be so, and let us assume that it is correct. In 1867, the expenditure on fisheries and coast service was something over $205,000. In 1896, the expenditure was $893,000, an advance during that time of $688,000. In 1907-8, the expenditure was $3,791,737, an increase since 1896 of over $2,900,000. I am not going to find fault with that increase now, because a great deal of the money was well spent in lighting the St. Lawrence channel and in many other important works.

I would like to draw attention to the salaries received by the agents of the Marine and Fisheries Department. Have they been increased or not? I find that Mr. J. U. Gregory, late agent at Quebec, was getting a salary of $2,200, a man who had been there 38 long years. This man was in charge of expenditures, averaging during the last three years $904,000. Mr. Harding, of St. John, was getting $1,800 a year after 13 years' service, and was handling an average expenditure of $250,000. Mr. J. O. Parsons, of Halifax, was getting a salary of $1,600 after 14 years' service, and was spending on an average $674,000 annually. Now, it seems to me that in view of the enormously increased expenditures since 1896, and particularly during the last four or five years, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ought to have had some thought for the agents at those places. Enormous responsibilities were laid on the shoulders of these men. They were expected to look after the spending of these enormous sums, they were expected to look after all the shipping and all the multifarious interests of the department. During the last five years the cost of living has greatly increased, and every one knows that men in those positions are supposed to maintain a certain style of living. Do you mean to tell me that many of those officials, who are paid salaries averaging from $1,600 to $2,200, salaries that are paid to ordinary bookkeepers because they keep their books correctly, are receiving what simple justice requires they should receive? I say the Minister of Marine is responsible for not having raised the salaries of those men. It is no wonder that some of those agents have done some things that they should not have done, or that things have gone wrong in this department, seeing that its agents were so poorly paid. I think they deserve sympathy, and that the government deserves condemnation for the parsimonious way in which it has treated those men. I noticed in reading the evidence taken at Halifax that the late members, Roche and Carney, were allowed to employ men during the election, or at least that they got men employed during the election. What has the minister done about that? Is he going to allow that to go on year after year? Are members and candidates on the government side to be allowed to have men employed in that way? I have myself suffered from the unfair interference of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in employing extra men during my election in Quebec West, men that were employed on purpose to vote against me. We are told that there is no reason why a further investigation should be held by the department. I think there are many reasons why a further investigation should be undertaken. Many of the men who have been proven by the Cassels investigation to have given bribes are still supplying goods to the Department of Public Works, and to several other departments. What kind of work is being done by the government at various wharfs? We have had the case of the Sorel wharf slipping into the water, after we have spent large sums of money upon it. We have been told about the absurdly high cost of the servants' quarters at Kingston. We know that there are various wharfs built in different parts of the country to many of which vessels cannot go. Now, it seems to me that if the public money is being wrongfully spent in these ways, an investigation should be held in regard to it. I submit that the amendment moved by my hon. friend from St. Anne's is a good one, that the reasons he has given in support of it are sound, and that the

government, if they wish to do their duty, should accept it and immediately order another investigation into the various departments. I do not suppose they will do it, they are altogether too well satisfied with themselves. To the pure all things are pure. I think it might be better said that to the impure all things are impure on the other side of the House.

Mr. GEORGES PARENT (Montmorency). I was rather anxious to hear my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Price) express his views on this question. As many hon. members are aware, the member for Quebec West lives in the district in which most of these pretended scandals took place. Mr. Gregory, of whom we have heard so much, is living in the hon. member's county, as well as several other gentlemen who have been concerned in the Cassels investigation. I am not surprised, therefore, to hear the hon. member for Quebec West express his sympathy with these men who have been dismissed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I think the hon. member might have gone a little further and told the House why he had sympathy for these gentlemen, but he did not. Perhaps the reason he did not was that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the leader of the opposition has spoken of these gentlemen in such language that the member for Quebec West did not dare to say anything further in their favour. After the words which have been pronounced to-night by the member for North Toronto about the Quebec merchants and the Quebec officials, I am not surprised that the hon. member for Quebec West could not say much more about them. If he did speak in that way concerning them, it was because he knew better than the member for North Toronto that these gentlemen who were concerned in that investigation were not as bad as the member for North Toronto has painted them. The member for North Toronto mentioned several names when he was replying to the hon. member for Lunenburg; he spoke, for instance, of Mr. Drolet, and he read some of the evidence taken with regard to him, but the hon. member did not read that evidence as he should have read it. He only selected certain words, or perhaps something that he might have heard from certain persons who were hostile to this gentleman, and then he brings them forward in the House of Commons. I might tell the hon. gentleman that if he had ever met Mr. Drolet personally, if he had ever known him, he would not have used that language. Let me tell you that Mr. Drolet is not a man to bribe anybody. He does not know how. He never learned, and he cannot even understand it. He is simply a skilled worker; he is a man of genius, a man who devotes his attention to mechanics. The business and financial affairs of his firm are in the hands of his bookkeepers. I mean to say that while he is at the head of his firm the business and financial side of it is managed by others, and he does not himself know anything about payments made on behalf of the firm. The same thing might be said of others whose names are mentioned in the report of Mr. Justice Cassels. I make this statement because I believe it to be true. I do not think there is any proof at all which would satisfy the country or parliament that Halliday has done anything wrong so far as his dealings with the Department of Marine and Fisheries are concerned. It has been said that he has received $6,000 more than he was entitled to. That is an affirmation which is entirely wrong and is not founded on fact. If Mr. Halliday has received $6,000 more than what his original contract called for, as stated in Mr. Justice Cassels' report, it is because of the subsequent agreement which he entered into with the Department of Marine and Fisheries and under which he was entitled to receive that amount. It is easy to say that he has received more money than he was entitled to, but do hon. gentlemen know the circumstances under which he received it? Mr. Halliday had a contract with the Department of Marine and Fisheries by which a boat of his was hired to the department at $125 a day. There was a condition that he should be entitled to a certain part of the service of the boat for his own trade, and it was agreed that the moment the department wanted the entire service of the steamer for its own use the department would pay more than the first contract called for. That is the whole story, and yet we hear hon. gentlemen opposite making the statement that Halliday has received more money than he was entitled to. We hear these hon. gentlemen saying that men like Mr. Drolet were bribers. The statement is entirely wrong; it is entirely false, and there is no reason whatever for making it. Of course, I do not get up to defend any person who has given money to officials of the department. I do not say it is right, but I am taking special individuals, that hon. gentlemen opposite do not know at all, whose names they have put before the country as being bribers, and I am showing that their accusations are entirely wrong and that they do not know what they are talking about. They may find enjoyment in slandering these men, but the name of Drolet will remain in the minds of the people of the city of Quebec as that of a man of genius and integrity.

I would call the attention of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. L. R. Borden) to the fact that the

hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Price) had not a word to say against Mr. Drolet or Mr. Halliday. Yet, we hear these hon. gentlemen trying to cast discredit upon these men. They admire very much the hon. member for Quebec West, they have great confidence in him, but still he does not share their views. He said to-night that he had a feeling of sympathy for the merchants and officials in Quebec. If I have referred to Quebec to-night it is because the hon. member for Qubeec West has spoken. It was not my intention to say anything about it, but I, in common with other Quebecers, feel sore because of the dismissals that have taken place in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. There were in the department men who had done a great deal for the public service. There were certain men who, if I am permitted to say what I think, should not have been dismissed, and who should not have been treated as they were. I might mention the case of Geo. O'Farrel, for instance, who, under special circumstances, happened to borrow money from some person who had business relations with the department. He borrowed money from him one day, it was made public and as a result of that the decision was arrived at that O'Farrel had to go. Any one who has followed O'Farrel's career knows that he has given valuable services to the department. He entered the department many years ago and since that time his life has been devoted to the public service. He continued in the service for many years at a very small salary, because as every one knows, the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries are not well paid. What were the circumstances under which he received the money which was the basis of the charge against him? He has explained them. His explanation is this: 'I was in Halifax when I received a telegram saying that my son was dying, that my wife was very sick and that everything was going wrong as far as my family were concerned. I came to Quebec without any money. Whom did I meet? I met some persons in the office who were doing work for the department and I happened to borrow $100 from one of these persons.' For the sake of $100 you put that man out of the service; and what can he do now? You have said to him: 'You are dismissed.' That is the voice of the department, that is the voice of the minister, that is the conclusion of Mr. Justice Cassels' report. I might say the same for others but it is not my duty. We are bound under circumstances of this kind to sacrifice a few heads, and perhaps there are others in the department who might have been treated in a different way. That, of course, is a matter of personal opinion I leave it at that.

I would also say a word for another official of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, Captain Spain. It is of course a good rule that when an employee of a department has to travel on government business, he should give an account of his expenses from day to day, but if an official happens to make a mistake, if he happens to forget, surely there must be enough leniency in the minds of the people to overlook the disappearance of a few hundred dollars, and if Captain Spain was a good servant of the country, as Mr. Justice Cassels says, should we for the sake of $500 for which he cannot account, deprive the country of the very valuable services which he has rendered in the past? I cannot believe that we should do that. What is $500 or even $1,000 that for it we should sacrifice the services of a man of that sort.

I wish now to refer to the work performed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Unfortunately the member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Lachance) who is much better able than myself to express the views of the Quebec members in this House, is absent, but I felt it my duty to say a few words about the work which I know has been performed in Quebec. I have admired the position taken by the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty). He has presented an amendment to the motion for Supply and he has done it in such language and in such a way as will surely appeal to the members on this side of the House. He has praised the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and he has done it probably because he knew that such praise was deserved. His language to-night was in striking contrast to that uttered by hon. gentlemen opposite last year. To-day the hon. member spoke not against Mr. Brodeur personally, not against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as being Mr. Brodeur; he was criticising his administration, but not his personality. That is something to which we have not been accustomed, because during the time I have had the honour of a seat in this House, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been the most bitterly attacked and criticised member of the administration. We have seen him for days and nights trying to pass a few dollars of his estimates, but prevented from doing so, by whom? By the members of the opposition, the same members who now recognize his merit and who now say he has done his duty and has been a good administrator of public affairs. When we say he has been a good administrator of the affairs of his department we know something about it and I probably know more than many other members in this House, because it is my good fortune to represent a county situated on the shores of the St. Lawrence river. My constituency is a maritime constituency; I have there sailors, navigators, captains.

pilots, and all classes of men connected with navigation. From all these men there comes nothing but compliment for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries because he has rendered every one of them full justice and has given them every aid in their profession that they could demand. A passenger travelling on one of the great ocean liners, going through the channel from Montreal to the gulf does not realize what the maintenance of that river navigation means; he does not think of the pilot who guides the ship, he forgets the men in charge of the lighthouse, and he forgets the man at the head of the river service. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has to look after all that , and to-day he has all the lighthouses and aids to navigation from Montreal to the gulf in such a state of efficiency that a steamer can start from Montreal at any hour of the day or night and traverse the St. Lawrence river as safely by night as by day. This has been the work of the present Minister of Marine. His predecessors tried to accomplish this, but they did not succeed. He has succeeded and the country should be thankful for his efforts and should give him credit for that great achievement. Not long ago the Shipping Federation, whose opinion will not be opposed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, enjoyed an excursion down the St. Lawrence river as the guests of the minister in order that they might see the work that the department was performing. I need not repeat the opinion expressed by the Shipping Federation; it was published in the papers. They recognized that the work of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was the very best effort that any Minister of Marine had performed. I shall not longer detain the House in demonstrating that the minister has done his duty towards his country. To prove that, I need only take the words of the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) who has said plainly that the personality of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not in question. It cannot be, for those who know the minister feel that his name stands for honesty, for integrity, for everything that is the very best.

I wish to state now why I shall not support the amendment of the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty.) I do not believe that sufficient reasons have been advanced to induce us to vote for that amendment. Without any reasons and without any justification, we have the hon. gentleman's assertion that other departments may be wrong; but we do not know it, and until we have from hon. gentlemen opposite a definite charge, we cannot justify an amendment of this kind, and therefore I wish to put myself on record as saying that I will vote against it.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Parent) upon the courtesy he has done those of us, who would have been unable to follow him in the beautiful language in which he is accustomed to address the House, in making his speech in English; and if I do not pay that attention to it to which it is entitled, he will have to pardon me because of the lateness of the hour. If this debate has been somewhat protracted, it has not been lacking, at any rate in the later hours, in interest. To that interest the Prime Minister has largely contributed. I fancy that it is many years since this House has witnessed such a scene as has been enacted here to-night, for which the Prime Minister and he alone was responsible. What position has the right hon. gentleman taken with regard to this resolution? He has taken the position of obstructing it, opposing it upon premises which were absolutely untenable, and, as has been pointed out by the hon. leader of the opposition, upon grounds which the right hon. gentleman demonstrated clearly he was not sure of, and which I am quite sure he is satisfied now were incorrect. The right hon. gentleman, in making the attack he did upon my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), boasted of his manliness and of his long parliamentary career; yet he did not hesitate to make an imputation against the hon. member for North Toronto which he was afterwards obliged to retract. That was the commencement of a scene which was somewhat extraordinary, and following which the right hon. gentleman, with a fluency to which he is quite accustomed, quoted scripture. We have heard the right hon. gentleman quote scripture before, I think pretty often during the last campaign. The right hon. gentleman to-night quoted this saying: 'To the pure all things are pure.' When the right hon. gentleman made that very apt quotation, it occurred to me that I would like to quote to him, not from scripture, but from Shakespeare, apropos of the right hon. gentleman's specious explanation or apology for calling upon his party to vote down this resolution:

> In law, what plea so tainted and corrupt,
> But being season'd with a gracious voice,
> Obscures the show of evil.

It is not extraordinary to find the right hon. gentleman opposing this motion, in view of the fact that during the last five years we on this side of the House have made similar motions to the present one, though limited in their scope to one department or another, and they have been met invariably with the same reply from the right hon. gentleman, that these departments were above suspicion, that he did not propose to investigate them no matter what scandal was charged against them. To

'the pure all things are pure,' is the song the right hon. gentleman constantly sings. Let me remind the right hon. gentleman of some of the pure things which he has called upon his followers to vote down a reasonable, fair and full investigation into. I remember a debate which took place in this House two or three years ago, in regard to the action of a gentleman named Philip Wagner, who was in the civil service somewhere in the North West Territories. This gentleman had been convicted of stealing from the very men with whom as a public official he was brought into contact. After having been twice in gaol, he was brought out, re-appointed to the Department of Interior, promoted, and given an increase of salary; and when a motion was made on this side of the House that Philip Wagner be dismissed or that his conduct be inquired into, the right hon. gentleman rose in his place and called upon his followers to vote down the motion, and it was voted down, because to the right hon. gentlemen then, as now, 'to the pure all things are pure.' I might refresh the right hon.gentleman's memory with one or two other instances in which he has voted and called upon his followers to vote against similar resolutions. He remembers well the case of one Joseph Nixon, another gentleman who in his office stole from the people with whom he was brought into contact. A motion to condemn that man, made from this side of the House, met with the same reply from the right hon. gentleman—'to the pure all things are pure.' As long as this government is in power, as long as this right hon. gentleman sits here, thieves in the public service are safe and immune from prosecution, because the right hon. gentleman says that 'to the pure all things are pure,' and by the thief all things may be thieved. Is the right hon. gentleman's memory so bad that it cannot carry him back to only a few days ago, when a measure of reckless extravagence was passed in this House, namely, the wilful and unjustifiable expenditure of $1,000,000 of the money of this country at a time when this country could ill afford it, when we have lectures on retrenchment preached to us by ministers of the Crown, for a work said to be a public work, but one that served no other purpose than either to satisfy election pledges or the greed of some contractor and to endeavour to entrench this government in power.

Does the right hon. gentleman remember this? I might cite several votes which the right hon. gentleman gave to burk investigation, even when there was a case made out so clear that he himself had to admit there was evidence in support of it and considerable suspicion. On each occasion the right hon. gentleman blocked the way. He prevented any attempts to clear the atmosphere of those charges which hung so black and low upon the government and refused, as he is now doing, investigation after investigation. We have here facts which undoubtedly point to corruption and irregularities in the various departments of the government, but all the reply we can get from the right hon. gentleman is a misapplication of the words of the scriptures. I do this, he says, because to 'the pure all things are pure.' With regard to the scope of the investigation there is a somewhat extraordinary divergence between the position taken by the government now and that which they took prior to the Cassels inquiry. When the Civil Service report was laid on the table, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made certain explanations. Let me draw a contrast between what the government promised in the shape of an investigation and what the government gave. In the session of 1907-8 the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on page 5621 of 'Hansard' said:

> While I am aware that some officials have been open to censure for the manner in which they have discharged their duties, I never had any evidence to show dishonesty on their part.

Note that at the time the Civil Service Commission report was brought down, the minister admitted that he knew that some of the officials of the department had been open to censure. Well, is there one jot or tittle of evidence to show that there was any attempt made by him at any time to censure any of his officials or dismiss one of them, or hold an inquiry on his own account into the administration of his department? On page 3725 of 'Hansard,' I find the hon. minister saying with regard to the scope of the commission:

> I may say at once that, so far as the government is concerned, nothing will be done to prevent this investigation being as thorough and as extended as possible. As head of that department I have every interest in seeing that it shall be as complete as it can be. I want to see this investigation conducted in such a manner that the people of Canada may be satisfied that the intention of the government and of the department is to make the investigation absolutely right in all respects.

Contrast with that declaration the fact that at that time the minister had written out, in the inner chamber of his department, a commission which circumscribed and limited the commissioner in such a way that it was absolutely impossible for him, according to his own ruling, to make a thorough and complete investigation into all the matters and in such a way as to satisfy the people that the intention was to have a thorough investigation. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance had also something to say with regard to the position in which the department found itself. On page 7330 of the 'Hansard' of 1908, he said:

It is practically stated in the report of two of the commissioners, Messrs. Fyshe and Bazin, that there has been corruption in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The word is not used, but my hon. friend says he knows what the report means.

And again, on the following page:

If they wished to go into that branch of the question—and I do not say they should not have done so—as to whether or not the officials in the service were corrupt, then they were bound in justice to themselves, to the House and the individuals concerned, to go further and say in some detail who was corrupt and wherein the corruption lay.

Therefore, I say that what the minister and the government promise, and what they gave, are so far apart that the only possible reparation they can make now, in view of the circumstances as they are, in view of the insufficiency of this report, in view of the fact that this report in every way breathes of matters behind the scenes which ought to be, and which some day must be, investigated, is to open the doors of each department and extend the investigation along the lines of the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty).

Now, what has been said by the other side in answer? Mainly, there are two grounds of opposition to this amendment. The first is that when the Conservatives were in office there was great corruption in the departments; and the other is one on which the right hon. Prime Minister and his supporters greatly plume themselves—that the people last election returned the right hon. gentleman and his party to power and thereby declared themselves completely satisfied with this investigation. How did they satisfy the people? I have shown that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and others were telling the country that the investigation would be thorough and efficient and that justice would be done all round. And the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) told the people on the hustings at Niagara Falls that the people believed his government was an honest government, and, as the hon. member for North Toronto showed, he took to himself the credit of directing the holding of an investigation by the Civil Service Commission, and, as it was not sufficient, of ordering the one which he said would satisfy the people that there was nothing wrong left undisclosed to the public gaze. I say that the report of Mr. Justice Cassels, in certain respects which have been pointed out, and which I shall not go into in detail, shows that the cloud which rests upon the government has not been dissipated and that a further investigation is necesary. The inquiry stops short at most important points; very important subjects are not followed up; conclusions are not drawn; witnesses who could give most valuable testimony on certain points are not called; and the result of the whole report is most unsatisfactory in that those who are most guilty are not disclosed and do not appear in the evidence.

I desire to refer to one feature of that report, the attitude taken with regard to the relations between Mr. Gregory, of Quebec, and the deputy minister of the department.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will tell me if I am wrong in believing that the deputy minister has been retired with a superannuation allowance of $3,000 per annum, while Mr. Gregory, of Quebec, has suffered the pain of dismissal. Some animadversions have been made in the report on the deputy minister. I have not made an extended or analytical examination of the report, but I think there is a great deal that might have been brought out if witnesses had been called whom the deputy minister wanted to have called to complete the investigation. Extraordinary facts are brought to light. For instance, at page 55 of the report, the comissioner purports to quote the first part of a letter from the deputy minister to Mr. Gregory:

My dear Gregory,—As regards the letters which have been written to you lately, and which will probably be written again, they are simply to save the department in the eyes of the Finance Minister, they are doing all they can to curtail our expenses, but that cannot be done.

That clause, standing alone, seems to be rather peculiar; it would appear to bear only one construction, and that is that the deputy minister was instructing Mr. Gregory in one way by letters which were on file in the department and instructing him privately to pay no attention to these letters. I do not know whether the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has laid on the table, or intends to lay on the table, the correspondence with Mr. Gourdeau in that connection. I would like to ask the minister that question. Apparently, the hon. minister does not consider the question of sufficient importance, so I will pass it by.

Mr. BRODEUR. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) to ask me a question?

Mr. BOYCE. Yes. Will the minister lay on the table the correspondence between Mr. Gourdeau and Mr. Gregory relative to the circumstances referred to in this letter?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know of any correspondence, except that Col. Gourdeau sent some letters last year with regard to his resignation. I think these letters have been brought down.

Mr. BOYCE. Last year, Col. Gourdeau sent some letters—that is all the minister tells us. Let me ask the minister if he

recognizes this as being the context of that part quoted from Col. Gourdeau's letter?

In the meantime, I have obtained the Prime Minister's approval for the large expenditure for repairing the lightship and provision will have to be made, some way or other, to meet this.

What does that mean? It means that the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries was telling Mr. Gregory that expenditures were being made beyond the estimated amount, that he was telling him to curtail, but only in order to blind the eyes of the Minister of Finance, and that he had, in the meantime, obtained the fiat of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the expenditure, and following that had got a warrant from the Governor-General in order to defray the expense. Well, Sir, it is an extraordinary fact, but I understand it to be a fact, that Col. Gourdeau also contends that there was—and I say this subject to correction by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if I am wrong—an interview in the city of Quebec between the right hon. Prime Minister and Mr. Gregory with reference to the expenditure, and that only a few days before this letter was written, the right hon. gentleman expressed himself to Mr. Gregory in the presence of Mr. Gourdeau as being satisfied with the explanation that Mr. Gregory gave as to his position at that time and the reason for the expenditure he had made, and that the Prime Minister came back, and, in order to provide for the expenditures, which then exceeded the estimates, he went to the Governor General and got a Governor General's warrant. Am I right or wrong? I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Then, if that be the case, what becomes of the statement in Mr. Justice Cassels' report with regard to this paragraph?

Col. Gourdeau, I understand, contends that the paragraph which was alleged to have been untrue was absolutely true, and that he was so instructed to notify Mr. Gregory. At that time the affairs of the department were under the management and control, not of the present minister nor of the late Mr. Prefontaine, but of the Prime Minister of the country himself. If there were irregularities which ought to have been brought to light as between the late deputy minister and Mr. Gregory at Montreal, surely it would have been proper, and in accordance with the scope of the investigation, if these statements are true, that the right hon. gentleman should have been called to the witness box to give evidence, seeing that he was in charge of the department at that time, and who, it is said, had conversations relative to these very matters with both the deputy minister and Mr. Gregory, and who gave his fiat for the increased expenditure. Without referring at greater length to the matters which are the subject of this resolution, I want to point out to the Prime Minister that the people of Canada demand a full and searching investigation into the expenses of this country, and I think I am only echoing the sentiments of the people when I say that they will not submit to an investigation being choked at its birth, as the government are trying to do in opposing this resolution. The resolution of the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) grows out of the facts referred to in Judge Cassels' report, and it follows as a logical sequence, that there should be a further investigation, an investigation not limited to one department, but extending to all the spending departments of the government. And I say that just so long as the government stand in the door and bar the way to a complete and thorough investigation into these departments, just so sure will the government lose the confidence of the people.

Mr. CYRIAS ROY (Montmagny). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose speaking at great length on the question now before the House. I do not propose going into the details of the inquiry which has been carried on at the request of hon. members and with the approval of the government. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) charged some hon. gentlemen sitting on your right, Mr. Speaker, with not being well posted on the rules of the House and having shown a lack of logic in their remarks. As regards myself, I think that if the mover of this amendment had proceeded in such a way as to permit our accepting his proposition, that is, if instead of introducing a non-confidence motion, he had applied directly to the government with a view to obtaining a continuation of the inquiry they had willingly granted in the case of the Marine Department, there would not have been a head of department who would not have agreed to such a request, and myself, as a liberal, I would have been in favour of such a move. But to-day a non-confidence motion is laid before the House asking for a general inquiry into the departments, and that after the government, through the Minister of Marine, has announced the policy he intends to follow in pursuance of the report of Mr. Justice Cassels. Seeing that the opposition has thought fit to take that stand, the proposal of a non-confidence motion, I consider it the duty, not only of the members on the government side, but of the whole House, to vote against the proposed amendment.

What reasons have been advanced in support of the amendment? Was there any

reference made to the report of Mr. Justice Cassels? Incidentally some members have mentioned it. We have it from the very mouths of those who have taken part in the debate on behalf of the opposition, that the Minister of Marine and his department are in no way involved in the findings of the Cassels inquiry. That is no doubt the reason why efforts are now being made to mix up things. What the minister has agreed to is declared insufficient. It must be stated publicly that the government is responsible for the circumstances brought out by the Cassels inquiry, since they refuse to grant the request implied in the said amendment. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say that such a mode of proceedure cannot be approved.

As I stated a moment ago, the hon. member for North Toronto has had the courage, relying on the experience he gained in this House, to rebuke an hon. member on your right, Mr. Speaker, for his so-called lack of experience and the illogical stand taken by him in consequence. Well, at the risk of being dealt with in like manner, being also a new member, not very familiar with the rules of the House, I shall undertake to express briefly the opinion I have as regards the question now before us. If I were called upon to answer the hon. member who has just taken his seat, I think that would be an easy matter, as he would have to admit that he has not dealt with the question before the House, that is to say the report of Mr. Justice Cassels. The hon. member stated that, if the report referred to is to be believed, all the ministers, and among them the right hon. Prime Minister, are to be held accountable for the findings contained in Mr. Justice Cassels' report. Now, what are those findings? Does not the report clear the department of Marine and all other departments of any charges made against them?

To show the good faith of the Minister of Marine, it will be sufficient to recall that this inquiry was made following on a report made by the Civil Service Commission appointed by the government. It has been claimed that the inquiry was incomplete, that the Minister of Marine was interested in preventing any light being thrown on the management of his department. Now, what is stated in the report of the Civil Service Commission, which has been the occasion for instituting the Cassels' inquiry? That paragraph has already been read, and in order to save time, I shall quote only the two last lines:

> In other words some of the government's officers are serving two masters, and apparently succeeding with both—Scripture notwithstanding.

Mr. ROY.

Mr. Justice Cassels, after quoting that sentence from the report of the Civil Service Commission, goes on as follows:

> Some limitation had to be given the inquiry and as the charges made by the report of the Civil Service Commission are mainly confined to the fiscal year 1904-5, 1905-6 and 1906-7, I limited the investigation in the meantime to those years.

An hon. gentleman on the other side charged the minister with having limited the inquiry. The above quotation from Mr. Cassels' report shows that, in limiting the scope of the inquiry to those three years, he took his inspiration from the report of the Civil Service Commission.

Then, by referring to the instructions given to Mr. Justice Cassels, it will be found that they do not contain any restriction as to the scope of inquiry. I quote the following lines from the commission signed by the hon. Minister of Marine appointing Mr. Justice Cassels 'Commissioner to investigate and report upon certain statements contained in the report of the Civil Service Commision reflecting upon the integrity of the officials of the department of Marine and Fisheries, or some of them.'

In view of the above quotations, on what grounds can it be contended that the Minister of Marine is responsible for restricting the scope of the inquiry? There is nothing to support such a contention.

As I stated a moment ago, the finding contained in the report of Mr. Justice Cassels, is that certain officers regarding whose conduct the inquiry was held, have received certain amounts which they should not have received. Well, my views may differ from those of some of the hon. members on whose side I happen to occupy a seat, but seeing that the inquiry has been granted at their request, and that as a result, some officials have been found guilty, should the House now, in accordance with the wishes of some hon. members, start a fresh inquiry? Of course, we have the right to do so, but would we be justifiable in so doing? I do not think so. Unless there are some very sound reasons for believing that the commissioner erred, it seems to me hon. gentlemen are not justifiable in discussing these conclusions. We are bound to accept them. And they go to show, unfortunately for the province of Quebec, a constituency of which I represent in this House, that certain officials have committed a breach of duty in accepting what they should have refused.

In view of the promptness and cheerfulness with which that inquiry was granted by the minister, who, though unaware of what had been going on, was anxious to dispel any suspicions resting on his depart-

ment, it seems to me that all that can be expected now from the Minister of Marine is that he should give effect to the findings of the commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, I have noticed, and I make the statement in all sincerity, that in regard to certain questions, members on both sides of the House are apt to repeat the same arguments. I noticed it and took note of it. I do not wish it to be said that I am committing the same error. Considering the lateness of the hour, and as I understand the question will shortly be put, I shall discard the copious notes I had jotted down. However, I may state that for the reasons above mentioned and for others which I might state, I shall vote against the amendment introduced by the hon. member for St. Anne's.

Mr. JOSEPH DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville.) (Translation.) I apologize to the House for having to take up some of its time at such a late hour. I listened with great interest and care to the speech delivered yesterday by the member for St. Anne's (Mr. Doherty). I am happy to say that, like the whole House, I appreciated his remarks in reference to the hon. Minister of Marine.

The hon. member for St. Anne's has deemed it his duty to publicly acknowledge the honesty of the hon. minister. Possibly he thought it incumbent on him to relieve his party of an obligation incurred, that of making amends for an injury unjustly caused to others.

The hon. minister had surely no need for the certificate of high honourability, which has been thus granted to him ; at the same time, the stand taken by the hon. member for St. Anne's is not the less meritorious, and is evidence on the part of the mover of the amendment of a spirit of fairness, which is creditable to him, and for which I sincerely congratulate him.

That is sufficient compensation to the minister for the attacks directed against him, during last session and this, as well as in the course of this very debate, attacks which have been of such a violent character, that we could not help wondering whether those who directed them were conscious of the part they were playing, and whether the minister was being attacked because of his being Minister of Marine or for some other reason.

The hon. minister had the right to expect an apology from some member of the opposition. True, the hon. member for St. Anne's has not thought fit to go to the point of congratulating the minister on his administration, but I think he could have done so just as well.

Just think what an enormous amount of work the hon. Minister of Marine has taken on himself to accomplish since he came into office ! Appointed in 1906, his first step was to go into the working of his department, so as to put himself in touch with all details of its management. Very soon, however, he realized that such a task was very difficult of accomplishment, on account of the defective system of bookkeeping in use. He then decided to effect a change and to introduce a new and business-like system of bookkeeping. That required several months and entailed a pretty heavy expenditure ; but that expenditure was justified, I think, in view of the benefits derived therefrom.

Shortly after, the Civil Service Commission started its inquiry, one of the findings of which informed us that some wrongdoing had been committed by high officials of the Department of Marine. However, as that report did not mention any one, it was impossible to find out who the guilty officials were. The hon. minister then decided to require on his own account a thorough inquiry, in order to get to the bottom of the whole matter and insure the punishment of all offenders. The inquiry was held and the guilty officials have been punished. The department is to-day on the best possible footing.

Was the hon. minister right in trusting the officials of his department, from the time he took office until the facts were brought out in the course of the Cassels' inquiry. Surely it is unbecoming on the part of hon. members on the other side to find fault with him on that account, considering that the officers in charge when he came into office had all been appointed by the late Conservative administration.

Could the minister be expected to do more than he has done? Appointed, as I have already stated, in 1906, that is three years ago, twenty months of which have been taken up by the work of succeeding sessions, he has been called upon to spend five or six other months in Europe, negociating the Franco-Canadian treaty. In spite of his numerous occupations, the hon. minister has found time to introduce in his department an admirable system of bookkeeping, which ensures a considerable saving. He has, moreover, vigorously prosecuted the great national work of deepening, lighting and providing with buoys the channel of the St. Lawrence. In spite of these enormous undertakings, the hon. minister has time to reform and renew the Montreal harbour commission, and to hold an inquiry which has enabled him to rid his department of a number of people who were not qualified to occupy important public positions.

The above statement of facts warrants me in saying that the hon. Minister of Marine has set himself to accomplishing a tremendous task, and I think he may well be proud for having carried it out in so short a time, by dint of unrelenting energy. The hon. member for St. Ann's might therefore

very well have gone a little further and instead of being content with praising the minister personally, have congratulated him also as to his administrative work.

As regards the amendment submitted to the House, I do not think we should agree to it. No new facts have been brought forward of a nature to warrant our starting a further inquiry into the management of the various departments. Inquiries are expensive, as we all know, and before granting them we should carefully consider that aspect of the question, and grant them only for very good reasons. I for one can see neither in the Cassels' report, neither in the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite anything sufficient to warrant such action on the part of parliament.

As regards the Department of Marine the circumstances were different. The facts brought forward by the Civil Service Commission were such as to render an inquiry without hesitating a single moment, without even waiting that the request be made. That action of the government is an assurance to us that if it had been necessary to institute inquires in regard to the other departments, such inquiries would have been instituted and all the circumstances brought to light, as easily as in the case of the Marine Department.

To my mind, the hon. member for St. Ann's and other hon. gentlemen opposite have not brought forward any arguments warranting such an inquiry. Besides, an amendment such as this one, coming from hon. gentlemen on the other side, is rather a matter for surprise and a subject for laughter, when it is remembered that the state of things revealed by the Cassels' inquiry has been in existence from 1878 to 1896, during the long period of office of the Conservative government; when it is remembered, also, that the Auditor General, in 1886—as stated yesterday by the Minister of Marine—went to the length of notifying the department of the existence of the deplorable state of things then in existence, notwithstanding which these gentlemen never raised their voice in favour of instituting an inquiry. We have, in view of these circumstances, every reason to be surprised at the motion introduced by the hon. member for St. Ann's.

I have faith in the government, and I know they will take necessary measures for the safeguard of the people's interests. They can very well do without the dictates of the opposition when it comes to reforming or setting matters right.

As for the speeches delivered by the members of the opposition, a number of them, while too long, were made up wholly of quotations from the evidence taken in the course of the inquiry and from the report of Mr. Justice Cassels. I cannot see what bearing nor what expediency these speeches can have, when the reading population has been thoroughly posted on the whole matter through the great daily newspapers which have printed that evidence and even Mr. Justice Cassels' report. A considerable saving of time might then have been effected by leaving out such quotations.

The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Crothers) charged the government with carelessness and neglect for not having discovered promptly enough the existing state of things, the outcome of the bad behaviour of the officers of the department of Marine.

To that I answer that the system recognized as bad has been in existence since confederation, as shown in the evidence and in the conclusions of Mr. Justice Cassels. I cannot admit for one moment that the Conservatives, from 1878 to 1896, realized what was going on, without seeking to apply a remedy; otherwise they should be held criminally responsible. Now, if they have failed during all those years in bringing to light the wrong-doing of certain officers of that department, is it surprising that this government should have let eleven or twelve years go by before finding out what was going on and applying a remedy?

The government have done their duty, and I trust they will continue to do so as in the past. By carrying on this inquiry they have shown of what metal they are made and what is their energy; they have shown themselves to be inspired by the purest motives of public interest.

As long as the government is favoured with a government such as this, the people may rest assured that public affairs will be managed in the best possible manner within the range of human power.

Mr. A. LANCTOT (Richelieu). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the various speeches which were delivered yesterday and to-day, in support of the motion introduced by the hon. gentleman from St. Anne's (Mr. Doherty). Of the various reasons put forward by hon. gentlemen who favour this motion, I fail to see a single one warranting its adoption.

In short, the hon. member for St. Anne's proposes by this motion that a general inquiry be carried on regarding all departments, so as to dispel, he says, any cloud of suspicion resting on the management of such departments; he adds that such an inquiry is called for by public opinion, by the whole electorate of this country.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if there rested a cloud of suspicion on the management of the various departments, that cloud has been dispelled and carried away by the wind

which blew on the 26th of October last, and brought about the victory of the present administration. It will be remembered that the Civil Service Commission was appointed on May 8, 1907, and submitted its report on February 28, 1908. In that report some charges against officers of the Marine Department whose names are not given, are mentioned.

On April 6 of the same year, a further commission was appointed at the suggestion of the Hon. Minister of Marine, under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Cassels, to look into some indefinite charges contained in the report of the previous commission, and summed up into an imputation of lack of conscience directed against public servants in the carrying out of their duties, and particularly against officers of the Marine Department.

That commission was issued about seven months previous to the last general elections. The result of the electoral campaign largely hinged on the discussion of that issue, and the people's verdict was that the scope of the inquiry as suggested by the Hon. Minister of Marine was sufficiently wide. The electors of this country took that stand, in spite of the charge preferred by our opponents that the same system of corruption was rampant in all departments. Whereof, I say that this issue has been settled at the last general election. There is no sense in insisting to-day on a further inquiry being carried on as regards the other departments, and in contending that such further inquiry is called for by public opinion.

The hon. gentleman from St. Anne's, in the course of his remarks yesterday, contended that the state of things which has been found in existence in the Department of Marine was to be found in the other departments as well; because the same people who have intercourse with officers of the Department of Marine must have acted in the same way in their dealings with the officers of other departments.

The hon. member for St. Anne's will allow me to ask him this question : he was for many years a judge of the Superior court at Montreal, and with honour to the bench ; would he advise a jury to force an inquiry on a party for the purpose of finding out whether he has committed some fraud, although no specific charge is made against that man ? I am satisfied the hon. gentleman will answer in the negative. Now, the proposition set forth in his motion is identical to the one I have just stated.

Allow me also, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the hon. member for St. Anne's on the courtesy he has shown in his dealings with the Minister of Marine, when he stated that the hon. member for Rouville was an honest and upright man. We had not been accustomed on this side of the House to such expressions on behalf of members of the opposition. In the course of the last two years that I have had the honour to occupy a seat in this House, I have never until the day before yesterday, heard a single kindly word in reference to the hon. Minister of Marine fall from the lips of members on the other side. It was necessary that a judge should come down from the bench and enter the political fray to have it proclaimed in the midst of his political allies in this House and before the country, what all his friends, no doubt, thought in their hearts, but had not had the courage and generosity to state in public. Political partisanship has its exigencies, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of it ; and it is seldom that from the ranks of a party there stands out a man generous enough to state the truth, in spite of party prejudices, and do homage to an opponent whom he has to fight, but whom he cannot help esteeming and admiring. Such is the purport of the hon. gentleman's remarks, and I congratulate him once more on that account.

Mr. Speaker, my intention is not to take up the criticisms of the opposition regarding the management of the Marine department. However, I may be allowed to state that, since the minister holds that important portfolio, he has invariably done his duty. He has accomplished in the interest of shipping and transportation more than any of his predecessors. It is under his rule, for instance, that the building of dredges has been started throughout the country, and particularly at Sorel, in the constituency which I have the honour to represent here.

The deepening of the channel of the St. Lawrence, as was stated yesterday, has had the effect of lowering the rates of ocean insurance. Manufacturers, farmers and shippers have largely benefited thereby, owing to the reduced cost of transportation in connection with the products imported or exported by them.

The policy of the hon. Minister of Marine which makes for the building in our own country of dredges and boats, which used to be imported from abroad, is also worthy of general approval. While deepening the St. Lawrence, lowering the rates of insurance and putting manufacturers, farmers and business men in a position to ship their products to the markets of Europe under more favourable conditions, the hon. minister has also had in mind that other very interesting class, the mechanics. He was anxious that people engaged in the trades should take a hand in forwarding the success of his undertaking; he was anxious of satisfying foreigners and the country as a whole that, within the bounds of the Dominion, within the province of Quebec, within my own constituency, there were men capable of building these dredges, these

boats, used by the Department of Marine; in other words, he was anxious that our craftsmen, particularly those familiar with work of that kind, should be in a position to put their talents to use right here, without having to go abroad for a living.

Such is Mr. Speaker, the showing made by the hon. Minister of Marine. Such is the showing of that utterely incapable and incompetent man, who should resign his portfolio, to please the virtuous member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

As a representative of the province of Quebec, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the hon. minister has always enjoyed the confidence of his fellow-citizens in that province and since he has taken office he has always been trusted and held in high esteem by his English-speaking fellow citizens.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, allow me also to congratulate the hon. minister of Marine on the firm stand he has taken in connection with the dismissal of the men who had been found guilty of wrong-doing in the Cassels' inquiry.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that it is not without some misgivings that a man of fine feelings, such as the hon. Minister of Marine, deprived of their means of living heads of families, who, I am satisfied, were not the greatest sinners. But it was necessary that severity should be shown; it was necessary that the good should be separated from the bad. The hon. minister has not hesitated one moment in doing his duty.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to state my satisfaction, as representative of the county of Richelieu, at being in a position to state in this House and before the people of Canada that the searching inquiry held on the extensive and multifarious works carried on at Sorel has not brought out any facts of a nature to discredit in any way, any of the officers or honest men employed at Sorel, and that the honour of the county of Richelieu has not thereby suffered the least injury.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I would not have taken part in the debate, particularly in view of the very exhaustive manner in which the questions of interest in the discussion have been referred to on both sides of the House, if it were not for the fact that I feel that if I were not to make some observations, I might allow a grave injustice to be done to the gentleman who was the representative of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the constituency which I have the honour to represent and upon whom a very unfair attack was made by one of the gentlemen who spoke from the other side of the House. I refer to Mr. F. J. Harding, who has been, for a good many years, agent for the department in the city of St. John. I thought that perhaps the House would pardon me for having felt it necessary to rise in order to do justice to that gentleman. I find, in the remarks which the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) made, that he referred in terms of condemnation to the government because we had retired Mr. Harding from the service and given him a superannuation allowance. The hon. member for North Ontario, in referring to Mr. Harding, said:

> The next official, Harding, is superannuated, although, according to the evidence and the report, he had financial transactions with corporations dealing with the department, and was concerned with the destruction of papers of the department and with false entries made in books, in order to protect him.

In justice to that gentleman I desire to say that there is not a shadow of foundation for the statement made by the hon. member for North Ontario. I cannot but express my surprise, that, when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was addressing this House, knowing the grave injustice which had been done to that gentleman, a gentleman who is well known to the hon. member for North Toronto, a gentleman whose father before him was well known to the hon. member, because both he and his son were under him when he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and having knowledge of the general character of that gentleman and of the faithful manner in which he has performed the duties devolving upon representatives of the Marine Department in the city of St. John, should not have felt it incumbent upon himself to do a small measure of justice to Mr. Harding by calling attention to the evidence and pointing out that the hon. member for North Ontario was entirely mistaken in the references which he made to Mr. Harding. It would have been but a simple act of justice on the part of that hon. gentleman and, coming from him as one of the leading members upon the opposition side, would have carried great weight in this country and would have afforded some measure of satisfaction to the friends and relatives of the gentleman who was so unjustly attacked by the hon. member for North Ontario. As far as Mr. Harding is concerned, the government has superannuated him because the evidence failed entirely to show that he had been guilty of any wrong-doing or of any corrupt act. Mr. Justice Cassels, in his findings, expressly reports that there has been no corrupt act proved against Mr. Harding. The one thing that was found against him was that he had the misfortune to be poor. For a good many years he had been in the habit of borrowing money from some gentlemen who had been for a number of years supplying goods to the department, which

moneys he had from time to time returned. Even before any of these gentlemen had business with the department he was in the habit of obtaining loans from them. But, in so far as the evidence shows, Mr. Harding always faithfully and honestly discharged the public duties which he owed to the department. Unfortunately, he had been stricken with paralysis a few months before the investigation took place. He was not able to give his evidence and because of his very severe affliction my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, has felt it in the public interest to retire him from the public service, but he has retired him honourably. He goes out from the public service without a stain upon his character and he receives the superannuation which he is entitled to by law.

With regard to the deputy minister, he also has been superannuated. I do not wish to add anything to what has been said in regard to him, but I would say to my hon. friend from North Ontario, if he were in his place, that if he searches the evidence from beginning to end, while he may find that Colonel Gourdeau has at times been lacking in discretion, or may not have been as firm as he should have been in the interests of the department, the evidence fails to disclose any corrupt act on the part of Colonel Gourdeau; it fails to disclose that he at any time profited by anything that was done by the different people referred to in the report, and, therefore, it seems to me, that it was not improper, in view of the forty years service which Colonel Gourdeau had rendered to the department and the country that he should be retired with a superannuation allowance. I, as one member of the government, am prepared to take the full responsibility for the superannuation of these two officials. In addition, having made these remarks and done, as far as Mr. Harding was concerned, the justice, which was due to him, of defending him from the attack which was made upon him, perhaps, while I am on my feet, it might be proper for me to give reasons why I think this amendment which the hon. member for Montreal, St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) has moved should not commend itself to the judgment of this House. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) referred in most eulogistic terms to the observations which the hon. member for St. Anne addressed the House in support of the resolution, and a good many compliments have been showered upon that hon. gentleman by other gentlemen who have addressed the House. With regard to the observations of my hon. friend I do not differ at all in my appreciation of his remarks, but I am not prepared to give to my hon. friend that credit which I would like to give him for the resolution which he has presented and for which he asks the support of the members of this House. It does seem to me that when an hon. gentleman presents a resolution to the House he should be sure that the statements which are made in it are accurate. He ought to be sure that he is calling upon the members of the House to support statements which they can justify afterwards and which are supported by evidence sufficiently strong to justify their actions in that regard. My hon. friend in his resolution calls upon this House to ask for an investigation into the other great spending departments of the government. And what does my hon. friend by this resolution say? He says:

> The report of the commission affords ground for the conviction that similar methods prevail in other great spending departments.

In other words, that the report of the commission affords ground for the conviction that there is official negligence ; there is wastefulness, and there is corrupt dealing. That is what he says by this resolution and what he asks this House to say. Let me ask him what there is in the report to justify a statement of that character? He may read the report from beginning to end and he will not find any suggestion of any wrongdoing upon the part of any officials of any other department of the government. Therefore, my hon. friend is asking the House to affirm something which upon its face is absolutely without foundation, and may I say without offence to my hon. friend, is absolutely false. Surely when my hon. friend prepared the resolution he should have taken pains to examine the report and see if he would be justified in asking the House to affirm the statements made there, which I have said are absolutely without foundation. Then by this resolution he makes the statement to this House that the commission of 1907 simply made inquiry into the workings of one department at Ottawa. As my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has stated, it is absolutely clear that the commission must have made inquiry into the Public Works Department, into the Customs Department and into the Military Department, because at page 42 you will find what they have to say of the Department of Public Works, and at page 37 what they have to say of the Militia Department, and also in another place as to the Customs Department. It is true that they did not go as fully into the departments as they might have gone if they had had a longer time, if they had had years to make an inquiry, because then they might have gone to all parts of the country and made inquiry as to all transactions between the public and the various officials of the different departments of the government. The remarks which they make with regard to the Public Works Department and with regard to the Customs and Post Office Departments I think are sufficient to satisfy

this House that if the commissioners had seen any evidence of wrong-doing in any one of those departments they would have fully set out what they had discovered in their report. That they have not done, and the fact that although they made inquiry into those departments they make no suggestion of having discovered anything wrong ought to be sufficient evidence that they did not observe there was anything wrong or anything that should be reported to His Excellency the Governor General. Therefore, it seems to me that my hon. friend in making the statement that the commission had only made incidental inquiry into one department, states something which is absolutely without foundation, and is asking this House to affirm something which is not only without proof, but which is absolutely contradictory to the proof as we have it in the Civil Service Commission and the report made by Mr. Justice Cassels.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the hon. gentleman under the impression that the word 'only' is in the resolution in the sense that only one department was investigated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is absolutely clear, I think:

> The commission, in the course of their investigation into the condition of the Civil Service, having made incidental inqury into the workings of one department at Ottawa——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But not only one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is right, it does not say 'only one,' but surely if any meaning can be given to language, that is intended to convey the meaning that there was inquiry into only one of the departments and the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on that side have advanced the argument that there was no inquiry except into one of the departments, and the same meaning is to be taken from the resolution of my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman in his argument said that because irregularities had been shown in the Department of Marine and Fisheries it was to be presumed that there would be irregularities and wrong-doing in the other departments Sir, in considering the foundation for that inference, we should bear in mind this fact that the only wrong-doing of any very great moment that will be discovered in reading the report, took place in the city of Quebec where the trusted agent of the department was a gentleman who had not been appointed by this administration, but who had received his early training not under any minister who was at any time a member of this administration; that agent had received his training under previous governments and was for a number of years under the control of my hon. friend the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I do not say there was anything in the course of the administration of the department which came to his knowledge which would account for the conduct of that official, but we must bear in mind that he had been for a lifetime in the department. He has now reached the age of 70 years and upwards and it is not reasonable to suppose that this practice of taking commissions, this practice of making advances to the people who delivered supplies and did work for the department has been indulged in only of late years. We may fairly assume that he had been doing this for a great many years. Unfortunately Mr. Justice Cassels, although he was in no way limited by the order in council, did not feel that he could go back beyond 1904, that is to say beyond the administration of the last three or four years. If he had been able to go back 15 or 20 years he might have found—I will not say he would have found—that Mr. Gregory, the agent at Quebec, had been pursuing the same practices for a great many years. In the other departments, in my department for instance, there are many young men. I have a deputy who was appointed in recent years, who came in there bringing new blood and new life into the department and who is vigilant, I believe, in the discharge of the duties which pertain to his position. We have in this country resident engineers, many of them young men, active young men, ambitious young men, ambitious to serve their country and to rise to positions of responsibility and influence in connection with the work of the department. They are the men who are engaged in hiring labourers, in buying supplies, in purchasing materials for the different works we are carrying on. Because the gentleman who had charge of the agency in Quebec has been guilty of wrong-doing, has allowed excessive charges to be made against the department and has received commissions from those having dealings with the department, is it a fair matter of inference that my deputy minister and the resident engineers of my department in different sections of the country would be guilty of wrong-doing also? It is an inference which my hon. friend cannot draw and which no person can be justified in drawing. Let me say that I would have no objection myself to the very fullest investigation being made in my department by the commission. If any hon. member of this House has asked for a paper or an account in connection with my department since I have been minister he has had the fullest opportunity of having access to the documents. We have a Committee on Public Accounts in which is vested the duty of examining into all the expenditures of the different departments and whenever any question comes up with reference to an account it is quite open to that committee to call witnesses as to the reasonableness of the prices which have

been charged, and if there have been excessive charges witnesses can also be called to show whether there has been any corrupt or improper conduct in connection with the purchase of those supplies. I have in my mind one or two cases in which it has been shown that excessive charges have been made; but it is quite open to any hon. member of the Public Accounts Committee, whether in the majority or the minority, to summon witnesses before it, take their evidence under oath, and have a full and complete investigation. But, Sir, is it to be said, with this Committee on Public Accounts before which there is every opportunity for the fullest investigation, and without any charge of any kind being made against any department of the government, that a commission is to be appointed to go into the expenditures of every department and into the conduct of all the officials of this government, to turn the departments inside out, in order to ascertain — what? Not the truth of any charges that are made against the government or against various officials; but to find out whether they are honest men or not— to find out whether there is anything wrong in the departments or not. You know, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of the commission which we have had has amounted to upwards of $50,000. Its investigations took in Montreal, Quebec, Prescott, Halifax, St. John and Ottawa. If that investigation had been carried to the west, if it had taken in British Columbia, its cost would probably have been double what it has been. There are thirteen different departments of the government. If you even multiply the cost of the investigation which has already been held by thirteen, you will find the expenditure running to three-quarters of a million dollars. Suppose my department were to be investigated by a commission, with a judge, a registrar, stenographers and lawyers in attendance, if they made a full investigation they would not limit their inquiries to Montreal, Quebec, Prescott, Halifax, St. John and Ottawa; but they would have to go to Toronto and Hamilton, to Kingston, to all the towns in which public works had been carried on—to Winnipeg and Edmonton and Prince Albert, to Vancouver and Victoria and New Westminster, away up to the Fraser river and on to the Yukon, in order thoroughly to investigate the working of my department. They would have hundreds and thousands of officials to examine as well as people doing work for or furnishing supplies to the department. And if a commission were appointed, and did not take in all sections of this country in its inquiry; if, instead of being limited to one year, it did not go back at all events as far as 1896, when this government came into power, it would be charged by the other side that it was only a limited and partial inquiry. I venture to say that a million dollars would not cover the expense of such an investigation as that proposed by the hon. member for St. Anne; and with what purpose? In order to determine whether we are able efficiently to carry on the affairs of our departments or not; in order to determine whether or not our officials are honest—whether or not there has been any wrong-doing in the various departments; and without the slightest tittle of evidence which can warrant the suspicion that there is any wrong-doing of any kind or description. What has the investigation before Mr. Justice Cassels disclosed? So far as the city of St. John is concerned, it has not disclosed, after the most full and complete investigation; after Mr. Watson, the counsel, and the gentleman associated with him went around among the different merchants supplying goods to the department and examined their books and accounts so that they could compare the prices paid by the government with the prices paid by other parties —they were not able to show that in one single instance any of the merchants in the city of St. John had charged one dollar beyond the fair value of the goods. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), in my absence this afternoon, asked whether the government was going to prosecute among other people the McAvitys of St. John. Let me say to my hon. friend that if he reads the evidence given before Mr. Justice Cassels from beginning to end, he will not find that the McAvitys charged one cent beyond the reasonable and fair price of the goods they delivered to the department; and, more than that, he will not find that the McAvitys were shown by the evidence to have ever given a gift of any kind or description to any one of the officials of the department. And yet my hon. friend asks the Prime Minister, in a manner as insulting as a question could be put by one hon. member of this House to another—looking towards the Prime Minister, and departing from the parliamentary practice of addressing the Speaker, he said: 'Why don't you prosecute those people who robbed the people of this country? Is it because you shared in'— and then my hon. friend was stopped by the Speaker because he was proceeding in an unparliamentary way, and then he said: 'Because you shared in it for party purposes?' Let me say in asking that question, so far as the McAvitys of St. John are concerned, that, my hon. friend has done a wrong and an injustice to gentlemen of the highest reputation and integrity —men who stand just as high in the commercial world as any business firm in the Dominion of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister allow me to ask him a question? Did George McAvity, who received $35,933 from Mr. Gershon S. Mayes, keep that money in his pocket, or did he hand it over to the Liberal association for party purposes?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know of any amount which Mr. George McAvity received from Mr. Gershon S. Mayes, nor do I know of any amount that Mr. George McAvity may have contributed for party purposes. My hon. friend professes to have a knowledge of that kind. If he has, he might acquaint the House with his knowledge. My hon. friend from North Toronto was not referring, I understand, to the alleged incident between Mr. McAvity and Mr. Mayes, but was referring to gifts alleged to have been made by these parties to officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department. I have already referred in this House to the matter about which my hon. friend asks, and if the matter is brought up in such a way that it can be discussed, I shall be ready at all times to discuss it; but of course this is not the proper and suitable time to do so. It does seem to me that when my hon. friend from St. Anne puts before this House the statement that there is ground for suspicion that the other departments of government have been wrongly administered, that there has been—to use the words of the resolution—official negligence, wastefulness and corrupt dealing in the departments,—let me say to my hon. friend that if he has any suspicion of that character, it is due to himself as an hon. member of this House that he should acquaint this House with the grounds of his suspicion. If he has any suspicion against any individual official in my department, it is his duty to acquaint me and the public with the name of that official. And let me say to my hon. friend if he has any suspicion that I, as Minister of Public Works, am improperly discharging the duties of my office, or have been guilty of negligence or wrong-doing of any kind, it is the part of a man of courage to come forward and make his charge; and, so far as I am concerned, and so far as any member of this government is concerned, I am satisfied that if any hon. member will take the responsibility of rising in his place and charging any one of us with maladministration of the affairs of our departments, we shall be only too willing and happy to afford to him every opportunity of having a full and complete investigation. But that is a different thing from going on a fishing expedition in order to see whether we are properly administering our departments or not.

One word in conclusion. I want to refer to what I think is going to be the beneficial results of the investigation before Mr. Justice Cassels. Let me say that that was not an investigation induced by hon. gentlemen opposite, but instituted by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself on his own initiative. When the report of the Civil Service Commission was brought down, it contained certain reflections on certain officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department; and when my hon. friend saw that the commissioners had not gone as far as they might have, he, out of regard for the proper administration of his department, asked His Excellency to appoint a Royal Commission to complete the work which the Civil Service Commissioners had not carried to a successful conclusion, and make a thorough investigation. What has been the result of that Royal Commission? It has been to show that practically all the evils which Mr. Justice Cassels complains of have resulted from the patronage system which has been in force ever since confederation.

Mr. DANIELS. The hon. minister has said that the commission was a Royal Commission. I understood that it was a departmental commission appointed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it was a royal commission. I do not know that there is much difference between the two.

Mr. BARR. Oh, yes, there is.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is none as regards the power of taking evidence under oath and the summoning of witnesses.

Mr. BARR. Surely the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could tell us which it was?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was a royal commission instituted under the statutes. The statute provides that investigations of this kind may be made under it, and these investigations are called royal because the appointments have to be made under an order passed by the King or his representative.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A royal commission simply means a commission issued by His Majesty, or with his authority, for the investigation of certain matters. This commission was issued under the statute, in His Majesty's name, to Mr. Justice Cassels. It has been declared by Mr. Justice Cassels that the evils complained of are the result of the patronage system which was introduced, not by this government, but by the first government which held power after confederation, and which has been continued ever since. I am not going into the merits or demerits of the system of having a certain number of prominent merchants and manufacturers in each community, whose name might be kept on file, and from whom purchases might be made after competition. There is no doubt

that there was a patronage list and that the prices were asked only from the few on that list, and there is no doubt that such a system is always likely to lead to confusion. But what has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries done? He has abandoned the patronage list. In my department, which is another great spending department, the patronage list has also been abolished. My hon. colleague the Minister of Militia, as I have understood, never had a patronage list in his department. Most of the supplies there are obtained by tender. I have found in my own department great benefit arising from asking for tenders and giving everybody an opportunity to tender. One great advantage, of course, is that it leaves no chance for favouritism, because the contract is given to the lowest tenderer. We have made a distinct move in the way of reform by doing away with the patronage list. When the furnishing of supplies is open to public competition, there will be no motive for any one to make gifts to certain officials in order to secure their influence or favour. In my own department I have realized, even in the case of smaller articles, where the amount involved was not very large, the great advantage of introducing tender and competition. What the country wants us to do is to profit by the examination which has taken place into the affairs of the Marine and Fisheries Department. The country does not ask that we should spend three quarter of a million or a million dollars on further investigations into departments with respect to which there is no ground for suspicion. What the people expect is that we should cary on the business of the different departments in an efficient and prudent manner. If we do that the country will continue to give us its confidence, and if we fail to do it then we shall have to meet public condemnation. I apologize for having taken up so much time, but I felt it was my duty to refer briefly to what I think are reasons why this amendment should not be carried. My hon. friend has taken a course which is calculated to induce every member of this House, who has confidence in the government, to refuse to vote for his amendment. He has not chosen to adopt a course which would enable an amendment to be made to his motion, but has moved it at a time when it must be regarded as a motion of want of confidence, and has asked the House to say that it has no confidence in my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, even when the hon. member for St. Anne's (Mr. Doherty) himself is obliged to admit that he has nothing whatever to say impeaching the integrity of my hon. colleague. but that, on the contrary, my colleague has done everything he could to secure the efficient administration of his department.

I oppose this resolution on two grounds. First, because it is a motion of want of confidence, and second because it is based on statements without foundation and contrary to evidence contained in the Civil Service report, and the report of Mr. Justice Cassels, and I appeal to the House with confidence to reject the amendment moved by the hon. member for St. Anne's division (Mr. Doherty.).

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). I had no intention of speaking, and would not have spoken at this hour of the night had not the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) taken the floor. With the consent and approval of my leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) I suggested to the whip of the government side that, after the two leaders had spoken, we should take the vote. Again, after the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) had spoken I made the same proposition. This was not accepted. I thought the government were anxious to get supply and concurrence to-night. But, after several speakers from that side not being replied to from this, the Minister of Public Works having got up and occupied three quarters of an hour, I think it my duty to draw his attention to some facts that have an important bearing on this case. I will not take my facts from the report of Mr. Justice Cassels, but from the report of the Auditor General, and I think those facts should convince the hon. minister that there is need of an investigation. I fully concur in the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Ste. Anne's (Mr. Doherty), and I agree with the language used by that hon. gentleman in his speech as quoted by the hon. minister, except that those words are not strong enough to properly characterize and duly condemn the reckless manner in which the government has expended the money of the people of this country. In 1896, the public debt was something over $258,000,000. In 1909, it is $308,000,000, an increase of $50,000,000 under this government. In 1896, the estimates of the Conservative government amounted to $43,000,000. Sir Richard Cartwright said this expenditure was outrageous. And the present Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) promised the people that if they put him in power he would reduce the expenditure by two, three or four millions, that he would surround himself with business men and conduct business on business principles. The Minister of Public Works rises to-night and tells us that the patronage system was in existence under the previous government. But how can he justify himself by the acts of the previous government when the Prime Minister promised to make such changes as would greatly reduce the expenditure? As

a matter of fact the expenditure is increasing until the estimates last year amounted to $129,000,000, and the supplementary estimates which have just been passed amount to $3,000,000 more, making a total estimated expenditure of $132,000,000, or almost $90,000,000 increase over the Conservative government. If we take the increase of expenditure and the addition to the public debt, we find a total of $140,000,000 of increase under this government instead of the promised reduction of two, three or four millions.

Out of this $132,000,000 which they asked for on account of last year's expenditure, I admit that a part is uncontrollable. The statutory expenditures amount to $26,000,000. Of course, we had statutory expenditures in our $43,000,000. Then, there is about $14,000,000 of salaries and other uncontrollable expenses. This would make a total of $40,000,000, leaving a controllable expenditure of $92,000,000. And where has that money gone? I say that every dollar of that wants investigating. If my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) will take the Auditor General's Report—and I wish him to follow me, for I am going to give him page and date for everything—and if he will turn to page V—52, he will find that his men in Montreal purchased 391 feet of five-inch belting and paid an average of $2.12 a foot for it. The invoice came to $924. They got a discount of 10 per cent, leaving $831 of the public money paid for that belting.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was that Lymburner?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Yes, if they had gone to any manufacturer, they could have got the same belting for $293. So, the middleman made a profit of $538. When I was a boy and went to school the schoolmaster used to propound this question: If a herring and a-half cost a penny half-penny, how many can you get for a shilling? I will ask the Minister of Public Works that question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Are you the schoolmaster? The question is too much for me, at this time of night.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Then, let me ask the minister to work out this: If on an expenditure by this government of $831, the middleman makes a profit of $538, how much has been made by the middlemen out of the controllable expense of $92,000,000? That can be worked out by the rule of three—every school boy can do it. If the minister will figure it out, he will find, at this proportion, the middlemen got a rake-off of $59,000,000. Now, if the hon. gentleman will turn to the Auditor General's report, page O—21, he will find that they went to a friend of his in St. John, having some little repairs to do, and they hired from this friend of the minister's two cross-cut saws for 100 days at 10 cents a day each, a total of $20. If they had stepped into any hardware store, they could have bought those saws for $7, but they paid $20 for the use of them. And they paid the same man, Mr. Daniel McLaughlin, $24 for the hire of three planking screws that they could buy for $4.50 each. They paid $5 for the rent of a grind-stone, and they could buy the grind-stone at one cent a pound and the frame for $3.50. They paid this man $50 for the rent of tools that they could have bought for $17 and could have owned the tools when they were through. On this, the middleman got a rake-off of $33. On this basis, how much rake-off did the middlemen get on the controllable expenditure of $92,000,000? They got $60,763,000. Now, if the minister will return to page V—53, he will find the record of purchases made for the repair of some buildings in Montreal. This was not let by tender, but they went to a political friend, Mr. Marchand, and they paid him for 11,000 feet of lumber, ash, basswood and elm, a total of $997. They paid $150 a thousand for ash, and $100 a thousand for basswood—and you can buy basswood anywhere for $28 a thousand. The average paid for ash, elm and basswood was $90 a thousand, and it can be purchased anywhere at an average of $35 a thousand. The middleman got a rake-off there of $55 a thousand. On that deal of $977 there was a rake-off of $607 to the middleman; what would be the rake-off on $92,000,000? The middleman would make out of that expense $57,000,000 of the people's money, if that rule applied as it applies everywhere else. After they got the building completed they went to a Mr. Thibault and got him to put in a floor upstairs, of hardwood, 216 squares, and they paid him $16 a square, amounting to $3,456; for birch flooring, 40 squares at $16 a square, amounting to $636.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the square?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I am surprised that my hon. friend, being Minister of Public Works, does not know what a square is. Any schoolboy knows what a square is, it is 10 feet each way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I must confess I did not know that.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Then you are not fit to be Minister of Public Works. And yet he is building all over the country. He will pay $16 a square when it is only worth $7. I went home on Saturday, and went to a firm of the largest lumber merchants, Mitchell & Wilson, and I said to them: What will you put me in squares for, hardwood lumber, maple or birch, and they said they would do it for $7 per square, or for red beech, at $6.50 per square. Yet the minister paid $16 to a political friend in Montreal. He paid for 256 squares $4,090. If he had called for tenders he could have got it done for $7 a square. The middleman made there a rake-off of $2,300. At

that rate how much have they made on $92,000,000 of controllable expenditure? In V—103, the minister wanted some basswood lumber for his ships and he went over to Hull, to a Mr. Desrosiers, and got 3,010 feet of basswood lumber, for which he paid $60 a thousand, and he could have purchased it for $18 to $25 a thousand. The Minister of Railways knows something about the quantity they consume in the railway shops, where they buy the best. But here the Minister of Public Works pays $60 a thousand for the same goods. On that $180 worth, which he could have bought for $75, there was a rake-off to the middleman of $105. At that rate how much did the middleman make on $92,000,000? $54,000,000. In every case it works out between $50,000,000 or $60,000,000. I could cite a hundred cases like that all through the Auditor General's Report. No wonder they do not want an investigation. But the country does want an investigation into the accounts for the last 12 years, in every department, and this is one sample of many of them. I want to refer now to the cost of the steamers. In 1896 the government had nine steamers, named 'Aberdeen,' 'Alert,' 'Druid,' 'Le Canadian,' 'Lansdowne,' 'Newfield,' 'Quadra,' 'Sir James Douglas' and the 'Stanley.' The government to-day have nine also, but they have replaced some of the old ones with larger ones. In 1896, $150,000 was the entire cost for these nine steamers. To-day the government have nine steamers, the 'Aberdeen,' the 'Champlain,' the 'Druid,' the 'Lady Laurier,' the 'Lansdowne,' the 'Minto,' the 'Montcalm,' the 'Quadra' and the 'Stanley,' and these nine steamers cost last year $696,000, or an increase of $519,000. How has all that money been spent? Here is a sample. In 1896 they paid the salaries of the captains and crews of these steamers, amounting altogether to $138,000. They paid for provisions to feed them, $77,000. Now the provisioning of the 'Aberdeen,' as a sample, cost $13,059, or $32.50 per month per man the year round, allowing the steamer had a full crew for a full year. They paid $32.50 per month just to feed the men on that boat, and the government furnished besides the cooks, the waiters, crockery and everything else. When I brought this matter up a few years ago my hon. friend promised me that he would make a change, and have the captain and steward board the men by the day. He did so, and how much did he save? On the 'Montcalm' he paid the captain, or steward, 50 cents a day for the men, and the cost for that steamer amounted to $8,693, or $16 per month. But where the patronage system prevailed they paid their customers at the rate of $10 a barrel for apples for one of the steamers, and everything else in the same proportion. When the steward boarded the men and purchased the provisions, it cost the government $16 per month, whereas, when the provisions were furnished on the patronage system it cost $30 to $32.50 per month. Is not that squandering the people's money? If the minister will turn up the Auditor General's Report, page O—16, he will find why it cost so much. On the 'Lady Laurier' the board was $30 per month.

John Tobin & Co., Halifax: Apollo water, one case, $9; condensed cream, 5 cases at $4.60; condensed milk, 5 cases at $5.20; herring, 4½ barrels at $2.50; jam, &c., $6.60; pork, 2 barrels at $22; Radnor water, 8 cases splits at $8.38; 7 cases pints at $9.50; shad, one half barrel, $12.50.

That is the way they fed the men on the 'Lady Laurier,' and that is why it cost so much. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page O—25, steamer 'Minto,' he will find that Louis Marois at Quebec was paid $10 for a barrel of apples, and there are other items in keeping—turkeys at $3.75 each and so on. Ten dollars for a barrel of apples when they were $2.50 and $3 in Ottawa. Then there is another case in which they helped a political friend very nicely to which I wish to refer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. It will be carried when I get through, and not a moment sooner. Here is J. J. Yorston, Pictou, for hauling up the steamer 'Minto' on two occasions, 1,451 tons at 20 cents, $580; laying on ways, 29 days, $4,207.90. If my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would go to Kingston dry docks or to any other dry dock in the country and have this boat hauled up would he pay half that amount for having it done? I have made up a statement here. In 1896 the cost to the country for the uniforms of the men on the nine steamers that the Conservative government controlled was $150. What does it cost to-day? The government are not satisfied to give each man a cap for a uniform, but they clothe every man from top to bottom. The total cost for uniforms last year was $14,500, as compared with $150 in 1896. Let me read you a few items of expenditure for uniforms for the men employed on these boats. They did not buy the uniforms for the men on all the boats from the same firm, but they travelled all over the country from Halifax to Quebec and they went to different firms for the supplies for each boat. To some of their friends they went two or three times. We pay the captain, the engineers and the men good wages and, under those circumstances, why do they not furnish their own uniforms? Let us take the case of the 'Montcalm:'

8 uniforms at..	$25
10 "	21
3 dress suits at..	45

Suits fit for members of parliament. They cost $135.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I will give the minister something to laugh at before I get through.

41 blue jumpers at..	$3 50
41 " pants at..	3 50
41 " collars at..	0 35
41 white dickies at..	1 00
41 white duck suits at..	2 50
41 sweaters at..	2 75

Then they go across the road to another gentleman and they buy $301 worth from him, which, with $1,114.50, makes $1,415 in all for uniforms for the officers and crew of the 'Montcalm.'

An hon. MEMBER. What is the rate by the rule of three?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. If the rule of three were applied to that we should not furnish anything. The men in our employ get good wages and they have a right to furnish everything they require to wear. I will give you another example. I want to ask the minister how much mud this expenditure took out of the ship channel? The money is charged to the ship channel. He will find these accounts in the Auditor General's Report at page O—163:

7 ladies blouses at $13.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I am surprised that the right hon. Prime Minister can laugh at that. He is the trustee of the people of this country, and yet he will allow one of his ministers to put his hand in the public chest and spend money like this.

1 ladies cloak..	$25
8 ladies costumes, each..	30

The total of these accounts is $744. I would like the right hon. Prime Minister to apply the rule of three to that. If one suit will move 20 yards out of the ship channel, how much will these eight costumes, which he has paid $30 apiece for, move? Then we have another which is worse than that, and the Minister of Public Works will say that there is no necessity for an investigation.

An hon. MEMBER. Who were the ladies?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I do not know. I will put these facts on record some day before the session is over. These hon. gentlemen had a political friend at Toronto and he had to have a pull:

63-5-12ths doz. black neckerchiefs... ..	$686 90
18 doz. petty officer's badges..	34 50
31 doz. badges..	57 18
100 gross Canadian gilt buttons..	613 10
20 yds. 1¼ gold wire navy lace..	46 13
400 yds. ⅞th gold wire navy lace.. ..	271 70
300 pairs officer's shoulder straps.. ..	109 50
25 pairs commanding shoulder straps.	17 74
24 doz. officer's cap badges..	$385 44
119-11-12th doz. cap ribbons..	189 68

Mr. EMMERSON. Who says Canada has not spent anything for a navy?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The duty on these articles was $456, the freight $18 and two cases $9, making $2,896 of the people's money that might as well have been thrown into the river. Why should we buy 52 dozen neck handkerchiefs, I ask the Minister of Public Works? I have given him the date and the page in the Auditor General's Report. In the other departments he will find the same story. All of these items make up a total of from $51,000,000 to $60,000,000 that has gone to the middle man for which the country has received no benefit. Yet we are told that in that department there is no need of an investigation. The Prime Minister laughed so hard that he did not hear what I read to-night, but I ask why we bought eight ladies costumes at $30 each which are charged to the ship channel. Does that need investigation? Was that brought before Judge Cassels? I want my hon. friend to ask his three officials in Montreal who certified that account for $831 why they did so, when they could have bought the goods for $209.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have already asked them.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I want to know where the $531 went if it did not go to the political supporters of my hon. friend for campaign purposes? Why was $100 a thousand feet paid for basswood and $150 for ash. Gentlemen opposite who will vote against this motion know in their inmost hearts that $1,000 is nearly four prices for that timber. They will vote for anything. I think I have said enough to convince the hardest conscience that it is the duty of this government to grant an inquiry into this loss to the country, which is really an increase in the national debt. Why should the government pay $10 for the rent of two bucksaws that they could buy for $7?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought they were cross-cut saws.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The minister should know that he can buy them in any hardware store for 50 cent a foot.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They cost more than that.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. They do not cost more than that; I have sold many of them. For these clamp screws to hold a plank on a vessel when it is being spiked the government paid $8 a day although you can buy the whole outfit for $3.50. Who got the rake-off there? I could cite many similar instances, but I think I have adduced enough to show that the middleman receives from $51,000,000 to $60,000,000 out

of the controllable expenditure of $92,000,000. The members of this House should certainly vote for the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Ste. Anne (Mr. Doherty).

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). At this early hour in the morning I shall not detain the House at any length. I would not add anything to the debate but I think it is due to my colleague who represents the province of Quebec in the House, that I should say a word not in his defence, because he needs no defence, but in justification of the attitude taken by the Liberal party which is being assailed through him to-day. I was pleased to hear my old friend from Ste. Anne (Mr. Doherty) speak yesterday. I was not surprised at the tone which he adopted in moving his amendment. I have known him for many years. I am well aware that he is above all things an honourable gentleman. I know that he possesses a judicial mind and I believe that he is unbiased by party politics. Thanks to the hon. member for Ste. Anne the cloud has lifted and we know, the country knows and the House knows that the hon. Minister of Marine is an honest man. Under ordinary circumstances, I would not mention the fact, nobody would take notice of it; I suppose a man's first duty to himself and to his country as a public man is to be of sterling honesty. However, we have heard so much for two or three years with reference to the honesty and integrity of the minister that it is refreshing indeed to hear a man of the position of the hon. member for Ste. Anne declaring that in his opinion the hon. Minister of Marine is indeed an honest man. Parliament, as you well know, is not a school for mutual admiration. But as this is probably the closing chapter of a very sad story, may I say a word about the hon. gentleman who has represented Rouville since 1891? He sat from 1891 to 1896 on the opposition benches. As private member for Rouville, a county which in the past has always elected men of ability, he enjoyed the esteem of all his fellow members in the House. He was highly esteemed and respected when in 1896 he was elected deputy speaker and later speaker of the House of Commons. It will be remembered by the older members that as speaker of the House he adorned the chair which you, Sir, occupy. He again enjoyed the respect and esteem of the House when later on he was called by the Prime Minister to fill an important position as Minister of Inland Revenue. He certainly possessed not only the esteem and respect of both sides of the House but also the confidence of all.

We all know that this man who has been branded before the country as a criminal and against whose character insinuations of the basest kind have been made, fought, as Minister of Inland Revenue, not a lonely battle, but a manly battle indeed against the trusts. I contend that at that time he possessed the full confidence of both sides of this House. Suddenly, he was called to fill the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and then the onslaught against him began. I am not at all surprised that the onslaught was made against one member of the Reform government two years ago. The Conservative party had to find some one in the Liberal party as a scapegoat for the approaching elections. History only repeats itself. In 1900, after four years of Liberal rule, finding nothing against the Liberal policy, realizing on the contrary, that this country had been prosperous in spite of themselves, hon. gentlemen opposite had no other war cry but that of corruption to raise against the Liberal party. The cry then was directed against the hon. member who sits to-day as the representative of the county of Brandon. The country was filled with posters representing that hon. gentleman, who was then among the most prominent members of the Liberal Cabinet, as having acted dishonestly in his administration of the then newly-discovered Yukon district. You remember, Mr. Speaker, the battle he fought in the Northwest against Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper on that very question. The elections of 1900 were not fought on the fiscal policy of the Liberal party or on any of the principles which divided the two parties; but they were fought on loud accusations of graft. It was the same with the elections of 1904. Then rumours were afloat that some members of the Liberal party were to be brought not merely before the bar of public opinion, but before the bar of the criminal courts of justice. During the last campaign the accusations were again repeated, and again a scapegoat had to be found. Unfortunately, circumstances have helped our hon. friends on the other side of the House in their campaign of defamation. We all know that important additions were made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries; it had become a great spending department. The minister who had that department in charge, the late Hon. Raymond Prefontaine, had died suddenly in Paris and his remains had been brought back to Canada. My hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) had to assume the direction of that department; and, Sir, as soon as the session opened, charges were hurled against the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Insinuations were made, not against the living minister, but against the dead minister, both in the press and on the platform; but there was such a protest from every section of the country, even from Conservatives themselves, that immediately the charges against the dead minister ceased, and they were directed against my hon. friend. Everybody will admit that he assumed a noble attitude

under these conditions. The elections were fast approaching, and on the eve of last session a commission had been appointed to investigate, not the administration of the departments, but the status of the Civil Service. We had heard in this House and out of this House, that the Civil Service of this country was underpaid, and that the work was not well apportioned among the employees of the various departments, and that commission was appointed by this government to investigate the two above mentioned facts. Three independent gentlemen were appointed, and they reported to this parliament generally on the status of the Civil Service, but as they investigated the Department of Marine and Fisheries, they found what they thought to be very serious irregularities, which they mentioned in their report. The hon. member for St. Anne has embodied in his amendment the very words which were used by these commissioners. What was the duty of the government when these three independent and honest men reported that that department was lacking in organization, lacking in conscience, and that some of the officials were serving two masters, Scripture notwithstanding? Sir, the government did not remain silent under these general charges made against the Department of Marine and Fisheries. We appointed another commission under the direction of a judge. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the fact that other judges have been appointed by preceding governments to investigate. In this instance the Reform party did not inquire whether Judge Cassels had been during his past political career a friend of the government or a Conservative. We all know that Judge Cassels had been an independent Conservative during the time he was practising law in the city of Toronto. He was therefore appointed to investigate the very vague and general charges which had been made by the three commissioners without naming any one. Judge Cassels accepted the task and investigated. Lawyers were retained by the government, we secured the best legal talent in the country to assist Judge Cassels. Sir, I will not repeat what has been said on both sides of this House ; I will not read the conclusions of Judge Cassels' report. He reported that serious irregularities had been committed in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Sir, let me point out a fact which our hon. friends on the other side should not lose sight of, and which the country in the last general election did not lose sight of, namely, that the officials whose names were branded before public opinion as having been guilty of very serious offences, had nearly all been appointed by the Conservative government thirty or forty years ago. I do not say that officials appointed by the Liberal party cannot be derelict in their duties. But, Sir, the public knew that in the present instance, the officials who were the cause of all the troubles in the Department of Marine and Fisheries were old-time nominees of the Conservative party. Sir, the report of Mr. Justice Cassels has been published. Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries been found wanting in taking action upon that report ? Here is the chain of facts; accusations made by the three commissioners ; the investigation immediately ordered by this government, in order to find out who were the guilty officials; names of the guilty officials published in the report of Judge Cassels. Has the minister not done his duty like a man under very difficult circumstances, because, as you very well know, Sir, it is always a hardship for any employer, more particularly a minister of the Crown, to dismiss any of his officials. My hon. colleague has dismissed the guilty ones, and therefore has wiped out the evil complained of in the report of the Civil Service Commission and of Mr. Justice Cassels.

Insinuations may be made, but there has been nothing charged against any minister of the Crown. I appeal to the sound judicial sense of my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) who asks this parliament to appoint a commission—to investigate what? Charges made? He knows full well that in no British parliament, unless a member puts his seat in jeopardy by making a direct charge, will the government grant a commission of inquiry. The government can afford to disregard mere insinuations. Can we be reasonably asked to investigate general insinuations? We have had no charges made against any minister of the Crown. We had charges made against officials, we have had an independent investigation into these charges, and the officials have been dismissed. Sir, charges were made against the officials and also against the patronage system which has prevailed since confederation. What has happened? Let me refer my hon. friends to that portion of the report of Mr. Justice Cassels in which he states that unfortunately many of the minor officials sometimes fell into temptation because their salaries were too low, and where he points out that perhaps those who offered the bribes may have been more guilty than those who had accepted them. For the removal of the patronage list, all credit is due to my hon. colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It was he who took the bull by the horns and did away with that list The patronage system has been abolished by the Liberal party. Then take the second evil complained of and that is the underpaying of the officials. This government has gone to the very root of that evil. Last year, under the inspiration of my hon. friend who administers the Department of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) a Bill was introduced to reform the Civil Service. In future our civil servants will not be ap-

pointed on the mere caprice of any party, but will be selected by an independent commission. We have now an independent commission which will select our officials, regardless of politics, and solely on their merits, and this parliament only a few weeks ago has passed legislation in order to raise the salaries of our under-paid civil servants. This is a great reform due to the Liberal party. I claim that we have eradicated the evil. Now we are asked to appoint another commission to investigate the other departments. What departments? Has my hon. friend named any one minister whose department requires investigation or scrutinizing? He has not. I appeal again to his judicial sense and his knowledge of parliamentary government. Is it not a fact that the regular process in such matters is to first, when there is anything wrong in connection with the administration of public affairs, to make a charge before the high court of parliament and await its decision This House is elected by the people, and amongst the representives of the people is chosen a cabinet. The cabinet is after all only a committee of the House of Commons. If there are charges made affecting the government, they must be brought before parliament, and if the majority of this House find that these charges are unfounded, these charges fall through. But the members of this House are responsible to the people who elect them and who will in last resort, pass judgment on their conduct. Such is the doctrine of British parliamentary government. It is a sound doctrine to which, for my part, I shall give my adhesion. I therefore decline to accept the amendment of my hon. friend from St. Anne.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The closing arguments of the Postmaster General and his quotations from the scriptures remind me of the several illustrations we have had this evening of Satan quoting scripture for his justification. Immediately after the general elections on the 26th of October last, a number of newspapers engaged in a contest to find out the reason or the meaning of what had occurred; and one paper, not unfavourable to hon. gentlemen opposite, suggested that the meaning of the results of the elections of the 26th of October was that the people had decided that 'He that is unjust let him be unjust still; and he that is filthy let him be filthy still.' I would ask whether the argument put before the House does not bear out the answer given by this newspaper? We are asked to vote down this resolution, demanding impartial inquiry into the conduct of important departments, on the ground that while the scandals complained of were fresh before the public we had a general election and that the government was sustained in that election by the majority which supports it in this House.

I do not intend at this hour to dwell upon that, further than to say that the majority by which this government has been sustained is not larger than the number of persons upon the pay-roll in the several constituencies. In fact, I would venture to say that, if we took the total number of people on the pay-roll in the constituencies, especially on election day, the total majority by which this government has been sustained will be found far less than the number of persons in their direct employ. The reason why I have arisen at this hour to take part in this debate is that I think the record would not be complete without the addition of a chapter contrasting the attitude of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) now with the attitude taken by him on a very important occasion when the report on an investigation of one of the departments was before parliament for adoption or rejection. At that time he did not lead the government, but occupied the seat of leader of the opposition and the post of chief inquisitor for the opposition of that day. We had an investigation into the Department of Public Works in consequence of grave charges which has been canvassed for a time before parliament and in the press, and which were at last put into such shape that they were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for thorough inquiry. In that investigation we did not find the spectacle presented now by hon. gentlemen opposite opposing at every step the work of a commission with authority to investigate only into the minor officials employed by the department; we did not have a commission restricted so that the moment a point of danger was arrived at, the moment, for instance, when a witness said—as I have seen reported in the press one witness did say in the present investigation—that one reason why he charged excessive prices to the department was that he was expected to contribute to the party campaign funds, the inquiry was checked. On the contrary, whenever in that investigation such a suggestion was made the inquiry got hotter than ever, the activity of every person was aroused, and summonses were issued for all those concerned in the allegation made, and they were brought before the committee to be questioned as to even the smallest detail. When they got the case of a minister under suspicion of having received from the government—or having stood in with the contractor who received from the government—sums to which he was not entitled, what did they do? Did they take his word for it that he was innocent?—word which he gave on his responsibility as a member of this House that, so far as he was concerned, there was nothing in the accusation. No; they

brought that minister with his little bank pass-book, and the accountants from the bank came with their ledgers, showing his account from the first day of the acceptance of office by the minister until the day the investigation was carried on, and an inquisition was held into every item of that account. After such an investigation, the committee came before the House with certain findings. And, when it was moved in this House that the report should be accepted—and it took four months to carry out the investigation, which was as complete as an investigation could be, for the government appointed leading counsel to conduct the inquiry, including counsel from the other side of politics, so that there could be no suspicion of bias—we found, according to the report in 'Hansard' of September 24, 1891, that Mr. Laurier made these observations:

Sir, this is not a question of individual offences. Individual offences may always take place; frauds may be perpetrated in the most honest communities, but in this case, we have to grapple with a system which permeates the whole public service from the top to the bottom. We have often boasted of our political morality in this country, especially in contrast with that of our neighbours to the south. But the American people have given us an example which should help us on this occasion. Twenty years ago, comparing ourselves with our neighbours with our eyes turned up to Heaven, we thanked the Lord that we were not like other nations. I admit that our neighbours had much to be ashamed of in those days.

Omitting a passage which is not relevant to the present discussion, we find that the hon. gentleman proceeded:

But I almost despair of my country when I see the government willing to punish the minor offenders, but receding before the mighty—when I see them willing enough to punish clerks in offices, but refusing to censure the men who are the most blameable of all. How can this nation expect to live if such offences are condoned? No nation can live in which public moneys are not applied exclusively to public purposes. In discussing this case the other day, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was only too happy to have a fling at the Liberal party, and to point out that there are accusations pending against it in the province of Quebec. Sir, I will not prejudge the case; I have only this to say, that that measure of justice which we call for in this parliament we want applied also in the province of Quebec. Wherever, after investigation, blame and censure are found to be deserved, blame and censure should be pronounced. Upon this occasion, I appeal especially to my fellow countrymen of French origin, to stand up to the duty of the hour——

The 'duty of the hour' seems to have been a spectre in those days as it was in 1908.

——painful as that duty is. I do not appeal to them in any words of my own; but I appeal to them from the teaching of their history. The old city of Quebec has been the victim on this occasion of most of the malversations which have been unearthed. Let them remember that this is not the first time in her history that she has thus suffered, and let them remember at what cost to the country.

So you will see in a great many phases of these two investigations the situation in 1891 was similar to that before this parliament to-day. The hon. gentleman continues:

Sir, the system which has been revealed in this investigation was not invented by the Department of Public Works. This system of manipulating contracts for the profit of the contractor, this system of substituting private for public interest, this system of plundering the treasury to enrich individuals, was not invented by the Department of Public Works, but was practised in those days by the administration, by Bigot the Intendant, and his creatures Pean, Vergor and others. In the month of August, 1757, M. de Doreil, one of the commissioners of the army, thus wrote to the Minister of War, concerning Pean, one of Bigot's creatures: 'Pean has made so rapid a fortune in eight years that he is now supposed to be worth two millions.'

Mr. Speaker, I am not authorized to make any application of that, but I would ask those familiar with the records of this country, and of the popular report voiced by the members of this House if there have been any fortunes similar to this made under the aegis of the Liberal party now in power in Canada? This very eloquent passage concludes:

Canada was the prey of official jackals—true lion providers, since they helped to prepare a way for the imperial beast, who, roused at last from his lethargy, was gathering his strength to seize her for his own.

That is a quotation from Parkman. Then Mr. Laurier proceeds:

How humiliating the language, but how true—how painfully true! The resources of the colony were exhausted in shameful peculations, the way was prepared for the invader, and after her first defeat Canada had not the strength to retrieve the loss. Sir, 130 years have rolled over since those unfortunate days, and time and freedom have obliterated the grief, but the shame is always there, and there is not to-day a cottage in Lower Canada where the names of Bigot and Pean and the other official jackals who sucked the life blood of their country in the hour of danger, are not remembered with abhorrence. Sir, Canada is to-day again the prey of official jackals—the jackals of this government. Again there is robbery everywhere; if again cupidity has taken hold of clerks and storekeepers and officers, again everywhere false certificates are admitted. Montcalm is not here, but if he were, and if he were a member of this parliament, with the right to speak and vote, is there any one who doubts that he would denounce the conduct and the infamy

of the Bigots and the Peans of to-day, as vigorously as he denounced Bigot, Pean and Vergor in his own day. But if Montcalm is not here, we have his example; and if his stern patriotism still lives in the hearts of his countrymen, to them I appeal, and as he would now do, so now let us do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know why I should not appeal to my fellow countrymen of the province of Quebec, which I am proud to claim as the province of my nativity, as the right hon. gentleman appealed to his fellow countrymen on that occasion —I do not know why I should not appeal to them to follow the noble example of Montcalm. The government of Canada has now been entrusted to men of their race, to men of their province whom they had delighted to honour, and who have so deservedly occupied positions of leaders in the political and social life of that province, and now when these hon. gentlemen have the government in their possession, I do not know why I should not appeal to them to preserve the record unsullied, and not to add their names to those of Bigot, Pean and Vergor on the roll of dishonour referred to in this narrative.

Mr. J. E. O. GLADU (Yamaska). (Translation.) Before speaking to the motion which is just now occupying the attention of the House, I wish to say a few words in answer to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). He recalled a moment ago an incident of his youth. His appearance shows that he is no longer a child, but his speech leads one to believe he is in his dotage. That hon. member stated with a groan that the country's debt has to-day reached $309,000,000. If that is not mere childishness on his part, I am at a loss to know what name to give to such a statement on the part of the hon. member. He knows very well that the financial situation of a country cannot be gauged merely by the amount of its public debt; its assets should also be taken into account, that is to say the financial status should be considered in all its aspects.

The hon. member finds fault with us for having considerably increased the expenditure. But when these hon. gentlemen were in power in 1896, the country's trade barely reached $200,000,000, so that the revenue at the time was very far from reaching the figures reached nowadays, when the trade aggregates $600,000,000.

To return to the motion submitted for our consideration, I intend to deal briefly with it, on account of the lateness of the hour and seeing that there is very little left that has not been said. However, there is one point which, if I am not mistaken, has not been dwelt upon in the course of this debate, and to which I shall refer. We are being called to task on account of wrongdoing and deeds of extortion committed in the Department of Marine. No doubt, you have not forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that in 1896 and 1897, when the government resolved to make some changes in the staff of the various departments, in pursuance, as it were, of the verdict of the people who had decided on a change of government, you have not forgotten, I say, how these gentlemen on the other side waxed indignant and branded us as persecutors. You have not forgotten with what energy they protested against the ways of the government whom they called persecutors because they were dismissing, they claimed, public servants of many years standing in the service.

Well, what does the Cassels inquiry now bring to light? That all those who have been guilty of extortion, who have committed the greatest frauds in the management of that department are those very men of the old regime whom we were prevented from expelling, under the threat of being branded as persecutors.

Of course, I do not contend that the present staff is unimpeachable. It is a human institution and therefore may have its imperfections. But we are free from all stain, and if to-morrow the people thought fit to change the government—I say so with a feeling of pride for the party to which I belong—if to-morrow the country though fit to send us back to the cold shades of opposition, our last moan, when descending into our political grave, would be the faithful echo of the first wail heard in our cradle when we came to power: there would be just as much honesty in one case as in the other.

I stated that, while not contending that our management of affairs was free from imperfections, it was at any rate free from all stain. I congratulate the hon. Postmaster General on his eulogy of the late hon. Raymond Prefontaine ; I congratulate him on the lesson he has taught a moment ago to those occupying seats on the other side and who still go through the country casting aspersions on the memory of the late Mr. Préfontaine. I trust they will not forget that lesson, and it is this : in the grave there is room only for the corpse ; there is room for nothing else, not even the poisonous breath of the serpent.

It seems strange to me that the hon. member for North Toronto should have grown so indignant and shown himself so touchy in connection with some remarks made by the right hon. Prime Minister. If those remarks had been uttered by a private member, it is just possible they would not have been taken back as they were by the Prime Minister, on account of the high position he occupies in the House.

If those remarks grate on the nerves of the hon. member for North Toronto, one thing only remains for him to do, and that is to read over once more the fearful arraignment of himself by the Minister of

Justice a year ago, when direct and formal charges of which he has never cleared himself, were made against him. As a matter of fact, he has never got rid of the blemishes which for the last twelve years have made him as well as his party, an object of scorn in the eyes of the public, not only in this House, but in the country at large ; nor did the abuse with which he and his friends have loaded the hon. Minister of Marine, tarnish the high reputation of the hon. minister as an honourable and respectable man.

I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to speak much longer, it being so late. In the meantime I was anxious to make known my views on the question, and to state in all sincerity my admiration for the Minister of Marine personally, and for the able way in which he has administered his department in the interest of the country at large, of the government of which he is a member and of the whole Dominion.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). Mr. Speaker, I had no intention, until, a short time ago, of taking any part in this discussion this evening, or, I might say more properly, this morning, if it had not been for certain statements made by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) in the course of his remarks. I have listened to many of the speeches which have been made here during this debate with a great deal of interest and pleasure. I have listened with some surprise to some of the remarks which have been made. I have listened to speeches made by some hon. gentlemen opposite with a great deal of surprise because of the lack of argument which they contained relevant to this resolution. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) furnished two very strong arguments, for further investigation, or rather he furnished one direct to the members on the government side of the House and when he was furnishing that argument they furnished this House with another argument. My hon. friend from Leeds made some very serious charges as regards the expenditure and as regards the prices paid for articles in different departments of this government. Those statements, which must be taken seriously, have furnished this House with something that we should think of very seriously and they have furnished us with an argument that this investigation should be carried on further. The mirthfulness with which they were received by hon. gentlemen opposite is a still further argument why this investigation should go further. It is a serious matter indeed that statements such as those which were made by my hon. friend from Leeds should only elicit from members of the government and their supporters laughter and jeers. By that very act of laughing and jeering at statements so serious as those, the government have inadvertently furnished this House with an argument why this investigation should go further because as evidently the Cabinet Ministers are disposed to look on matters such as that in a light manner we naturally think that there is ample reason for further investigating the affairs of the different departments of the government. Before referring to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Public Works I want to call attention to some statements made by the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux). The Postmaster General said that the Conservative party went into the last election with the cry of graft and corruption. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman and the members of this House who forced the Conservative party to refer to graft and grafters: Was there not evidence enough to attract the attention of the Conservative party to graft and grafting? What about the case that was referred to by one of the speakers this afternoon of Philip Wagner, the man who was taken out of prison and appointed to a responsible position at an increased salary? Was that not sufficient to call the attention of the Conservative party and of the people of the country to graft and grafters? What about the importation of ballot boxes into the ridings of Frontenac and Hastings by men connected with the party across the way? Is not that sufficient to attract the attention of the country and would not the Conservative party be open to censure if they passed matters of that kind without comment? The Liberal party, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, has furnished the Conservative party with lots of reasons for speaking of graft and grafting. I regret that the Liberals have done so. Another reference made by the Postmaster General was to the effect that the officials who had been dismissed after the Cassels inquiry were officials who had been appointed by the Conservative party. Very well; it does not matter ,as far as I can see, whether they were officials who had been appointed by the Conservative party or whether they were Conservatives or Liberals. I think he makes a case out against himself and the government in making that reference because the fact shows that if these men were appointed by the Conservative party the Conservative party were successful not only in keeping them but other officials in their places while the Liberals were not capable of keeping them in their places when they came into power.

Now, I want to call your attention to one or two remarks made by the hon. Minister of Public Works. He said that he rose for the purpose of defending a gentleman by the name of Mr. Harding, but it struck me that he was more concerned about doing

justice to or putting up a defence on behalf of one of his party friends than he was in discussing the resolution of my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty). The Minister of Public Works criticised my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Anne, on the ground that he had made inaccurate statements. He said that he should be sure his statements were accurate before he made them. I could not help but take particular notice of a statement like that from the Minister of Public Works and I repeat that it was the statements made by the hon. gentleman which led me to speak at all upon the matter under discussion. I had before my mind, when he made that statement, certain statements which had been made by the Minister of Public Works in reference to expenditures in the neighbourhood of the city of Kingston. Let me refer to one or two statements made by that hon. gentleman. The Minister of Public Works has been more than inaccurate. He appealed to this House for $15,000 to build a veterinary hospital. When that expenditure was criticised he defended it. What did we find later on? We have the hon. gentleman, after obtaining that appropriation, coming forward and admitting that the year previously he had talked the matter over with the Minister of Militia and Defence, and had made up his mind not to indulge in the expenditure, stating that it was a printer's error and that he would, with the concurrenec of the House, cut it out of the estimates. Yet, the hon. gentleman comes here and criticises the mover of the resolution as to the accuracy of his statements. Do you want another instance of the inaccuracy of the Minister of Public Works? A certain contract was let in the city of Kingston for some sixteen cottages, now famous, and the contract called for $77,000 of expenditure. Some $55,000 was voted last year. The hon. gentleman asked for $57,000 additional this year. Gentlemen on this side of the House criticised that, and said that the expenditure was ridiculously high and absolutely indefensible. The Minister of Public Works put up a defence for that. He argued that the amount was not too much and went into details about rock excavation and so on. After defending this expenditure of $112,000 and the additional expenditure of $57,000 the minister announced that it was a mistake, that a five had been put down instead of a three, and he reduced the item by $20,000. Then he presumes to criticise the mover of this resolution on the ground of inaccuracy. The very manner in which money was expended in the Public Works Department as we have seen this session calls for further investigation, and shows the need for further investigation. I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman state that works in his department were carried on by tender and the patronage list was abolished. This statement was repeated by the Postmaster General in reference to all the departments. In Kingston alone we have had the Royal Military College stables for which the contract price was $6,960. They were built several years ago at a total cost of $8,573. An extra of over $1,500 was given without tender to the man who had the original contract. As these stables were built four or five years ago and have never been used, surely there should be an investigation of that expenditure. Do the ministers think that the people of Kingston are not asking for it? I can assure them they are, and that there is room for investigation. For the barrack accommodation in connection with the stables the contract price was $9,490, and the work has cost $15,000. $5,000 or $6,000 going to the fortunate contractor. The Royal Military College cottages were to be erected for $77,739. The minister says he has abolished the patronage system, yet he gave to Michael Sullivan without tender extras in connection with these buildings amounting to $6,237, and other works to the amount of $3,034, a total of $9,361. The only amount above the original contract let by contract was $3,695 for lighting to the Halliday Company. The Royal Military College gymnasium cost $40,000 without being equipped, and it is common street rumour in Kingston that the specifications required that that building should be lined with pressed brick, but that ordinary brick was substituted and painted red. Do the members of this House not think that the people in Kingston, knowing these things, are asking for an investigation into all these departments? That is the opinion of the people down there. They believe there is need of investigation in the different departments as called for in this resolution. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) admits that the investigation of Mr. Justice Cassels was not thorough and did not cover the whole ground. He said it would cost $1,000,000 to make a thorough investigation. Would it not be more sensible and more in the interests of the country to spend even $1,000,000 on that work than to throw it away in the Newmarket ditch or in such useless expenditures as the building of those cottages in Kingston at that price?

I believe there is a general feeling throughout the country that these matters should be further investigated. Prior to the last election if these questions were raised in the country the Liberal party would appeal to the people, it was one of their election cries that because the Civil Service Commission reported certain irregularities Sir Wilfrid Laurier would investi-

gate further, he would probe to the bottom and had appointed Mr. Justice Cassels for that purpose. They appealed for support for Sir Wilfrid Laurier on that ground and in that way many votes were cast in his favour. When we referred to the irregularities, we were met with the argument that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was disposed to be fair and to go to the bottom of these things, that he had shown that by appointing Judge Cassels. In that way they appealed to the people to give the Prime Minister an opportunity to finish his work. To-day not a man has attempted to prove that the investigation has been anything but a partial investigation. The amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for St. Anne is one which should appeal to all members of this House, but more strongly to members on the other side than to those on this side. The public honour is in the keeping of the Prime Minister and his cabinet and it is up to them and not to this side to keep that honour unsmirched and to probe this matter to the bottom. I repeat they are not doing their duty by the country in voting down that resolution.

Mr. P. A. SEGUIN (L'Assomption). (Translation.) I do not intend giving a silent vote on the amendment which is now before the House; but I shall be short. I wonder why the hon. member for St. Anne's has introduced a motion on those lines. He proposes that an inquiry be carried on concerning all the departments, because the inquiry relating to the Marine Department has brought to light certain frauds, certain extortions already condemned by the Liberal party.

I do not wish to fritter away the time of the House; however, as a young member, I must say that I was really surprised to hear old members, who have occupied seats in this House for several years, or even members who have been entrusted in years past with the administration of justice, suggest into the various departments, inquiries entailing heavy expenditures, without having any idea of the outcome of such inquiries.

I am perfectly satisfied that the policy adopted by the Minister of Marine is absolutely correct. He has thought fit as a result of the Cassels inquiry to dismiss some of the men and to superannuate others. I must say that some of his followers have possibly disapproved that policy to a certain extent. We were of opinion, especially if yielding to the impulse of youth, that some of the officers who have been superannuated, might have been dismissed purely and simply. We considered that some of the worse cases of extortion were attributable to officers who have been kept on through condescension, through the good-heartedness of the Liberal ministers, and among others the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who wished in that way to give fair play to the appointees of the old regime.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the House very long. I am bound to say that the Minister of Marine has acted with all the earnestness that might have been expected in starting this inquiry, that he has followed it up with unrelenting zeal, and has meted out punishment to the guilty men. I shall vote against the motion of the hon. member for St. Anne's, because it strikes me rather as a pretext for empty talk, as a means of making political capital, as an attempt at slandering our government. We are interested in maintaining in power the honest government which we have since 1896. I shall not detain the House any longer at this late hour of the night. However, I must add that the carrying on of an inquiry into any of the departments would not satisfy the opposition, and particularly those who, while holding here a mandate as members of the House of Commons, are at the same time pensioners of the state.

We have a duty to fulfil here, it is to administer the public funds in such a way that every dollar expended may accrue to the benefit of the state. Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that if further inquiries were granted, the net result would be the condemnation of friends of hon. gentlemen on the other side, who were appointed while these gentlemen were in power. Those who are in favour of a general inquiry have not shown that we would be justifiable in spending such a large sum of money as an inquiry of the kind would entail.

I know moreover that the inquiry which has been carried through will cause the ministers to keep their eyes open, and that some day or other we shall witness the disappearance from the service of those people who are there only for the purpose of intriguing in the interest of persons occuping seats on the opposition side.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE (Quebec County). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I request a moment's hearing. I have made up my mind to vote independently of all party prejudice; and I am even willing to close my ears to anything that has been said by members on this side of the House and to rely solely on the remarks made by hon. members on the opposition side. But there is one circumstance that is somewhat annoying to me. I would like to know from the leader of the opposition whether he intends starting a new inquiry into the Marine Department in case the amendment carried. I am waiting for an answer.

I want to know from the leader of the opposition if, in case the amendment is adopted he will be ready to begin over again the investigation in the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. (Translation.) I would be entirely disposed to do so. There are some matters in that department which have not been fully investigated. The Commission which began its work in 1907 only partially completed it, and the investigation made by Mr. Justice Cassels was confined to a single paragraph of that Commission's report.

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) Then, if I understand correctly, we have this extraordinary statement: An inquiry has been ordered for the purpose of discovering all that has taken place in one particular department, that of Marine. That inquiry was open to the public; the opposition was entitled to have a representative present.

Mr. BORDEN. (Translation.) That enquiry was only partial.

Mr. TURCOTTE. (Translation.) I cannot see how it can be called partial. It bore on all questions relating to the Department of Marine and it was open to the public at large. The hon. leader of the opposition was at liberty to take a hand in it. He is a distinguished lawyer and might have summoned witnesses, questioned or cross-questioned those that were called upon to testify, so as to bring out the whole truth.

Should it be understood that the leader of the opposition has failed to do his duty? Where was he, what was he about when the commission was travelling from town to town? How is it that we have to-day, from the mouth of the leader of the opposition, the admission that he is not satisfied with the inquiry.

Well, if so, he can only lay the blame on his own gross negligence. He gets a salary because he is expected to look after public business the whole year round; why did he not think proper to appear before the commission and do the work the country pays him for ? Thus, on that occasion the hon. leader of the opposition was obviously neglecting his duty.

Then, if such an investigation costing $55,000 do not answer his expectations, will he be any more satisfied with a general investigation ? Or perhaps he thinks that we are going to order as many inquiries as there are departments.

There is a touch of irregularity in the resolution of the hon. member from St. Anne's. The hon. gentleman acknowledges that the Minister of Marine is not guilty, that he is honest. On the other hand, we heard the hon. member for North Toronto making insinuations and taking to task not only the Minister of Marine, but the whole cabinet, and even the Prime Minister himself.

Another surprise was sprung upon us when the hon. member from West Quebec (Mr. Prince) came here and stated that as for him not only is the Minister of Marine honest, but even those who have been found guilty by Mr. Justice Cassels, and dismissed, did not deserve it.

Finally, the hon. member from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) stated this evening that for his part he thought the whole system was faulty and needed a thorough cleaning

Thus we have four different views. I rely on the evidence of our oponents themselves. I can see them altogether surrounded by a mist or by that cloud which is mentioned in the amendment. This is not only a suspicion, it is naked truth. Evidently, those gentlemen did not put their heads together beforehand, for one says white and the other says black, and they pull different ways. Therefore, how could I conscientionsly pass sentence without knowing anything positively, how could I blame the government and ask that they be put on trial when there is no cause for it.

The hon. leader of the opposition is an eminent lawyer, and let him say what scandal he is after. Why not be courageous enough to make a change and we shall answer you. There are eighty members on the other side of the House, but not one of them is able to proffer a formal charge against a single member of the government.

The Cassels inquiry was regularly held in such a manner as to enlighten public opinion. For that reason, I shall vote against the amendment.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Doherty.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Ames,	Lennox,
Barker,	Lortie,
Barnard,	McCall,
Barr,	Magrath,
Blondin,	Marshall,
Borden (Halifax),	Meighen,
Boyce,	Middlebro,
Bradbury,	Nantel,
Burrell,	Northrup,
Chisholm (Huron),	Owen,
Crothers,	Paquet,
Currie (Simcoe),	Perley,
Daniel,	Price,
Doherty,	Roche,
Donnelly,	Schaffner,
Edwards,	Sexsmith,
Elson,	Smyth,
Foster,	Sproule,
Fraser,	Stanfield,
Goodeve,	Stewart,
Haggart (Lanark),	Taylor (Leeds),
Henderson,	Taylor (New Westminster),
Herron,	Thornton,
Hughes,	Wallace,
Jameson,	Wilson (Lennox and Addington),
Lake,	Wright.—54.
Lalor,	
Lancaster,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Beauparlant,	McAlister,
Béland,	McCraney,
Black,	McIntyre (Perth),
Borden (Sir Fred'k.),	McKenzie,
Boyer,	McLean (Huron),
Brodeur,	McLean (Sunbury),
Calvert,	McMillan,
Carrier,	Major,
Cash,	Marcile (Bagot),
Champagne,	Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Chew,	
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Martin (Regina),
Chisholm (Inverness),	Martin (Wellington),
Clark (Red Deer),	Michaud,
Congdon,	Miller,
Conmee,	Molloy,
Currie (Prince Edw.),	Murphy,
Delisle,	Nesbitt,
Demers,	Neely,
Devlin.	Papineau,
Dubeau,	Pardee,
Dugas,	Parent,
Ecrément,	Paterson,
Emmerson,	Pickup,
Ethier,	Proulx,
Fielding,	Pugsley,
Fisher,	Rankin,
Fortier,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fowke,	Richards,
Gauvreau,	Rivet,
Gervais,	Robb,
Girard,	Ross,
Gladu,	Roy (Dorchester),
Graham,	Roy (Montmagny),
Harty,	Rutan,
Hodgins,	Sealey,
Hunt,	Seguin,
Kyte,	Sifton,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Smith (Middlesex),
	Smith (Nanaimo),
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Templeman,
Lapointe,	Tolmie,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Lavergne,	Turcotte (Quebec County),
Law,	
LeBlanc,	Turgeon,
Lemieux,	Verville,
Loggie,	Wilson (Laval)—94.
Maclean (Lunenburg),	

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Warburton,	Rhodes,
Gordon (Kent),	Porter,
Macdonald,	Maddin,
Tobin,	Armstrong,
Lovell,	Worthington,
Bickerdike,	Monk,
McGiverin,	Kidd,
Brown,	Reid (Grenville),
White (Victoria, Alta),	Campbell,
Prowse,	Staples,
McColl,	Russell,
Geoffrion,	Crosby,
Meigs,	Broder,
Low,	White (Renfrew),
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Talbot,	Sharpe (Ontario),
McIntyre (Strathcona),	Blain,
McCoig,	Clare,
Harris,	Beattie,
Aylesworth,	Maclean (York, S.),
Oliver,	Haggart (Winnipeg),
Allen,	Thoburn,
Knowles,	Arthurs,
Sutherland,	Cowan,
Guthrie,	Macdonell,
Turriff,	Osler,
Schell,	McCarthy,
German,	Crocket,
Clarke (Essex),	Bristol,
MacNutt,	Forget,
Sinclair,	Lewis,
Carvell.	Sharpe (Lisgar).

Amendment negatived, motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FIELDING. I desire to make a general motion. The committee has passed a large number of items, but I desire to move that one-fourth of each remaining item be voted by the committee. The clerk can work out the details, so that we need not go over the items.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no objection to that, subject to the usual reservation always made in such cases as to our right of discussion on the balance.

Mr. FIELDING. I could not deny that right if I wished.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A reservation of that kind is usually made.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported accordingly.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 3.12 a.m. Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 5, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

The Department of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1908. Part II, Trade of Foreign Countries and Treaties and Conventions.—Rt. hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

COMMERCIAL FEEDING STUFFS.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 127) respecting Commercial Feeding Stuffs. He said: This Bill proposes to deal with feeding stuffs for domestic animals. There is no law dealing with these substances other than indirectly. The Bill runs pretty much along the line of another Bill now on the Order

Paper dealing with agriculture fertilizers. It is proposed to compel manufacturers of commercial feeding stuffs to register and sell their products under a number given by the Inland Revenue Department, and to put upon the packages the guaranteed analyses of the contents of the food sold, thus creating to some extent, a standard by which the manufacturers of these foodstuffs will sell and affording the purchaser some guarantee of the genuineness of the article bought. The Bill is believed to be very much in the interests of the purchaser and has been approved by agricultural associations and others interested.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Do I understand that other cattle foods than bran or shorts must have branded on the package the contents showing exactly what the mixture is made of? Farmers complain that when they buy bran, instead of getting pure bran, sweepings and other stuff are mixed with it, so that the purchaser does not know what he is buying.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Bill covers the point raised by the hon. member. It relates to any article offered for sale for the feeding of domestic animals, including those claimed to possess medicinal as well as nutritive properties. Hay, straw, roots, the ordinary meals of wheat, rye, barley, oats or corn, and also bran or middlings of any of these grains sold separately, must be genuinely what they profess to be, and must not be mixed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called, I would ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if he will hurry down the returns ordered by the House with respect to loans since January 1, 1907?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. Minister of Finance). If not to-day, I think they will be ready to-morrow without fail.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have it before the Easter holidays.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it will be ready.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood from the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) when I asked about the return of the armouries, that it was practically ready. But I do not find that it has been brought down. I would like to get it also before the Easter holidays.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I said that, so far as my department was concerned, it was ready, awaiting the principal part, which comes from the Department of Public Works.

Mr. FOSTER. Am I right in thinking that the government have taken Mondays?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That resolution will be introduced to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. If that resolution were introduced to-morrow and carried, and were made the rule for the first Monday thereafter, we might get at the motions to-day, and there are a number of motions which would be unopposed. There are also certain orders on the paper that some members would like to drop. It might be possible for the government to take unopposed motions before private Bills, with the consent of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think we will come to motions presently. I do not think there are any contentious private Bills. But we will consult the convenience of the House with regard to it.

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization last year has not been distributed. I think it is very important we should have it.

Mr. FISHER. The evidence of each officer is generally taken and distributed. I do not remember that they were all bound together.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Every year that is done, and most of us have not got the evidence that was given before the committee last year that is bound in blue book form.

Mr. FISHER. The Minister of Agriculture is not responsible for that evidence. The Committee on Agriculture is responsible, and I decline to have the responsibility put upon me.

THE LOGBERG PRINTING COMPANY.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk). I desire to bring a matter before the attention of the House. On the 17th of February I asked for a return of the amount that was paid to the Logberg Printing Company. On the 26th of March that return was brought down, stating that the amount was some $500, for the Public Works Department only. All other departments return report nil. In looking over the Auditor General's Report I find that for the year 1908 alone there was a sum of $4,752 paid to this company. Taking the years I asked for in the return, the sum would amount to at least $25,000. But the return actually brought down says there was only $572. There was certainly a great error made in this return. If all the returns brought down to parliament are as unreliable as that, it is a serious matter.

Mr. FIELDING. Is there any question as to the period which the return covers? Can there be any misunderstanding?

Mr. BRADBURY. No, the returns are brought down by the Public Works Department for each year.

SUB-CONTRACTORS ON GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—BRITISH COLUMBIA SECTION.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I wish to call attention to a matter which refers to the departments of the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Railways and Canals. I have here a report sent to me from Prince, a Prince Rupert paper, based upon the telegram from Vancouver.

Vancouver, March 27.—Royal mail steamer 'Monteagle' arrived from the orient yesterday with sixty Russian moujiks from Siberia, imported to work on the Grand Trunk Pacific construction from Prince Rupert east. The moujiks are to replace the English-speaking labourers, who do not really conform to hard conditions and to the wages they have been receiving. The Russians are to work in a colony by themselves, just as Italian gangs do, if they prove satisfactory. They are to be taken to Prince Rupert on the 'Princess May.' It is not learned what they are to be paid; but it is evident they are under something like the padrone system. Another and larger party is to arrive on the next Canadian Pacific Railway steamer.

If this despatch represents the true condition of affairs, it shows that contract labour of a very degraded kind is being imported for service on the Grand Trunk Pacific. On another page of the same paper there is an article setting forth that a year ago the firm of Foley, Welch and Stewart, of St. Paul, Minnesota, of Spokane Washington, and of Winnipeg, Manitoba, entered into a contract to grade 100 miles of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway beginning at Prince Rupert. The Prince Rupert 'Empire' states that they had 2,500 men at work a month ago, but that the work was going on very slow, and it gives as a reason that the sub-contractors were employing labour of an inferior quality. The 'Empire' goes on to say:

Foley, Welch & Stewart, as practical railway builders, have a system of carrying on their business. The system is a good one for Foley, Welch & Stewart, however poor it may be for the men who do the work. They will not change it, no matter if men injured on the work are treated worse than brutes are treated on farms in Ontario; no matter if men who earn wages are put to undue expense to collect the wages earned; no matter if the subcontractors, who are judgment proof, cause loss to station men; no matter if expensive plant remains idle for weeks at a time owing to petty disputes over wages. They know that the Dominion government moves slowly, if it moves at all.

On another page of the same paper I find a report of a case that was tried in the county court at Prince Rupert before Judge Young, showing the relations that exist between the main contractors and the sub-contractors. The report states that a number of labourers got work from Fred. Petersen, a sub-contractor under Foley, Welch and Stewart. Not being able to get their pay, the men brought suit to recover pay for work done and the jury gave them a verdict for $2,548 for work done and $5,000 for damages. Foley, Welch and Stewart claim this is excessive and refuse to pay, claiming that Peterson is in debt to the old firm of Foley Brothers, Larson and Company for $15,000. The 'Empire' article goes on to say:

It is not known to the 'Empire' what action the station men will take who have a $7,548 judgment against Fred. Petersen, who is apparently judgment proof, although he has $8,000 worth of tools and supplies in his camps. The $7,548 represents work done or in shape to be done at a minimum cost by the ten station men in six months. If the amount is not paid them, it will wipe out half the $15,000 Petersen owes Foley Bros., Larson & Co., of St. Paul, Minnesota, and Helena, Montana. It will help swell the personal fortune of Timothy and Michael Foley and of the Larson estate, both millionaires many times over, and all of their millions are invested in the United States.

But while Foley, Welch and Stewart are wielding a big club here in Skeena district it is just possible a bigger club can be wielded on the head of Chas. M. Hays, of Montreal, who is president of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and that Premier Laurier will yield the club, for is it not the money of the people of Canada that Foley, Welch and Stewart are withholding from the ten station-men——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Taylor) knows the rule under which it is not permitted to discuss a matter of this kind upon the orders of the day. It is allowable to put a question to the government relating to the business of the House, but the discussion of a question of this nature is out of order. The hon. gentleman may state the facts or he may put a question which will not entail a debate.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I have to leave today and if I do not present it now I cannot present it at all.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will have to be satisfied with calling the attention of the government to the facts without discussion.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. That is what I propose to do.

Mr. SPEAKER. There seems to be an attack upon the government which will entail a reply.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. No, I am not proposing to make an attack upon the government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The paragraph says.

It is just possible——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, these are not the facts; these are the ideas of the editor. If the hon. gentleman will rest satisfied with putting the facts he will be in order.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I will proceed then to present the facts in this way: Section 40 of the National Transcontinental Railway Act, chapter 71, 1903, provides that:

The company shall, before being entitled to the guarantee provided by this agreement, furnish evidence, satisfactory to the government, that all just claims of contractors and for materials, wages and supplies, and all just claims against contractors and sub-contractors for materials, wages and supplies, entering into and supplied for the construction of the railway have been duly paid.

Here is a firm of contractors who are violating the conditions of the Act by preventing these people from getting the money they have earned. As the government have contracted to see that they get that money I want to call the attention of the government to the fact that this state of affairs exists and to ask that they put the necessary machinery in operation to assist these men in the obtainment of their wages.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. M. CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Speaker, I desire to crave your indulgence and that of the the House for a very brief personal explanation. The explanation refers to a paragraph which appears in a newspaper called the 'Toronto Sunday World.' In that paragraph the writer purports to give an account of the proceedings in this House last Friday evening and in that report he uses these words:

Mr. Stanfield, the husky member for Colchester, overheard the member from Red Deer apply an insulting epithet to Mr. Foster. He warned Dr. Clark that if he did not instantly withdraw he would thrash him; and after looking Mr. Stanfield carefully over, the apology was forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, during the time that I have had the honour of knowing the hon. member for Colchester, I wish to ask you, Sir, and this House, to believe me when I state that he has never addressed to me one single word which, interpreted according to the strictest canons, could be called ungentlemanly or impolite, much less has he ever used to me language which, by any stretch of the imagination, could be called threatening. I wish the House to believe this further statement that there was no language of this description used towards me; so that there was no withdrawal or apology forthcoming from me. I regret to have to call attention to this incident at all, because I may say that I have carefully read a large number of the newspaper accounts of what happened on Friday night and these accounts are very generally truthful, very generally unexaggerated and reflect the very greatest credit upon the press of this country. In regard to the paragraph to which I have just referred and to which I wish to give the most emphatic contradiction, I can only say, in quoting the language of Macaulay in regard to certain scribes of his day, that the people who compose these paragraphs 'act after their kind.'

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt). Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is another member of this House who has been maligned to some extent by the same article in this edition of the 'Toronto Sunday World.' A little farther on this article proceeds to say:

Later in the House Mr. Stanfield got into a heated argument with Mr. Neely, of Humboldt and threatened that member with extermination if he did not withdraw a remark, also applied to Mr. Foster. The affair was patched up by friends.

I want to say, Sir, that I am sorry the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) is not here to-day, because I am sure that he would give to this quite as emphatic a denial as my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has to the paragraph just preceding. The hon. member for Colchester could not possibly have had any excuse or reason for threatening to exterminate me on account of any statements or epithets applied to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) because I did not apply any epithets to that hon. gentleman. I did not say anything to the hon. gentleman for North Toronto, either agreeable or disagreeable, unless it might be something in the way of mild admonition that he should take his medicine in common with remarks of that kind applied by quite a number of the members of this House.

MANITOBA AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 81) respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

Mr. NEELY. When this Bill was before the committee on Friday last, Mr. Chairman, I placed in your hands an amendment. I would point out that paragraph A of section 9, of chapter 52, of the statutes of 1893, refers to that part of the charter of this company granted in 1893 for the building of a branch line from the town of Yorkton to the city of Prince Albert in the present province of Saskatchewan. The effect of my amendment, if it is carried, is to strike out the particular paragraph in the Bill now before the committee, which has reference to the building of the branch line from Yorkton to the city of Prince Albert.

The reason I have brought this matter before the committee is, that this Manitoba and Northwestern charter has had a very striking history; a histroy which if thoroughly known to the members of the House would not I am sure inspire in them any feelings of sympathy towards that charter. I have had very strong representations from the people in that part of the country protesting against the renewal of this charter. The Canadian Pacific Railway have held the Manitoba and Northwestern charter, as the House knows, since 1893 or practically for sixteen years, and the charter was in existence for some twelve or thirteen years previous to that. Therefore, the charter for this particular line of railroad that I am referring to has been in existence practically since the year 1880, the year in which the original Manitoba and Northwestern charter was passed by the Manitoba legislature. The Canadian Pacific Railway therefore have held this charter for sixteen years, and while they have made surveys two or three times, and while they have gathered together a few shovels full of earth in the shape of starting to grade at one or two points along the proposed line, they have practically made no use whatever of this particular charter. I want the committee to understand that this has been a very great hardship to a great many people who have gone into this section on the understanding and with the expectation that the Canadian Pacific Railway had taken over the charter in good faith for the purpose of building this piece of road. Every means possible have been taken to bring pressure to bear upon the Canadian Pacific Railway to construct this piece of road. For instance, in looking up chapter 52 of the statutes of 1893, I find that section 9 gives the power to build these particular lines of railroad, and subsection 3 of that section provides:

> The company shall construct and complete to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council, not less than 20 miles of railway on or before the 31st day of December in each calendar year after the year 1893, or otherwise their powers under this section shall cease as regards so much of the said lines of railway as is not completed by the said date in each calendar year.

That means that there has been a provision in this charter ever since the Canadian Pacific Railway have taken it over, as there was before that time, to the effect that this company was to build twenty miles every year. To show what attention they have paid to this provision, I may mention that they have not built one single mile of line from the town of Yorkton to the city of Prince Albert. Then again, I object to the way in which the Canadian Pacific Railway undertake to get their extensions of time for these charters so long over due. I object to the way in which they undertake to get such legislation through the Railway Committee and through this House. In this Bill (No. 81) which is before us at present, they are asking for an extension of time on some other branch lines, the charters for which they have obtained since 1893. In order to cover up the fact that they have held the charter for this particular branch line for the past sixteen years they run in three or four other charters which have been granted in more recent times. This particular charter that we are considering illustrates very well the futility of putting in any requirements as to building a road in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway; because as I say there is this provision in the charter ever since they took it over, and for that matter before they took it over, to the effect that they must build twenty miles every calendar year. The fact of the matter is that they have never carried out that condition, but they apparently find it easier to come back to parliament to obtain a renewal of the charter. Now, Sir, I think that sixteen years is a reasonable length of time in which to have allowed the Canadian Pacific Railway to accomplish something on this road.

Mr. J. D. REID. Twenty-nine years.

Mr. NEELY. Twenty-nine years so far as the whole charter is concerned, but the Canadian Pacific Railway have held it since 1893 or for sixteen years. I think something should be done now, and I would like the promoter of the Bill to tell this committee, what he did not tell the Railway Committee, why it is that the Canadian Pacific Railway are asking to have this charter renewed. It is only a couple of weeks ago that in Bill (No. 79) the Canadian Pacific Railway obtained from this House an extension of time for the construction of the branch line from the town of Lanigan on the Kirkella branch up to the city of Prince Albert. I am sure the hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill has no confidence in his own mind that the Canadian Pacific Railway intends to build this particular piece of road, or at all events that it intends to build it in the immediate future. Why should this House grant this renewal of time when we have no evidence whatever that the Canadian Pacific Railway intend to build. If they did intend to build they should at least say so, and yet I have it on good authority that this branch line is not part of their programme for this next year, and so far as I can obtain any information it is not a part of their programme for the year following. The people in that part of the country do not want this extension granted. Their view is that if this charter is not renewed that probably some local capitalists or promoters may become interested in building a railway from Prince Albert to some point on the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Whether they are right or wrong the people of that part of the country feel that the granting of a charter to the Canadian Pacific Railway tends to prevent other railroads from seeking for charters through the same territory. I am strongly of the same opinion. We know perfectly well that in a great many cases the obtaining of a charter by promoters who are not actual railroad builders does not prevent others from obtaining charters and constructing railroads; but in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway it is an entirely different proposition because so long as that road holds a charter for a certain territory and the section will support only one line, no other railroad company will undertake to get a charter through that territory, and if another railroad company should obtain a charter and begin building the Canadian Pacific Railway would immediately get busy in order to stop the construction of the competing line of railroad. That is the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I am convinced in my own mind that that is the only reason why they are seeking an extension of time for this particular charter, in order to blanket this territory and keep any other railroad from undertaking to build through it. So I think the view of the people of that part of the country is reasonable, and that unless the Canadian Pacific Railway immediately commence construction the charter should be taken away from them. It is merely a question of asking the Canadian Pacific Railway to quit playing dog in the manger. I am not finding any fault with the operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The argument most frequently advanced in favour of granting such extensions of time to the Canadian Pacific Railway is that they have such an extensive programme of railway construction in the west. I do not think that is any excuse for the Canadian Pacific Railway not building this particular line. Why should the Canadian Pacific Railway not have an extensive programme of building branch lines and other lines in the Canadian Northwest? I would like to know whether the people of the Canadian Northwest are under any compliment to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the amount of railway construction they are carrying on there. The wealth of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been obtained to a very large extent from the resources of the Canadian Northwest, and the people of that country do not feel under any compliment to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the building of their branch lines. They are using the people's money, they are using the resources of western Canada, which were given to them by the terms of their original contract That argument I say, therefore, does not hold water, because we feel that we are entitled to all the railroad construction we are getting from the Canadian Pacific Railroad. Whether this amendment of mine carries or not, I shall continue so long as I am a member of this House to use every legitimate means I possess to prevent these extensions of time to the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other company unless the company is in a position to give some reasonable excuse or reason for not having carried out the terms of its charter, I shall oppose the granting of any extensions which will enable a company to blanket territory for no other purpose than to keep other railroads from building through it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not discuss the mode of construction of railways by the Canadian Pacific Railway in the west. I assume that hon. members fully appreciate what the Canadian Pacific Railway has done and what they are endeavouring to do, but I must say that I think it is a mistake to depreciate, as some hon. members have done, what that great railway corporation are and have been doing. I do not believe in throwing obstacles in their way if they are endeavouring to give railway accommodation to the people in the west. The whole matter lies in a nutshell. In 1903 the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company applied for and obtained a charter to construct a railway from Yorkton in a northwesterly direction to Prince Albert on the north branch of the Saskatchewan river. The sub-clause of section 9 now in question reads:

> The company may lay out, construct and operate the following lines of railway of the gauge of 4 feet 8½ inches.
>
> (a) An extension of the main line from the present terminus at Yorkton in a northwesterly direction to a point at or near Prince Albert on the north branch of the Saskatchewan river.

The hon. member's amendment repeals this subsection which would have the effect of repealing the right to construct a railway, repealing a charter which gave the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company the power to construct a railway from Yorkton to Prince Albert. The hon. gentleman forgets or perhaps he is not familiar with the territory. I do not claim to be very familiar with it; I have been in Yorkton but I was never beyond Yorkton on that road, but I understand distinctly from my hon. friend from McKenzie, that the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Manitoba and Northwestern Company, whichever it is, has already constructed nearly 50 miles of that road and that it is in operation today. I spoke to a gentleman to-day who told me he had travelled over that road, that it is in actual operation; yet here is an attempt on the part of an hon. gentleman from the west to repeal an Act of parliament which authorizes the construction of a road of which nearly 50 miles has been

built and is now in operation. I submit to the House that such a thing was never attempted in parliament, and although parliament has the power to do almost anything it would be interfering with the right of that railway company in reference to an undertaking which it is now carrying on that I do not think this parliament would for a moment tolerate.

Mr. NEELY. I would say to the hon. member that his statement that 50 miles had been built on the line from Yorkton to Prince Albert is absolutely contrary to the facts of the case.

An. hon. MEMBER. How many miles?

Mr. NEELY. None whatever.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think there are men in the House who know that territory better than the hon. gentleman does.

Mr. NEELY. I know the country very well.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member from Huron told me he had travelled over that road.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. So I did, from Yorkton to Sheho.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill (Mr. Cash) is familiar with the fact that that portion of the road has been constructed from Yorkton to Sheho, a distance of 40 or 50 miles, sufficient to warrant this House in defending the charter of the company which constructed that road. My hon. friend seems to be entirely mistaken. He will find on inquiry that he is attempting to repeal the charter of a road, a considerable portion of which has already been constructed. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) is not in his place but I am sure the right hon. the Prime Minister will not consent that, where a charter has been granted and the company has constructed such a large portion of the road, that the charter will be taken from the company. The charter was obtained in 1893. In 1902 the time was extended for the construction of the line mentioned in subsections A and B. In 1907 it was extended for the completion of the railway authorized by section 9 of chapter 52. Not only have these charters been kept alive by parliament, but the company has gone ahead in good faith and constructed nearly 50 miles of road. That surely entitles them to the consideration of the House, and I do not think that, under the circumstances, the House will repeal the very charter under which the company are now operating the railway to that extent. I submit that my hon. friend must be labouring under a serious mistake or he would not have introduced this amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. NEELY. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong and so is the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm). The line of railway from Yorkton to Sheho has nothing to do with the line from Yorkton to Prince Albert. That is a line going westward and which will connect with the Kirkella at the town of Lanigan.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. I do not understand it in that way. I travelled over that road before the extension was made to Lanigan, and I understood it was part of this very road to Prince Albert.

Mr. NEELY. I think that the hon. gentleman who is promoting the Bill will say that the line from Yorkton to Sheho is being extended to Lanigan and is almost completed at present.

Mr. HENDERSON. The clause of the Act of 1893, which it is sought to repeal, is the clause that authorizes the construction of a road from Yorkton to Prince Albert. I am not speaking of the road from Sheho westerly as that is a different charter altogether. The language is unmistakable that this is a charter for a road now in operation, and I cannot see how the hon. member for Humboldt can fail to be mistaken. The section says:

> Extension of the main line from the present terminus at Yorkton in a northwesterly direction to a point at or near Prince Albert on the Saskatchewan river.

There is no other railway running from Yorkton in that direction to Sheho. The road from Sheho to which the hon. gentleman has referred is another charter running westward from Sheho to a place called Lanigan, but the hon. gentleman has made a mistake. He is repealing too much. If he had submitted an amendment to repeal a portion of subsection A in section 9 of the Act of 1893—that portion lying between Sheho and Prince Albert, he might have had some ground for his appeal; but he is asking the House to repeal the entire charter from Yorkton to Prince Albert or the road running from Yorkton, through Sheho and on to Prince Albert. The hon. member for McKenzie (Mr. Cash) will substantiate what I have said with reference to the portion of the road constructed and now in operation.

Mr. CASH. I am perfectly familiar with the conditions. The road runs from Portage La Prairie with a terminal at Yorkton. The line extended to Prince Albert under the old survey; and the line built from Yorkton to Sheho is on that old Manitoba and northwestern survey, right in a section where fault was found with the Canadian Pacific Railway for not building the road, many settlers having gone there from Dakota under the conviction that that line

would be built. The line remained at Yorkton quite a number of years, but since 1903 it has been extended, on the old survey to Prince Albert, as far as Sheho. After it arrived at Sheho, for some reasons known best to the Canadian Pacific Railway, they went westward to join with their Kirkella branch at a place called Lanigan. They have graded that line and have built to about half way between Sheho and Lanigan and what they are asking now is to go on the old survey from Sheho to Prince Albert. I presume they want to build that road, and I am anxious they should because it will give my section of country the shortest route possible to Prince Albert, and from Prince Albert to Winnipeg. I think that this extension of time should be granted for several reasons. I have no particular interest in the line, but it is of considerable importance to the people in my section of the country that it should be built. The Bill was handed to me to take charge of, and I did so as I was interested in the Manitoba and Northwestern to this extent. I can see the advantage the road will be to my section of the country and to Prince Albert and the country through which it will pass. The people are complaining at not having got the road sooner, and I do not know how they will get it any sooner if we refuse this extension. The Canadian Pacific Railway will probably build the line this summer. I have no doubt that, with the force of men they have on hand, they will begin construction to Prince Albert possibly this fall; but I am not stating this on the authority of the Canadian Pacific Railway people but simply on my own judgment. In my opinion it is their interest to do so as it is the shortest line to Prince Albert and the best. I think the amendment is a great mistake and consequently ought not to be considered. I do not find that the amendment as read by you, Mr. Chairman, agrees with the notice in the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There were two amendments proposed. If the hon. gentleman will look at some other copy of the Votes and Proceedings, he will see that the amendment as now put is properly put.

Mr. CASH. I have the second amendment before me and also the other. The amendment in Friday's Votes and Proceedings reads:

That clause 1 be amended to read as follows: Paragraph A, of section 9, of chapter 52, of the statutes of 1893, is hereby repealed.

There is no question of the clause reading as clause No. 2.

That would practically cut out the whole of the clause and all the branch lines connected therewith. If clause No. 1 were repealed it would practically cut out the whole of the line, and all the branch lines connected therewith.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment is really that clause 1, instead of being as it is in the Bill, should be as the hon. member has read it. But, as I stated, the intention was that clause 1 of the Bill should become clause 2, and I mentioned that. The amendment is simply that clause 1 should read as follows:

Paragraph A, of section 9, of chapter 52, of the statute of 1893, is hereby repealed.

But as the hon. member stated that the present clause 1 would become clause 2, I thought in explanation in committee I was justified in mentioning it.

Mr. CASH. I think that ought to be stated in the notice.

Mr. RUTAN. As a portion of this line runs through my constituency I wish to support the protest of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely). The people who live in that section have grave doubts of the intention of the Canadian Pacific Railway to extend this line to Prince Albert. After sixteen years of promises by the company the people there feel that it is now about time that something should be done. They have been promised this road for many years. People came into that section of the country with the expectation that this road would be built, and they went through many of the hardships of pioneers. They lived from 40 to 80 miles from a railroad. When the Candian Pacific Railway acquired the Manitoba and Northwestern road there was a clause in the agreement that they should build 30 miles of this road each year until it was all built. The people thought that it would be done, but they were disappointed. In 1903 they, the people, were given to understand that the company would build their road west to parallel with the Canadian Northern. In 1902, when the Canadian Northern were extending their lines from the boundary of Manitoba west to Prince Albert, the Canadian Pacific Railway did become active for a little while. They put forth considerable effort and ran two surveys, and they got all their friends to talk for them and help them make the people believe that they were going to Prince Albert, that they were going on at once to build that road following the surveys. However, nothing was done. They ran their survey lines, and as the Canadian Northern did not stop, they dropped the project and at once turned their road west to parallel the Canadian Northern main line. The people who live in that section of the country and who have undergone great hardships in pioneering felt

very much disappointed. They have been obliged to haul their grain to market, as I said, all the way from 40 to 80 miles. It took them a week to make a trip to Prince Albert, and their expenses about ate up whatever they received for their produce. As this road has turned west and the company has not yet manifested any intention of building, I think the people have a right to doubt their intention to go on and build this road. No doubt ultimately they will build it, because the growth of the country and its products will sometime or other induce them to construct it. But the people want it now. We know that if another charter was granted to run over this line, no matter to whom it was granted, the Canadian Pacific Railway, being a very powerful company, could in 48 hours put on enough men to start construction, and in this way prevent the other company from going on. There is another reason why we doubt their sincerity. They have not selected any land in the north part of Saskatchewan, their lands are all else where, as are the rest of their interests, and we think they are holding this charter as a blanket. Further than that, this great road in the last eight or ten years has done nothing to promote immigration into our country. When people come up from the States with the intention of going to Prince Albert and other northern points, the company carries them elsewhere, gives them transportation clear out to Calgary in another province entirely. The Canadian Pacific Railway was willing to undertake their transportation and send them on further west rather than allow them to go to the northern parts. Therefore, I say we have certainly reason to doubt their sincerity. We think it is now about time that they should get out and allow us to give a charter to some other company who will be willing to help us develop our section of the country. I shall support the amendment to the hon. member for Humboldt.

Mr. LANCASTER. How would the repealing of this charter facilitate you in getting your railroad built?

Mr. RUTAN. If this charter was out of the way we could get a new one. But as long as the Canadian Pacific holds the charter they can go to work at any time and start construction and head off any other project.

Mr. TURRIFF. When this matter was before the Railway Committee I supported the contention of the hon. member for Humboldt. I quite agree that the Canadian Pacific Railway has done a great deal of work in that country, and is doing a great deal of work, and everybody gives them credit for what they are doing. But it seems to me the fact they are building a certain number of roads is no argument why a charter should be renewed year after year when nothing is being done on that particular charter, and especially when it is a charter that has been in existence for the last 29 years, for the last 16 of which the Canadian Pacific Railway has held it. The Canadian Pacific Railway has had all consideration; but don't you think there ought to be some consideration shown to the settlers in that part of the country? What is the position? The hon. member for Humboldt and the hon. member for Prince Albert came before the Railway Committee representing those people, and stated that the people in those sections where this line is to run are against the renewal of that charter, simply because, as I have been told, the Canadian Pacific Railway have stated that they have no intention of doing anything on that charter this year.

They have no intention of building for the next two years. Why should not the charter be cancelled so that somebody else may be given an opportunity to come in and build the road, especially when the people of that part of the country ask that that should be done? It comes to this: Are the wishes of the people of the section affected to have any weight with the members of this House, or are the wishes of the Canadian Pacific Railway, who want the charter kept in force and have no intention of building at the present time, to have weight? I, for one, am going to take the ground that the voice of the people should be heard and not the voice of the railways. We do not want to oppose the Canadian Pacific Railway wherever they want to build, but they have had this charter sixteen years and have no intention of building now. There is a misapprehension between the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) and the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Cash). The road is already built from Yorkton to Sheho. I am not prepared to say whether that was built under the original Manitoba, Northwestern charter, or whether it was built under the new charter the Canadian Pacific Railway has got. But this I am certain of—they got a charter from Sheho, not in a northwesterly direction, but rather in a southwesterly direction to Lanigan, and from Lanigan they got a charter this session to extend through to Prince Albert. This is the second charter they want to get—this being a renewal—from Sheho to Prince Albert. The hon. member from Humboldt (Mr. Neely) is not to blame, for he is taking the language of a former Act of parliament. But what he wants to have cancelled is not the line from Yorkton to

Prince Albert, but the line from Sheho to Prince Albert.

Mr. LANCASTER. But does not the hon. member (Mr. Turriff) say that the effect of the motion is the opposite of what he says is intended?

Mr. TURRIFF. There may be something in that. The amendment may not be properly worded. But this branch comes up in connection with five or six others, making it almost impossible to cut out one without cutting out all. But the voice of the people should be heard, and they do not want this charter revived or given any longer existence, for they want to give somebody else an opportunity to go in and build the road.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. member allow me to ask a question? I want to find out for myself, if I can, what would be the effect of passing this resolution. As I understand it, the Canadian Pacific Railway now can build from Sheho to Prince Albert.

Mr. TURRIFF. Via Lanigan—they have that charter now.

Mr. CASH. They have a charter from Sheho to Prince Albert.

Mr. TURRIFF. That is what they are asking.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this by a new charter or by renewal?

Mr. TURRIFF. By renewal.

Mr. FOSTER. They have had, and if this passes they will continue to have?

Mr. TURRIFF. They have a charter from Lanigan to Prince Albert.

Mr. FOSTER. Each of these charters running through Sheho?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Very, well; then they have a charter to run from Lanigan——

Mr. TURRIFF. From Sheho to Lanigan and Lanigan to Prince Albert.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, if they get this they will have the right to build two roads to Prince Albert?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose the amendment were to pass, what will they have?

Mr. TURRIFF. They have the road built to Sheho, and they have it built half way from Sheho to Lanigan. They will have the right to continue from Lanigan to Prince Albert.

Mr. FOSTER. And cut the people out from Sheho to Prince Albert. What do they say?

Mr. TURIFF. Nine-tenths of the people from Sheho to Prince Albert say that this has been in existence for sixteen years, and nothing has been done with the charter and so they ask that it be cancelled.

Mr. FOSTER. How will that help them?

Mr. TURRIFF. It will let somebody else come in and build. They have no hope or faith that the Canadian Pacific Railway will build the road. This charter has been in existence for twenty-nine years, and the Canadian Pacific Railway have had it for sixteen years. As the people have no hope that the Canadian Pacific Railway will build, they ask that somebody else be given a chance to do so. They are suffering, and they are the people whose voice should be heard, and not the voice of the railway company. That is what it comes down to. Let the people themselves judge whether they want the charter or not; they are the ones who will suffer, if, by cancelling this charter, the road is not built. And they ask that that be done. For once, let us do what the people along the line ask should be done.

Mr. SPROULE. If we do what the hon. member (Mr. Turriff) asks the House to do, the result would be absolutely absurd It would repeal the charter under which a road has been built, and is being operated.

Mr. TURRIFF I stated that there was a mix-up, and that all that was wanted was to cancel the motion as relating to that part from Sheho to Prince Albert, but not the whole line from Yorkton to Prince Albert.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the amendment. Its effect would be to cancel the whole line. I see by the Canadian Pacific Railway report that a portion of the line has been built. The Manitoba North Western from Portage la Prairie to Yorkton, 229·9 miles has been built. From Yorkton to Sheho, 42·2 miles, has been built. If this amendment passes, it would repeal the Act which gave authority to build that line and run it. The hon. member must see how absurd this amendment would be if carried. I see it stated here also that the line from Sheho to Lanigan is under construction, 82·8 miles. Part of the road has been built and running for years, and we are asked to repeal the law under which it is operated. It must be obvious that that is something that cannot be entertained.

Mr. TURRIFF. It is an easy matter to change the wording to make it apply only to that portion of the line for which they are asking a renewal, from Sheho to Prince Albert.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The hon. member (Mr. Turriff) has spoken of the people wishing to have this charter not renewed. Have the people petitioned this House to that

effect? Another question: Is there a bunch of capitalists standing by ready to build this road if the Canadian Pacific Railway loses this charter? These are important questions. It is all right enough to make a great talk before the committee for the benefit of the people, to talk about 'the wishes of the people,' and so on, but the fact remains that no independent company, no company outside the Canadian Northern, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific has built ten miles of road in that western country in the last ten years. If the big concerns desire to build twenty lines into Prince Albert or any other place, why should this House stand in the way? The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) in discussing the National Transcontinental—the government part of the line —and the government policy in relation to the building of roads, declared that it was a competitive policy, not a pioneer policy. From the standpoint of competition, it would be advisable for Prince Albert to have several roads. I quite approve of the stand taken by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the amendment is irregular. In addition I do not think that it is in the interest of the people of the west that any charter held by a bona fide railway building company should be struck out.

Mr. TURRIFF. Let the people of the west judge.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I ask the hon. member for Humboldt, or yourself, whether there has been a petition presented to this House against the renewal of this charter.

Mr. NEELY. As far as notice of the intention of the company to apply for a renewal of the charter is concerned, frequently this notice is very limited, but I have had information that within a few days a very largely signed petition from the farmers all along the line would be forwarded to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) and to myself protesting against a renewal of the charter unless the Canadian Pacific Railway guarantee to go on and build the road.

Mr. LANCASTER. We had better wait until we see what they say.

Mr. NEELY. In so far as this amendment not being in proper form to attain the result I desire is concerned, I have just to say that the clause referred to, in my motion, subsection A of section 9 of chapter 52 of the statutes of 1893, reads as follows:

> An extension of the main line from the present terminus thereof at Yorkton, in a northwesterly direction to a point at or near Prince-Albert, on the north bank of the Saskatchewan river.

I am not going to say definitely—hon. gentlemen may say the opposite—that under this charter the line has been extended to Sheho. That may be the case but I have this to say that in so far as using the charter for the purpose for which the charter is intended is concerned, it has not been used in that way from Yorkton to Prince Albert. No line has been built in the direction of Prince Albert from Yorkton. This line has already been extended westward showing what the original object of the Canadian Pacific Railway in so far as they have extended the line from Sheho practically to the town of Lanigan. It will be completed to Lanigan before the shipping season commences. The extension from Sheho is an extension in a westerly and not in a northwesterly direction. I do not care under what charter they built this particular line to Sheho; it does not affect the argument at all in favour of the amendment which seeks to cancel the charter that gives them power to build in a northwesterly direction to Prince Albert.

Mr. CASH. I do not like the members of this House to be misled by statements which must have that result. For instance, the first statement made is that this company do not intend to build this road. I do not know where hon. gentlemen get that information. I cannot get it. I assume that when they are asking for a renewal of this charter they do intend to build within two years.

Mr. NEELY. What assurance can the hon. gentleman give?

Mr. CASH. The assurance that they are not asking for a renewal of this charter without a purpose. My hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely) states that the road has been built from Yorkton to Sheho in a westerly direction. That line runs in the direction of Prince Albert. Sheho is northwest of Yorkton. I forget the township although I ought to know because it is in my own constituency. The line runs in the direction of Prince Albert and the survey has been extended in as nearly a direct line to Prince Albert as it would be possible to obtain. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) tries to make this committee believe that they have built to Sheho, but that this carries them west and that they are seeking authority to build their line from Lanigan. That is misleading. Lanigan is in another direction. It is on the Kirkella branch. When this railway got to Sheho it wanted to connect with the Kirkella branch so as to be on the main line to Edmonton. Therefore, they have built something like 50 miles of this line from Sheho to Lanigan.

Mr. SPROULE. 82 miles.

Mr. CASH. They have built that distance to Wynward. They have graded the line to Sheho. To show that it is not their intention to run the main line to Lanigan I may state that they have graded the line part of the way to Fishing lake. They turn off a few miles from Sheho and then go west. I think there was some condition that they should build so much of each line each year. I imagine that their principal object in asking for this renewal at the present time is that they may complete the forty or fifty miles that they have already built of their western line towards Prince Albert. I see no reason why this renewal should not be granted. It seems to me that some hon. gentlemen have taken a great objection to the Canadian Pacific Railway because it is that particular line, not giving sufficient consideration to the fact that the people living in this neighbourhood are desirous of obtaining railway facilities. If they are desirous of obtaining railway facilities they can get this line quicker by having the Canadian Pacific Railway construct it than by having it constructed by a private company. It would take a private company a year to get their charter and we know that it is seldom that railway companies are able to go to work immediately after they get their charter. The result is that two years might elapse before actual operations are commenced.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. We have heard considerable to-day about the influence of the railway and the influence of the people. I would just say that this appears to me very much like an effort on the part, not of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but of some other railway to keep the Canadian Pacific Railway out of Prince Albert. We found the same influence working against the wishes of the people in the construction of a branch line from Lanigan to Prince Albert. We know that it also has worked against the construction of other branch lines. We know that it is also the same influence which has been continuously working against the building of a line to Prince Albert on other occasions, but what we and the people wish to see in that western country is competition. That is what the people of the west, one and all, want. I would say that it is not 30, or 40 or 50 miles of this road that have been built but over 200 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. 293 miles.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. From Portage la Prairie I think it has been built?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. And what has been built is directly in line between Yorkton and Prince Albert; so that, instead of using the line running by way of Fishing lake and Lanigan, they have built a branch line from Fishing lake to Lanigan and in that way they have shown themselves entitled to more consideration and respect. They have finished nearly 82 miles of the branch lines from a little north of Sheho to Lanigan and while they have built a line to Lanigan they expect to build the other branch. They have pretty nearly completed the branch line from Sheho to Lanigan, and they are now preparing to build the main line directly to Prince Albert. We must remember that Lanigan is 82 miles out of the way, and that the traffic of Prince Albert will be compelled to go 82 miles out of the way for all time if the construction of this line is prevented. Eighty-two miles in that country is a great distance and there is a large section of country adjacent to Lake Leonore that would be benefited by the construction of this branch line. During all the years I have been in this House I have never heard of a railway company that had built so many miles of railway or which had proceeded with the construction of its line in the same manner as this has been proceeded with and, having constructed 82 miles of a branch line covered by another and recently granted charter, and then having the charter for its partly constructed main line refused a renewal. It is perfectly absurd to say that they do not intend to proceed and complete the road, therefore the extension of their charter should certainly be granted, and the absurdity appears still stronger when I see the careless way in which the amendment has been drawn up, so careless indeed that even the mover of the amendment has to admit that it does not say what he really meant it should say. I am surprised that a man living in the west, and living at Humboldt at that, should come here and know so little about his own country.

Mr. NESBITT. I would point out to hon. gentleman that the Railway Committee has laid down the principle this year, that they would not oppose the granting of such charters as this, and the Minister of Railways has himself emphatically stated two or three times in the House that such is the policy of parliament. I do not see how the members of the west are going to benefit their people by refusing to extend these charters. If I thought it would benefit the people I would vote in favour of it, because I have great sympathy with the people in the west who are badly in need of railway facilities in some districts. I have not the least doubt in the world that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will build this line of railway and other lines similarly situated just as soon as they are able, and when this particular branch line is built it will be operated in connection with one of the largest and best managed railways in the world and

will afford every facility to the people, and I do not agree with the contention that the existence of this charter stops other people from getting charters, because I have not the slightest doubt that if any other company wants to build a railway over this route they can apply to parliament tomorrow and they will get a charter, probably whether they intend to build or not. This is a prairie country, there are no passes to go through, there is room for any number of roads, and there is no blocking or blanketing. I think the hon. gentlemen from the Northwest who have spoken against this Bill are standing in their own light.

Mr. RUTAN. I would point out to the hon. gentleman that this is not a prairie country, but on the contrary there are many hills which the railways have to go through. I also want to tell hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that there are many petitions from Prince Albert and from the people living in that section of the country opposing this charter. They have good reason to believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway are not sincere in their intention to build. The people in that country believe that if this charter were out of the way they could deal with other people and get a line of railroad built quicker than the Canadian Pacific Railway would build it.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman seriously believe that any company would build a little bit of a road like that leading no where and commencing practically nowhere?

Mr. RUTAN. My experience both in the United States and in Canada is that many short lines of railroad have been built through new country, and although of course they were afterwards devoured by the other companies, yet they afforded means of transportation to the settlers and relieved them from the disabilities under which they laboured. We cannot raise grain profitably and haul it 40 or 50 miles to a railroad; we must have railway transportation facilities or our land is of no value to us. I am entirely opposed to placing in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern Railway, or the Grank Trunk Pacific either, the monopoly of building railways throughout that country, a monopoly which we practically give them if we allow them to blanket the country with charters, and come here year after year asking for extensions of time. It may be all right to have free trade in railway charters when you are granting new charters, but when you come to these renewals it is an entirely different thing. Now, I object to this system of the railway company including in one Bill legislation for the renewal of several charters. The Minister of Railways has distinctly stated that we should deal with these charters each on its own merits, but so long as the railway companies jumble the whole thing up into one Bill for the purpose of misleading the people of the country it is impossible to treat each on its own merits. There are several branch lines included in this one Bill, and while it may be fair in the case of some of them to grant an extension of time, in other cases it undoubtedly should not be granted. We have the right to know now whether the Canadian Pacific Railway are ready to build this road or whether they simply intend to get an extension of time now and to come back a few years hence for a further extension. There has been settlement in that part of the province of Saskatchewan as long as in any other part of the province, and we have a right to expect that we should have railway facilities. We know that it is the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway to divert settlement from one section of the country and to scatter it in other sections so that they may have the benefit of the long haul on the freight in and out, and that is no doubt a natural thing for a railway company to do in its own interest, but we certainly should not allow these railway companies to blanket the country with charters so as to prevent other roads from coming in there. Prince Albert needs another railway and Lake Leonore country wants a railway badly. People have been settled in there for five or six years; there is a large colony of French people who have settled there in the expectation that they were going to get a railway. They have gone through a great deal of hardship, they have obtained accommodation until they were able to get their patents and they now want to relieve themselves of their obligations. Every gentleman in this House knows that if you have 160 acres of land twenty-five miles from a railway, even though it is the best land in the world, you cannot get a loan company to help you. I have been trying personally for the past few years to help some of these poor people. If I had the money myself I would be willing to lend it because I know the time will come when they will have a railway in there and then they will be able to meet their obligations, but you cannot get a loan company to take chances on that. There are people in some sections of that country who have been settled ten or fifteen years there and who are miles away from a railway and they would like now to experience some of the comforts of life. They do not want the road for their grandchildren, they wish to see it during their lives they would like to see the amendement; carry and this company who have shown no evidence of intention to build, should get out of the way and let

some other road have a chance to get in there.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I presume from the way the hon. gentleman has spoken that he does not desire either the Manitoba and Northwestern or the Canadian Pacific Railway to build this road at all.

Mr. RUTAN. It does not make one bit of difference to me who builds the road so long as we get it built.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Then why do you not approve of this charter?

Mr. RUTAN. Because it has been in existence for 16 years under the Canadian Pacific Railway and we are no nearer getting it built that we were 16 years ago. I would say further that when this matter came before me and I had to investigate it to see if the Canadian Pacific Railway intended building into Prince Albert this year, I was plainly told by the man who knows that they were not going to build any of it this year, that their plans were all made. I asked whether they would build in another year and he said he could not say that, he might not be here and he did not want to say anything that would bind his successors.

Mr. HENDERSON. I stated on the authority of a member of the House familiar with that part of the country that the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway had built about 50 miles on their line from Yorkton to Prince Albert under their charter. I believe the correct distance is 42·2 miles. It was contended that this 42 miles was not built under the Manitoba and Northwestern charter but on another route under a charter obtained later running from Sheho towards Lanigan. I find in the statutes of 1904 that the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company obtained a charter giving them authority to build that road. The section reads:

The Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada, hereinafter called the company, may construct or acquire and operate a branch line of railway about 100 miles in length from a point on its main line near Sheho, westerly and northwesterly, southward of Quill lakes, to a point in township 33 or township 34, in range 23, west of the 2nd principal meridian.

That is the road that is being built towards Lanigan, a different charter altogether from the old Manitoba and Northwestern charter. It seems clear to my mind that the 42 miles to which I referred from Yorkton to Sheho has been built under the old Manitoba and Northwestern charter and not under this new charter authorizing the construction of a road from Sheho towards Lanigan. It would therefore be absurd to say that we should repeal or desire to repeal this charter for the construction of a road from Yorkton to Prince Albert, because 42 miles of that line has been built and is already in operation. To cancel the charter would cancel their power of operation of these 42 miles and might get somebody into serious trouble. I do not think the House intends to do this, and I trust the committee will vote down the amendment.

Mr. TALBOT. I am not in the habit of interfering with any legislation affecting any part of the country which is better known to other hon. members than it is to myself. There is no doubt that the hon. members for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), Prince Albert (Mr. Rutan) and Humboldt (Mr. Neely) have voiced the disappointment of their people, because they have been disappointed through not having the railway constructed before now; but I ask them if their arguments are of any weight to affect the judgment of this House? Have they any proof or guarantee that should the House not grant this extension of time, any company or individuals would build the road? Would it not be worse for their people if we should forbid the Canadian Pacific Railway to build there? No private corporation will build in that country in opposition to the great companies now operating there, and I think it would be far better for these people if we should grant the extension and allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to build the road. The Canadian Pacific Railway has no interest in preventing the settlers from getting transportation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) is not in his seat this afternoon because the motion made by the hon member for Humbolt (Mr. Neely) deserves some answer from him. I know the views he entertains on that question and I can state them. All the considerations involved in the Bill and the amendment of my hon. friend have been, as I understand, discussed and considered by the Railway Committee, and while it is not an absolute rule it is a rule I think of great convenience and safety that when a matter of this kind has been considered by the Railway Committee the judgment of the the Railway Committee should be accepted, unless there be some very strong reason to the contrary. The only reason which has impressed me to-day is that advanced by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) that we should consult and abide by the wishes of the people in a matter of this kind. But what are the wishes of the people? There is a serious discrepancy as to that. Two of my friends on this side of the House state that the wishes of the people are against an extension of this charter, and on the other hand my hon. friend from Mackenzie (Mr. Cash) who is as much interested in this matter as any one else and who ought to know the country and the circumstances is strongly in favour of this extension. The argument made by my hon. friend

from Humboldt (Mr. Neely), supported by my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. Rutan), is that the Canadian Pacific Railway have been remiss in the duty imposed on them by a charter as far back as 1883, and have not done anything. What is the reason? The reason is that to-day the western provinces are developing so rapidly that it is not possible to keep abreast of the demand for railways. At this moment if the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific were to undertake the construction of 1,000 miles of railway each during the coming summer they would not meet all the requirements of the people of the country. The demand comes from all quarters for more railways, and if such a strong railway as the Canadian Pacific Railway has not been able up to the present time to meet the demands of the new settlers, is it to be supposed or believed that any other company could have done it? Suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway does not go on with this work? Is it to be supposed that an independent company will be formed and will be ready to undertake the task any sooner than the Canadian Pacific Railway will do it? I think not, and I think my hon. friends had better rely on the will of the Canadian Pacific Railway to perform this work. It is to their interest to do so. That section of the country is developing very rapidly, as has been stated by the hon. member for Prince Albert, and therefore it is to the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to be able to serve that section of the country as soon as they can, and I think on the whole we had better rely on the judgment of the Railway Committee in this matter.

Amendment (Mr. Neely) negatived; Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPERIOR AND WESTERN ONTARIO RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Superior and Western Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Conmee.

On section 8,

Mr. BOYCE. What point is this going to connect?

Mr. CONMEE. The railway is projected from a point on the branch line of the Grand Trunk Pacific, about 200 miles west of Fort William, to the main line of the Transcontinental, about 125 miles. It will connect with Sturgeon lake, which is a mining centre in that locality, by a short line, and there is in the neighbourhood 100 miles of navigation as well as the railway. It is partly graded already. The intention is to hurry the construction so as to meet the requirements of that section.

Mr. SPROULE. How can it be graded when it is not incorporated?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. CONMEE. They have taken the risk of forestalling the granting of the charter. The line is located and they are actually at work constructing. There are no municipalities there but simply mining and lumber interests. There is no real settlement because there have been no facilities for transportation.

Mr. SPROULE. Under what authority are they constructing? Does the Minister of Railways approve of the plan? They have no charter, yet the hon. gentleman says they have surveyed the line and have begun construction. I have always thought that a company could not begin constructing until the minister approves of its plans.

Mr. CONMEE. This is not the only set of promoters who have taken a little risk. there are no engineering difficulties and no interests to be prejudiced. Of course, until they get their plans approved they cannot operate the road.

Mr. SPROULE. But the Railway Act says they shall not construct at all until their plans are approved of.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I assume they must be going on as private individuals. If an individual owns the right of way there is nothing to hinder his building a railway. They must be going ahead on their own property, or, if through Crown lands, with the consent of the Ontario government. The railway charter is necessary to enable them to expropriate land, but if they own the right of way, there is no reason why they should not build a railway if they wish to do so. Of course, they take the risk of afterwards getting a license from the government to operate, but owners can build a railway over their own land or over right of way that they have acquired from the provincial government.

Mr. BOYCE. Would the minister consider it a proper thing, in the Public Works Department over which he presides, for a contractor to proceed with work before a contract was entered into?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a different case.

Mr. BOYCE. I would like the minister to answer the question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly I would not consider it proper.

Mr. BOYCE. But the minister does it in connection with a company to which the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) belongs.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a case of a railway——

Mr. BOYCE. I am talking about the public works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we had better stick to the question.

Mr. BOYCE. I was asking the minister a question in view of his pointed argument in favour of the hon. member's Bill.

Mr. CONMEE. They have obtained the right of way from the Ontario government.

Mr. LANCASTER. Have they an Ontario charter?

Mr. CONMEE. No, but they submitted it to the Ontario government and pointed out that it was necessary in their opinion, to have a Dominion charter because of the connections that they were making. But notwithstanding that they did not ask for a provincial charter, the Ontario government not only gave them a right of way but gave them a land grant as well.

Mr. LANCASTER. A right of way through Ontario land?

Mr. CONMEE. These are all Crown lands of Ontario. They got permission there—at least, so I am informed. And, though their company is not incorporated, the Ontario government gave them al land grant on the strength of their expected incorporation. So, I do not think the House shuold take objection to it. The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce) intimated, as I understood him that I had some interest possibly in this railway. I have no interest in it.

Mr. BOYCE. I did not make such a suggestion.

Mr. CONMEE. Then, I misunderstood.

Mr. HENDERSON. This discloses a very extraordinary state of affairs. We understood from the promoter of the Bill that the Ontario government approved of the measure, and, notwithstanding that, their representative appeared before the committee the other day to oppose it. I would like to understand how this conflict of authority comes in.

Mr. BOYCE. In view of the statement made by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) and the extraordinary position he has taken of constructing a road without filing the plans, incorporation powers, restrictions or limitations, and in the absence of the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) who certainly ought to be informed about this, and be ready to give us information, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, in hope that the minister will be in his place when we take it up.

Mr. CONMEE. That is entirely unnecessary.

Mr. LANCASTER. The charter is unnecessary, apparently.

Mr. CONMEE. No, the whole question was fully discussed in the Railway Committee. I made the same statement there that I made here, that the road was being constructed. These people have taken the risk of going on with construction in advance of the charter. This is not the only road that has been gone on with in that way; I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) that many railway companies have gone a little in advance of their charter where there was no possible difficulty to be met with. If there were highways to be considered, or surveys of municipalities, it would be different. This is what might be called a wilderness, except so far as the mining and lumbering to which I have referred are concerned.

Mr. BARR. We have been opposing these companies because they were not going on with the work, and not likely to do so. But this company seems to be going on. I remember that we had opposition to some clauses of this Bill in the Railway Committee from a representative of the Ontario government. But, as the company is to go through and connect with the Grand Trunk Pacific it seems to me that is the reason why it should have a Dominion charter.

On section 9,

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I understood from the promoter of the Bill, both here and in the Railway Committee, that this was a charter for a railway company. Apparently, it is a charter for a company very different—it is really a power company, and, under the provisions of this section, a most extraordinary power company.

Mr. CONMEE. I think the hon. member is reading from the first draft of the Bill. It was amended in the Railway Committee, and the model clause used instead of this.

On section 9 b,

For the purposes of its undertaking, and subject to the provisions of section 247 of the Railway Act, the company may acquire electric or other power or energy which may be transmitted and delivered to any place in the district through which the railway is authorized to be built, and may receive transform, transmit, distribute and supply such power or energy in any form, and may dispose of the surplus thereof and collect rates and charges therefor; but no such rate or charge shall be demanded or taken until it has been approved of by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, who may also revise such rates and charges from time to time.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I do not know whether this is the standard clause or not, nor do I care very much. This is a clause to permit the company to acquire power, and there is no limitation or restriction as

to the manner of acquiring that power, whether by generation or by taking over existing powers. There is no limitation to the localities in which it is to be acquired. It seems to me the committee is entitled to a very much fuller explanation of the objects of the company and its powers than is contained in the clause just read. In the first place, it is undoubtedly a power clause, and, in the opinion of many hon. members of this House, it is entirely within the control of the provincial legislature. The hon. gentleman who moves this Bill has more than once taken that stand in this House. I ask the hon. gentleman to explain what he means, what he proposes to do by the power clause, and what restriction he proposes to put upon the company with regard to generating that power, with regard to distance, and locality, and so on.

Mr. CONMEE. The clause is the usual clause that is inserted in nearly all the Railway Bills that are passed in this House, there is no difference. It is a clause that is approved by the Railway Committee and by the Minister of Railways, and it has appeared I think in the majority of Bills. It is not giving to the company the general powers of a power company, it gives them power to expend their money as a corporate body for the purpose of acquiring water-power or generating electricity for the operation of their road; that is all.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. There is power there to dispose of the surplus.

Mr. CONMEE. If they have more than they require for their own use, they may dispose of it. But that does not constitute this company a power company instead of a railway company.

Mr. LANCASTER. What would prevent it, as the Bill stands ?

Mr. CONMEE. What would prevent it in the other Bills ? This provision does not move this company out from under the general law of the province or of the Dominion. How are they going to become a power company ? They are subject to all the restrictions and conditions of the provincial law. They have got to acquire the water-power; this Bill does not empower them to take water from any particular place.

Mr. LANCASTER. It allows them to do it everywhere.

Mr. CONMEE. Not at all, only for the operation of their road. At the present time power is merely an incidental.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They have no power of expropriation.

Mr. CONMEE. They have got to show that they want it for their road, that is the first thing. But incidentally if they have more than they want, who wishes to prevent them from selling it ?

Mr. BOYCE. Will the hon. gentleman point out that clause in the Bill that makes the disposal of the surplus power subject to such rules and regulations as the provincial law may impose ?

Mr. CONMEE. It is not in the Bill, but I want to ask the hon. member why should it be in the Bill? Is it in any other Bill? There is no power under this Bill to expropriate a water-power, they have the power of the Railway Act for the purpose of constructing their railway only. This clause has been adopted in other Bills, why object to it in this case? If there is any Bill I know of that has passed this House in recent years where such a power ought to be given, it should be given to a road of this character that is being built in an absolutely new country, entirely unsettled, and unoccupied except by mines, lumbering and construction.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose that a water-power had been developed so as to generate electricity and they acquired control over it, would they not then have control over it?

Mr. CONMEE. If a company owned a water-power and developed it, and obtained it from either the Dominion or provincial authority, that company would be bound by the conditions under which they obtained the power to develop it, and if this company acquired it they would be bound by the same conditions. I know of nothing that would prevent a company from selling a water-power. But that is not the point in this Bill, the point is, does this give power to expropriate and take it without consent of the owner ?

Mr. J. D. REID. Does this railway cross the Nipigon river ?

Mr. CONMEE. No, it is about 200 miles west of the Nipigon river.

Mr. J. D. REID. What river does it cross ?

Mr. CONMEE. I do not think it crosses any river, it runs along what is called the English river for a portion of the way which, is I believe in some sections of its course an interprovincial boundary between the province and the district of Keewatin.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the hon. gentleman is promoting his Bill very cleverly, but I cannot adopt his view that because the Bill is silent as to the right to expropriate that therefore they could not expropriate. Why, they could not expropriate for railway purposes according to his argument. The Bill itself does not give him the right to expropriate. They can go on and construct and operate a railway, but not a

word about expropriation. The hon. gentleman will not admit that he cannot expropriate for railway purposes under the Railway Act. And they go on and say that for the purpose of the undertaking they may also acquire these water-powers.

Mr. CONMEE. This company has not got specific powers of expropriation in the Bill, but they have them under the Railway Act. Then they are thrown back on the Railway Act, and how could my hon. friend argue that the Railway Act gave this company power to expropriate a water-power ?

Mr. LANCASTER. I did not say they could, but I say it could be well argued before a court that inasmuch as the special Act gave them the right to acquire these water-powers and that the Railway Act applies to it, they would have the same right whether by expropriation or by private purchase, in regard to the one matter as to the other. If they are going to take water-powers by expropriation when people are not willing to sell them, they will be causing a great deal of trouble. Even if it was limited to the purposes of the undertaking, I think the point is just the same. 'For the purpose of the undertaking' means for the purpose of carrying on everything that is authorized by this charter. Then without the words of limitation that you cannot expropriate, certainly when you say you want the water-power for the purpose of using and working the railway, you can at once use every right of expropriation that you could for the other purposes of the undertaking.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot think upon reflection that my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) will adhere to the view which he has just expressed. There is no power contained in this Bill to expropriate land. As far as the railway is concerned, the Railway Act would apply. Then, we have to look to the Railway Act to see what are the powers of expropriation which are there given and they are to expropriate a right for the railway of, I think, not exceeding six rods in width and what is necessary for station purposes. That is the only land which can be expropriated under the Railway Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is to say that they do not have this power but practically we declare in this charter that they may do these other things for the purpose of this undertaking. The special Act extends the Railway Act and makes it apply to the very things in question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If this Act contained a clause saying that the provision of the Railway Act should apply to all properties that the company might desire to acquire for the purposes of the undertaking.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is not that so ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is not, because all this Act does is to give to the company the power to acquire land; that is to acquire it in the ordinary legal way by agreement with the people who happen to own it. The company is not given power to take land without the consent of the party who owns it. The only power of expropriation which exists is the power which is contained in the Railway Act and that is limited to six rods in width for the right of way and such lands as may be necessary for station purposes. If a water-power happened to be within the right of way or within the six rods, of course, it might be acquired by expropriation.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is exactly where the acuteness of the company would cause them to operate. If they should say: We will put this line of railway within the 90 or 100 feet belt that we are allowed to expropriate and thereby take in a water-power, under the Bill they could do it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They might do that.

Mr. LANCASTER. Exactly; and yet it stated distinctly that they are not going to expropriate water-powers.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill why they want water-powers to operate this railway. When the Bill was before the Railway Committee the understanding was that this was to be a railway operated by steam entirely. Now we all know that if there are any water-powers in the district between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific they are all entirely within the control of the Ontario government, and if this clause is allowed to remain in, such a thing might occur as my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has just stated. They might run this railway 20 or 30 miles along one of these rivers, expropriate a water-power and the Ontario government could not interfere. If that is the object of the Bill we certainly must have a different impression of it than that which was sought to be conveyed in the Railway Committee. When it was stated that the usual standard clause as far as water-powers are concerned was to be put into the Bill nobody ever thought it meant what has been suggested here today. I was in favour of the Bill and am now in favour of the granting of a charter by this parliament provided it does not mean practically taking all the water-powers in that district and locking them up. I do not see why the clause referring to water-powers should not be dropped. We were assured in the Railway Committee that this was a railway to be constructed from

the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Grand Trunk Pacific and that it was to be a steam railway throughout its whole length. With reference to the clause dealing with boats and docks, it was mentioned by the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill that they might want to run boats on the lakes and take people to summer resorts. There was no objection to that. But it seems to me, from the discussion which has taken place, that there is another object altogether behind this Bill. I think it would be better to refer the Bill back to the Railway Committee and let us get it thoroughly threshed out there rather than to try to push it through here to-day in its present form and containing a clause the effect of which we may not be able at the present time to fully appreciate.

Mr. TURRIFF. This is the same clause that we have put in practically every railway charter.

Mr. LANCASTER. No.

Mr. TURRIFF. Most of them. This clause has appeared in most of the charters that have passed through the Railway Committee during the present and previous sessions. The fact that this is a steam railway should not prevent the company at some future time, if it found it advisable to run their trains by electricity, from adopting that motive power. The Canadian Pacific Railway is a steam railway and at the present time the management have under consideration the electrifying of certain portions of the line. I do not think my hon. friends need be alarmed about the power of expropriation where it only extends to a strip of land six rods wide. Any one knows that they could not have a water-power and a railway working together on a right of way of that width.

Mr. J. D. REID. How would it be crossing the river.

Mr. TURRIFF. It might be possible, but I do not think it would be. Railways do not want a water-power right at a bridge where they cross, because there is always the danger of the dam going out and taking away the railway bridge. The clause is one which we have put in before, and I do not see any reason why this particular Bill should be picked out or why the same provisions should not be given to this company as are given to others.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the hon. gentleman name any charter that has passed this House within the last two or three years containing a clause such as this? I do not know of any, and I am a pretty regular attendant at the Railway Committee. I never saw such a clause as that in a Steam Railway Bill in my life.

Mr. J. D. REID.

Mr. CONMEE. When this Bill was before the Railway Committee the clause dealing with water-powers was withdrawn and the model clause which the Railway Committee have accepted with regard to water-powers was inserted in lieu of it. This is the model clause.

Mr. LANCASTER. What does the hon. gentleman mean by the model clause? I am afraid he is dignifying this with a name that it is not entitled to.

Mr. CONMEE. That is what it was called by the chairman and it was inserted. My hon. friend is borrowing trouble when he imagines that the railway company might run its line purposely to get a water-power. I wonder if the Railway Board or the Minister of Railways would ratify the plans of a railway company that would try a trick like that?

Mr. LANCASTER. They might not know it.

Mr. CONMEE. They would know it. It would be plain because it would require 60 or 100 acres to enable any person to operate a water-power. It would be absolutely useless in the charter. It is only borrowing trouble; it is a suspicion without any foundation.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am afraid I am not borrowing trouble. I wish I were because I do not want to keep this discussion up unnecessarily. This clause says that this power shall be exercised subject to section 247 of the Railway Act. That strengthens my argument and strengthens the contention of my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid). The Railway Act is brought in and then this special Act is brought in and it provides that this power can be exercised provided it does not interfere with section 247 of the Railway Act. It may be held that as long as it does not conflict with section 247 of the Railway Act the provisions of the Railway Act are complied with. Section 247 presupposes that these rights will be purchased, and it simply restricts them from using them on the highways without the consent of the municipalities. Then, if the municipalities cannot agree with the company, the Railway Board decides upon what conditions these rights are to be acquired. How can my hon. friend contend that it is quite sure they cannot expropriate. My point is that this charter is made subject to section 247 only, and 247 provides that you must not put your lines and poles along the highway without the consent of the municipality, and if the municipality does not consent you have to go to the board, who can order in what manner the wires shall be placed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. By section 3 of the Act passed last year respecting the Edmonton Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway

even broader power is given than is contained in this Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. But that Act does not say that the company is subject to section 247 of the Railway Act. It does seem to me that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) is in this Bill getting much more than he wants.

Mr. SPROULE. Oh no, he could not.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman tells us that he does not want expropriation powers and I have to accept his word. If the hon. gentleman does not want power to expropriate it is very easy to insert words excluding that power.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Act, also passed last year, there are still broader powers given to acquire for the purpose of developing electricity.

Mr. LANCASTER. All that shows that this is not a model Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It might be called a modest Bill.

Mr. TURRIFF. In Bill (No. 11) passed this session respecting the Canadian Western Railway Company, there is a clause subjecting it to the provisions of 247 of the Railway Act, as to the charges which may be made for electricity, &c., and the Board of Railway Commissioners have the power to decide.

Mr. SPROULE. Did that Bill pass as the hon. gentleman has read it?

Mr. TURRIFF. I think there was no change whatever made in that Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why is it that the Bill referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) subjects that company to the provisions of section 247 of the Railway Act, while the Bill mentioned by the Minister of Public Works does not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Bills I refer to were passed last session.

Mr. CONMEE. It is because of amendments to the Railway Act which gives the board powers they did not have before. It is a further protection for the public; that is all.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is all right to say it is a further protection to the public, but when you make this company subject to one specific clause of the Railway Act, any court will decide that you have not restricted it in any other way than in respect to whatever restrictions may be in that particular clause. Under section 247 the board may order that the wires shall be placed in a certain way for the protection of the people, and that being so you cannot work out section 247 unless you do give them power to expropriate under certain conditions to be decided by the board. If this House is of opinion they should have power to expropriate that is one thing, but if we are deciding they should not have power to expropriate then the Bill should say so.

Mr. McKENZIE. At one time the law was that unless a company were restricted down to certain things they could do anything which they were not prevented specifically from doing in their charter. If it were fairly within the bounds of their charter the courts held they could do that thing whatever it was, if it could be said to be akin to their business. But that is not the law to-day and that has not been the law for the past ten years. The law is now that before a company can do any specific thing it must be set forth in its charter.

Mr. LANCASTER. It says so in this charter.

Mr. McKENZIE. There is nothing in this charter so far as I can see that specifically gives this company the right to expropriate.

Mr. LANCASTER. It says they may acquire.

Mr McKENZIE That is not expropriation. I should judge from the manner in which my hon friend (Mr Lancaster) discusses questions in this House that he is a good lawyer and he knows that there is nothing by inference to be decided in favour of a corporation. There is no intendment in their favour at all. The power must be defined in clear language, and particularly a power so drastic as expropriation. They cannot by inference, or by reading half a dozen Acts together patch up a case for expropriation. The power must be given specifically, and if it is not given specifically the court will decide it was not intended they should have it.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is not a matter of inference, it is a matter of the gentleman opposing the Bill thinking there is a limitation that is not expressed in the Bill that the railway company 'may acquire.' I contend that there is no limit in the way of acquiring, it is not a matter of inference but a direct statement that they can acquire whatever any other railway company can acquire.

Mr. McKENZIE. That is what I said. The Railway Act is construed by the courts in the light of its purpose and will not be strained by them to give any corporation the right to get water-power which, as a rule, is not used in connection with railways. From my knowledge of corporation law and the common law generally I do not think there is need to be alarmed. This provision has been inserted in several other Bills. I do not think an argument in

favour of expropriation of water-power could be based under this Bill.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. The point I desire to make is with regard to the power this company is seeking to acquire in connection with the generation and sale of electricity. I asked the promoter to explain that and he explained it partly. I am not opposing the Bill as a railway Bill, I desire to be perfectly fair, but I am opposing it inasmuch as it is a power Bill. The promoter says that the Bill as it stands now would make the company subject to the general legislation of the province of Ontario regarding electric companies generating and selling and dealing in electric power and fluid. I differ from the hon. member principally because of section 2, which declares this work to be one for the general advantage of Canada which, as my hon. friend knows, brings it by the force of the British North America Act directly under the control and legislation of the Dominion parliament, so that it would pass away from the control and jurisdiction of the provincial parliament. That is to my mind the effect of this Bill, it will be freed entirely from the effect of the general legislation of the province of Ontario regarding electric companies. It would also be freed from the general legislation of the province regarding railway companies, because the undertaking is declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. It thereupon ceases to be a provincial undertaking. My hon. friend says that as the Bill is worded the company would still be under provincial control. If he will submit to an amendment simply declaring that it is subject to the general legislation of Ontario regarding electric power companies, the Bill might pass. Several other Bills have that clause.

Mr. CONMEE. What Bill has that clause in?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. A number of railway Bills. The charter for running the railway in this city has that clause. Such an amendment would remove the objection of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster).

Mr. CONMEE. That is an electric railway.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Because the general legislation of Ontario regarding electric companies provides safeguards regarding expropriation for electric purposes.

Mr. CONMEE. My statement was that this company would be subject to any general law of the province or of the Dominion affecting its works.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. What objection is there to putting in a clause to that effect?

Mr. McKENZIE.

Mr. CONMEE. There is a great deal of objection to putting in a clause to that effect. There is this objecion that it is unfair to put burdens upon this company and surround it with legislation different from that applying to other companies.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Why?

Mr. CONMEE. Simply because this company are here within their rights asking for certain legislation. If it is the general rule of this parliament to give general powers, why insert such a restriction in this Bill?

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. member says there is no power of expropriation; then why not specify it?

Mr. CONMEE. You might say why do you not do many things. The general law of this province will apply to this company, and its acts just as to any other company. The declaration that it is for the general advantage of Canada will only affect it so far as it is a railway. The moment the company go outside of their railway work and establish workshops, the general Factory Act of the province, for instance, will apply.

Mr. LANCASTER. Oh, no; oh, no.

Mr. CONMEE. Oh, yes; oh, yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. By declaring it to be for the general advantage of Canada you remove it from provincial control.

Mr. CONMEE. Not at all.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the hon. gentleman think that by statute from this government he can get water-power?

Mr. CONMEE. Certainly, I think this is the only government that can grant powers in certain cases. I do not know anything about the water-power that this company have in view, I do not know if there is any. The Act to incorporate the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company passed last session containing exactly the same clause, word for word.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The hon. gentleman states that there will be no expropriation powers as far as water-powers and electric development are concerned, that that will apply only to the railway. I would suggest as a solution of the difficulty that the word 'railway' be inserted in clause 2 so that it will read:

The railway undertaking of the company is declared to be a work for the general advantages of Canada.

That will settle all the trouble and the Bill could go through.

Mr. CONMEE. That may be a very reasonable proposition, but I am only the member to whom this Bill has been referred and I would not undertake to make any changes

in it; it is for the promoters to advise me through their solicitors and so far as I am concerned I would not agree to any amendment.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is not quite for the promoters and their solicitor to say what legislation we shall pass. We are here to pass legislation in the interests of the people. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) is most reasonable; it would carry out what we all intend. But I want to settle with the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) this question. I want to understand whether he means that the whole of the undertaking will not be for the general advantage of Canada if this Bill passes. Does he really believe that the water-powers will be in any different position from the railway when the whole Bill is declared for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. CONMEE. There is no power under this Bill by which this company could expropriate a water-power. As to the question whether its particular works, after they are established, in so far as they relate to its actual undertaking, might be somewhat removed from provincial legislation or not, I am not prepared to say because I do not profess to have any information on that point.

Mr. LANCASTER. What harm will be done by putting in a clause, such as suggested by the hon. member for South Toronto, to the effect that the provincial laws shall apply to the regulation and expropriation of these water-powers ?

Mr. CONMEE. I would not agree to that.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then the hon. gentleman means to override provincial legislation ?

Mr. CONMEE. No, but I would not agree because that would prohibit the company taking a water-power which would be on an international or a navigable stream. I do not propose to have the hands of the company tied up by any such a condition.

Mr. LANCASTER. We must not tie our own hands by giving to the company what they should not have. Between now and eight o'clock the hon. gentleman had better consider that.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Before we rose at six o'clock, I asked the promoter of the Bill what reason he had to give for incorporating in a railway Bill power privileges, and especially when as under section 2, all the works of the company are declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada. I can quite understand why this provision bringing the company's works under the control of this parliament should be passed in relation to a railway company of this kind. But here is a purely provincial adjunct inserted in this Bill, here is a clause dealing with a purely provincial matter, and yet this part of the works of the company is also brought under the control of this parliament and removed from the control of the province. The promoter of the Bill, if I understood him aright, said that the sections to which I refer had not the effect I attribute to it. But I refer the hon. gentleman to the well known section 92 of the British North America Act, subsection 10, clause (c). As we all know, section 92 deals with those powers which are exclusively within the control of the provincial legislature. Subsection 10 declares that local works and undertakings other than certain classes enumerated are provincial undertakings. Of these exceptions clause (c) relates to ' such works as, though wholly situate within the province are before, or after execution declared by the parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more of the provinces.'

By this declaration under the authority of this clause, these works and undertakings of this company are removed from provincial jurisdiction. As the promoter (Mr. Conmee) before recess gave it as his opinion that the works of the company, so far as they related to power distribution are provincial in their character, I think it only fair that he should insert in this Bill a declaration that, so far as these works are concerned, they are excepted from the declaration as to the works of this company being for the general advantage of Canada. Or, as an alternative, let the hon. gentleman make it plain that the law of Ontario relating to electric companies, including the Hydro-Electric Power Commission Act, shall apply to this part of the company's undertakings. Then the hon. gentleman will have the powers he wants, and the others will remain subject to the jurisdiction of the province. Whoever heard of the undertakings of a power company, wholly within one province and purely local in their character, being declared works for the general advantage of Canada? It was stated this afternoon that this power clause is what is called the model power clause. I never heard of a model power clause in any railway company's Bill. I can understand a model power clause in a power Bill. But this is primarily a railway Bill, and I am not aware of any practice in regard to this model clause in the case of such Bills. There is none, so far as this House is aware, and if there is a model clause, it surely does not apply to merely provincial undertakings. I think the promoter should give some better reason than he has given

why these works, purely provincial in their nature, should be declared works for the general advantage of Canada. There is no desire to obstruct this Bill. As a railway company's charter, I quite agree with it. I think this undertaking is a Dominion undertaking, as it connects with the Transatlantic line. But, as a power company Bill, I object to it being brought under Dominion control.

Mr. TURRIFF. I find, on looking over the Bills that have been before the House this session, that the clause giving these same powers have been embodied in Bills Nos. 11, 44, 50, 59 and 62. It is also in Bill 102, which has passed the Railway Committee, but has not yet passed this Committee of the Whole. But these powers have been granted in the Railway Committee, and supported by all those gentlemen who are now opposing this Bill. In all these Bills, the only change that was made was to substitute the model clause for the clause that happened to be in the Bill. I do not know that this power has been refused to any railway company that has asked for it, and I fail to see why this railway company should be selected for refusal of these powers especially when the matter is placed under control of the Railway Commission as it is in this Bill.

Mr. MACDONELL. I have not had time to look up the Bills to which the hon. gentleman refers, but in the first one I look at, which is the last one he mentioned, No. 102, I find—and I suppose, should find it in all the others—the same words that I am now contending for.

Mr. CONMEE. That clause was taken out of the Bill in the Railway Committee, for the reason that the minister rather objected to that character of legislation, and in lieu of it was substituted the very same clause that is in this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. So far as I understand the clause, it does not seem to be very objectionable, but I think it is liable to the very abuses which my hon. friend from Lincoln referred to before six o'clock. Moreover, the hon. gentleman promoting the Bill has a reputation that is so well known, both in this parliament and in another, that though his name is not placarded on the outside of the Bill, we suspect this hon. gentleman's sign manual is to be found somewhere in it. That is what makes every one suspicious of the Bill, and therefore we are obliged to look into it more carefully than we would other Bills.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I am merely saying that the sign manual, the astute Chinese hand, is to be found somewhere in the Bill. We are consequently doubly suspicious of any Bill which that hon. gentleman introduces here, because we fear that there is something occult in it, something that is not disclosed at the first reading. In other respects I do not see anything very objectionable in it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose the hon. gentleman feels that the Bill introduced by the member for London (Mr. Beattie), which is in identical words, is all right?

Mr. SPROULE. I was not referring to that at all. I have not read the Bill introduced by the hon. member for London, and the hon. Minister of Public Works is a little too previous, as he usually is. He is attributing to me something that emanates from, I was going to say the evil designs of an evil heart. 'Evil be to him who evil thinks.' So far as this Bill gives the right to construct a railway, and operate a railway and railway property, I am sure that, so far as I can judge the sense of this side of the House, there is no objection to it whatever. But it is because we believe that it is intended to carry the right to take over, or expropriate, or secure control of water-powers that are to-day under the control of the provincial government, and upon which they have announced their policy to the world as one which they desire to carry out in the future—it is because of that danger that we look upon this Bill with suspicion. The hon. member himself says that it is subject to the control of the provincial government, which every parliamentarian knows it cannot be and could not be, by any provision which is in the Bill to-day. I think the hon. member went further and stated that he had the consent of the Ontario government, and their approbation of this Bill. But how can he reconcile that statement with the fact that the Ontario government has sent one of their supporters down here to oppose the Bill. If they were satisfied with it and had given their approval, why should they send a man here to oppose it? That is what increases our suspicion. I think therefore we should try and make this enactment as plain as possible, so that no abuses may develop afterwards.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member I think has told the truth in one respect. Because he happens to see in the Bill the name of the member who is promoting it, he is suspicious of it.

Mr. SPROULE. That goes a long way, I confess.

Mr. CONMEE. They say that open confession is good for the soul, so I suppose my hon. friend is relieved now that he has got that off. Then he says that those who know the hon. member are suspicious of the Bill. Now, he is wrong in that. It is because my hon. friend does not know the hon. member who is promoting the Bill that he is suspicious. I guarantee that he

cannot find any one who does know him, whether he be Liberal or Conservative, who will give him the character that the hon. gentleman would like to impute to him.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Macdonell) sees it in the same way.

Mr. CONMEE. Perhaps he is as prejudiced as the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), and objects to the Bill for the same reason. Now, I did not say that the Ontario government approved of this Bill; what I said was that I was apprised that the Ontario government were giving them the right of way free.

Mr. BOYCE. Did not the hon. gentleman say the Ontario government had approved of this Bill?

Mr. CONMEE. No, I did not. As a matter of fact, I think they have approved of it. But what I stated was that they had given it a land bonus, although it was not yet actually chartered, and they did so knowing that the application for a charter was made to this parliament and not to the legislature. They I assume are not prejudiced against this Bill.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Why did they send their representative here to oppose it?

Mr. CONMEE. I do not know, but I will give the hon. member my opinion. I think that the legal gentleman who appeared here was not instructed to oppose this Bill particularly. He is here as the representative of Ontario to oppose all Bills that, in his judgment, he thinks conflicts with provincial rights, and he opposed this Bill as he opposed a dozen other Bills, and for no other reason. It is not conceivable that the Ontario government would grant a bonus to a company if they had serious objection to their charter, and they knew the company was getting their charter here.

Mr. SPROULE. When did they grant the bonus, and what did the bonus consist of?

Mr. CONMEE. Land. The hon. member will see it reported in the returns and in the press. For this very railway they gave 1,000 acres of land per mile, as I understand the return.

Mr. SPROULE. The Superior and Western?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes.

Mr. BOYCE. Could the hon. gentleman say the distance this line is projected?

Mr. CONMEE. About 125 miles from the branch to the main line.

Mr. BOYCE. Can he give the House any information about the waterways that lie on the route of the railway?

Mr. CONMEE. So far as I have personal knowledge there are no water-powers. I believe they go close to what is known as the English river. It is merely a branch of the Albany river, but whether there are water-powers on the line I do not know. They go to Sturgeon lake and I think in passing north they pass what is known as the English river. I am not sure whether it is the English river or the Albany river which is right close to it at that point which forms the boundary between Ontario and Keewatin, but one or the other does.

Mr. BOYCE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this road has already been surveyed and that the work is under construction? If so, how much has been surveyed and constructed?

Mr. CONMEE. I am not aware of how much has been surveyed but the road has been located to Sturgeon lake and my information is that a portion is under construction. They are grading now.

Mr. BOYCE. How much is under construction?

Mr. CONMEE. About seven miles.

Mr. MACDONELL. Does the hon. gentleman consider that this Bill considers power company clauses? If so, does he consider that this is the proper authority to grant a charter to a power company whose works are entirely within the borders of a province and in no way touch or affect international or interprovincial waters?

Mr. CONMEE. In regard to this being the proper authority to give the powers, that would depend. If the waters affected were interprovincial, or international, or navigable——

Mr. MACDONELL. I excepted that.

Mr. CONMEE. This would be the proper authority. If it were otherwise I would assume that perhaps the legislature would have the control.

Mr. MACDONELL. Are the waters with which this Bill is concerned interprovincial, international or navigable?

Mr. CONMEE. I am not prepared to say that they are interprovincial but I do say that they are navigable as far as I know.

Mr. BLAIN. I think this matter is of sufficient importance for the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) to give the committee an opinion upon it. I do not wish to be a party to any Bill that would interfere with provincial rights over water-powers. I do not think the Minister

of Railways would consent to the adoption of any such policy by this parliament. I am quite sure that he is conversant with this question and that he will give us his opinion upon the subject.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Bill was thoroughly discussed in the committee and all these points were raised. They were raised also, in so far as the Bills are identical, against the Bill introduced by the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie). The clause to which the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) refers as to water-powers, he will find, I think, in the great majority of the railway Bills by which charters have been given in recent years. There was a clause in the Bill introduced by the hon. member for London, such as the hon. member for South Toronto suggests, but the committee, without any dissenting voice, struck it out and put into the Bills the usual clause that we have put into other railway Bills governing the question of the right to distribute surplus power.

Mr. J. D. REID. The same clause as this?

Mr. GRAHAM. The clause we put into the other Bill is the clause we put into this. My hon. friend will remember that we struck out certain clauses and left the clerk to put in what we call the model clause because that clause was one which was decided upon by the committee, not this session, but on a previous occasion as one which should be introduced into Bills of this character. As to this being for the general advantage of Canada, I do not think it is an extreme view to say that in so far as practicable every railway that does a general business should have a charter granted by this House so as to place it under the control of the Railway Commission and thus secure uniform rates. As to the power of expropriation, this Bill does not give the company any extraordinary rights with regard to water-powers.

Mr. FOSTER. Where would they get these powers?

Mr. GRAHAM. They would have to buy them. They cannot expropriate water powers under this Act.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

LONDON AND NORTHWESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Commitee on Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the London and North Western Railway Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Mr. CONMEE. I rise to remark that my hon. friend from North Grey has lost all his suspicions with regard to this Bill although it is similar to the one I proposed.

Mr. SPROULE. If this Bill, which contains a similar clause, had been taken before the hon. gentleman's Bill I would have had far more confidence in the Bill which he introduced.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 85) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor (Leeds).

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No 120) respecting the Windsor, Essex, and Lake Shore Rapid Railway Company.—Mr. A. H. Clarke.

Bill (No. 121) for the relief of John Grant Ridout.—Mr. Guthrie.

QUESTIONS.

TORONTO OLD FORT AND ADJACENT LAND.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. Has there been any correspondence between the Premier or Minister of Militia and the Mayor of Toronto looking towards the reclamation by the government of the land held by the Park Blackwell Company, near the old fort in Toronto? If so, is it the intention of the government to reclaim it?

2. Have the Historic Society and the Army and Navy Veterans Association pressed to have this portion restored?

3. What is the present situation as regard the possession, restoration, preservation and care of the old fort itself.

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

1. (a) Correspondence has passed between the government and the mayor of Toronto looking towards the reclamation by the government of a small parcel of land held by the Park Blackwell Company near the old fort, Toronto.

(b) On June 4, 1898, a parcel of land adjacent to the old fort was conveyed by letters patent to the Park Blackwell Company. Subsequently the company applied to be allowed to straighten the boundary of the land acquired by it and to build a stone wall to prevent the embankment from falling into the company's yard, which permission was granted by letter, dated September 19, 1901. The company was thus given a license of occupation of a corner of the old fort property, which is the piece of land respecting which correspondence has been exchanged with the mayor.

The sale of the Garrison Common property, which included the old fort property, to the

city of Toronto was authorized by order in council of May 16, 1904, or two years and seven months after the license of occupation was given to the Park Blackwell Company. Letters patent conveying the Garrison Common property to the city are now being prepared, but the area to be thus vested in the city does not include the small corners occupied by the Park Blackwell Company under the authority of the license of occupation dated September 19, 1901.

2. Representations have been made by the historic and other societies with a view to reclaiming from the Park Blackwell Company the small parcel of land occupied by them.

3. It will be a condition in the letters patent that the city shall restore the old fort property as far as possible to its original condition, as per plan, dated Quebec, June 24, 1816, drawn by G. Nicholls, government engineer.

PORT HOPE METEOROLOGICAL STATION.

Mr. THORNTON asked:

1. Is the Port Hope meteorological station situated within the town limits? If not, how far out and where?

2. Is there a meteorological tower in the township of Clarke, county of Durham, Ontario?

3. If so, when was it built, at what cost, who has charge, what are his duties and what expense?

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

1. The meteorological station at Port Hope is near the centre of the town. The observer reads thermometers and records rainfall, and forwards monthly reports to the Central Meteorological Office in Toronto. He receives no remuneration.

There is a mast on the wharf at the harbour, Port Hope, from which storm signals are displayed. The agent receives $60 per annum.

2. There is not.

3. Answered by No. 2.

CEMENT CONTRACTS.

Mr. S. SHARPE—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Has the Department of Railways and Canals recently given a contract for cement to the William G. Hartsanft Cement Company, Limited, of Montreal? If so, for what quantity and at what price?

2. What was the specified brand of cement, and where is it made?

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

1. Yes. A contract was awarded to the Vulcan Portland Cement Company through their agents, The Wm. G. Hartsanft Cement Company, Limited, Montreal, for cement as follows: 43,500 barrels for the Quebec canals delivered at Montreal at the rate of $1.06 per barrel, and for 1,750 barrels for the Cornwall canal, delivered at Cornwall, at $1.17 per barrel. The above prices are net.

2. 'Vulcan,' manufactured in Montreal.

LAND GRANTS TO CIVILIANS.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

Have representations been made to the government by or on behalf of the Canadian volunteer teachers who, during the South African troubles taught in the concentration camps, for similar consideration as to land grant to that which has been granted the female nurses? If so, what reply did the government give to these representations, and what are the government's intentions in this matter.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908, does not make provision for the issue of land warrants to the teachers referred to, or to any person or persons employed in a civil capacity. The nurses referred to in the question ranked as lieutenants in the militia, and the Act specifically provides for the issue of warrants to them.

DUTY ON PASSOVER BREAD.

Mr. PERLEY—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Have any parties, within the last six months, approached the government with the object of securing a higher rate of protection upon what is known as Passover bread?

2. If so, by whom was such advance in duty asked, when and to what extent, and what reply was made by the government to their request?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Not that I am aware of.

EMPLOYMENT OF REV. E. P. BERUBE.

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Is the Rev. E. P. Bérube, of Vonda, Saskatchewan, employed by the Minister of the Interior as an immigration agent or otherwise?

2. If so, from what date, what amount has he received since his appointment, and what is his monthly salary?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.

2. Engaged for three months, from February 15, 1909, at one hundred dollars per month, paying his own expenses. Has received one payment of one hundred dollars thus far.

GOVERNMENT FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE asked:

What was the number of letters and despatches and quantity of correspondence generally, received and despatched between the government of Canada and of Great Britain

and other countries during the years 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1903 and 1904?

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY (Secretary of State):

NUMBER OF COMMUNICATIONS.

Year.	Colonial Office.		Govs. of Colonies.		H.M's. Representatives Abroad		Total.		Grand Total.
	From.	To.	From.	To.	From.	To.	From.	To,	
1886	574	496	12	10	167	128	753	634	1,387
1887	705	597	9	5	111	113	825	715	1,540
1888	606	446	33	37	74	71	713	554	1,267
1889	432	324	20	11	43	53	495	388	883
1890	427	321	23	21	44	70	494	412	906
1891	519	448	14	12	83	118	616	578	1,194
1903	816	571	43	33	167	116	1,026	720	1,746
1904	808	567	23	22	149	119	980	708	1,688
	4,887	3,770	177	151	838	788	5,902	4,709	10,611

CONTRACTS FOR PRAIRIE SECTION, NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE asked:

1. Who are the contractors in the first instance, other than sub-contractors, for the prairie section of the National Transcontinental Railway?

2. What contracts have been given by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company or by the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, to the Grand Trunk Pacific Construction Company or the company controlled by the directors of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company?

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

1. The work of grading, building culverts and small bridges has been executed by the following named contractors:

Messrs. McDonald, McMillan & Company.
Messrs. Treat & Johnson.
Messrs. Canadian White Company.
Messrs. Foley Brothers, Larson & Company.
Mr. John Bradley.
Mr. J. R. Booth.
Messrs. Bishop & Huck.
Mr. C. H. Richards.
Mr. C. Frost.
Messrs. Foley, Welch & Stewart.

The steel bridges were built by the following named contractors:

Messrs. John Gunn & Son, masonry substructures.
Messrs. The May Sharpe Construction Company, masonry and substructures.
Messrs. Canadian Bridge Company, superstructures.

For buildings Messrs. McDiarmid & Company are the contractors.

For fencing, Canadian Steel and Wire Company are the contractors.

The work of tracklaying and ballasting has been carried on by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

2. Contracts were given by the Commissioners of the National Transcontinental Railway to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for the construction of the following sections of the eastern division:

District 'A.'

Contract No. 1, from the city of Moncton, New Brunswick, for 50 miles westerly.

Contract No. 3, from Chipman, New Brunswick, westerly 39·7 miles.

Contract No. 4, from near the crossing of the Fredericton section of the Intercolonial Railway to the Tobique river, about 67 miles.

District 'B.'

Contract No. 11, from 150 miles west of the Quebec bridge to Weymontachene, a distance of about 45 miles.

Districts 'C' and 'D.'

From about 8 miles west of the Abitibi river crossing easterly for a distance of about 150 miles.

COBOURG HARBOUR EKPENDITURE.

Mr. THORNTON asked:

1. What amount has been expended on Cobourg harbour during the year 1908?

2. What contracts, if any, have been made by the government for improvements and repairs on Coburg harbour during the last two years?

3. With whom have such contracts been made?

4. What amount is involved in such contract?

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

1. $34,601.59.

2. Contracts have been made for the construction of two breakwaters at entrance of harbour and for dredging.

3. The Randolph Macdonald Company, Limited; W. E. Phin.

4. The Randolph Macdonald Company, Limited, construction of breakwaters, contract price, $139,000.

Paid to W. E. Phin for dredging, season of 1907, $20,721.69.

Paid to W. E. Phin for dredging, season of 1908, $24,187.68.

MR. WALLBERG'S CLAIMS.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE—by Mr. Geo. Taylor—asked:

1. Has Mr. Wallberg entered an action at law for moneys alleged to be due him? If so, what is the amount of the claim?

2. What was the original amount of the contract in respect to which this balance is claimed?

3. At whose request was a fiat granted allowing Mr. Wallberg to proceed with his action?

4. Who are the solicitors, and who is the counsel for Mr. Wallberg?

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

1. Mr. Wallberg has made a claim for payment of ' $105,940.15, with interest from the 25th day of January, 1909; his costs of reference; and such other relief as to the court may seem meet '—being for the construction of a sewerage system and water system and other work in connection with the same, on the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton, New Brunswick.

2. The original lump sum of the contracts for the buildings to which the above work was appurtenant, but not forming a part, aggregated $682,975, with provision for payment of additions at prices set out in the schedules contained in the said contracts; the total value approximating in the neighbourhood of one million dollars.

3. No fiat has been granted to Mr. Wallberg, but his claim has been referred to the judge of the Exchequer Court under the statute.

4. The statement of claim is signed by Mr. Harold Fisher, counsel for the petitioner.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS.

Mr. PAQUET asked:

What are the names of our immigration agents who reside in Canada, and what is the address of each?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior:

J. P. Lavoie, M.D., Quebec, Que.
John Hoolihan, Montreal, Que.
J. V. Lantalum, St. John, N.B.
F. W. Annand, Halifax, N.S.
Rd. Hickey, North Sydney, C.B.
Geo. L. Stewart, Toronto, Ont.
J. H. MacGill, Vancouver, B.C.
G. L. Milne, M.D., Victoria, B.C.
R. A. Burriss, Port Arthur, Ont.
Damase Gauthier, Laurentides, Que.
Rev. L. P. Gravel, Moosejaw, Sask.
Rev. J. C. Sinnett, Sinnett, Sask.
Rev. Laganière, Montreal, Que.
Rev. Jos. A. Ouellette, Montreal, Que.
Rev. Ernest Gauthier, St. Alphonse, Que.
René Dupont, Quebec, Que.

DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Referring to the report of the Auditor General for the fiscal year ending the 31st of March, 1908, showing an item of $1.40 having been paid to J. A. Lussier, of St. Johns, Quebec, and another item of $98.65, what were those payments for?

2. Did Dr. A. Godin, of St. Johns, Quebec, or his wife draw at any time from the government an amount of indemnity for damages to some land at the island of Ste, Thérèse, caused by the waters of the Richelieu river? If so, what was the amount so paid, was the interest allowed on the amount, and has the government a receipt for said interest?

3. Is Joseph Bonin, of Iberville, Quebec, in the employ of the government at St. Johns, Quebec. If so, in what capacity and what necessitated his nomination?

4. Is Hormidas Martial in the employ of the government at St. Johns, Quebec. If so, has he been doing all that is necessary in connection with the supervision of the harbour at St. Johns, and what is his salary?

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

1. $1.40 was paid to J. A. Lussier for a certified copy of a deed from Cecil Briggs to His Majesty. The sum of $98.65 was paid to J. Aimé Lussier on August 16, 1907, by the Department of Public Works for legal services (from December 28,1905, to May 8, 1907) in connection with the purchase of land for a wharf at St. Blaise, Que., from one Napoleon Harbec.

2. Mrs. Cecilia Briggs, wife of Dr. Godin, was paid the sum of $2,000, on August 11, 1904, for damages caused to her property at Ste. Therèse island, by the waters of the Richelieu river. No interest was allowed on the amount.

3. Joseph Bonin is employed as watchman in the harbour at the head of the Chambly canal. He replaced Hormisdas Martial, who has been given other duties.

4. Hormidas Martial, formerly the watchman in the harbour at St. Johns, is now in charge of the lands and canal banks between the guard lock and Ste. Therèse island; he has no longer anything to do with the harbour at St. Johns, his salary is $45 a month.

PUBLIC WORKS, WELLAND.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM asked:

How much public money has been expended during the past twenty years by the Dominion government on public works in the territory now constituting the constituency of Welland?

Hon. Wm. PUGSLEY. (Minister of Public Works). $805,695.10.

RED RIVER EXPEDITION.

Mr. BOYCE asked:

1. Has any provision been made by way of land grant or otherwise for recognition of the services of officers and men in the Red River Expedition of 1870, under General Lord

Wolseley? If so, what provision has been made, and what form does the recognition take?

2. If no such form of recognition has been arranged, is it the intention of the government to take the same into consideration in the near future?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Officers and men who served in the Red River expedition of 1870 have been, severally, granted 160 acres of land in recognition of their services.

MR. W. T. R. PRESTON.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. Does W. T. R Preston still occupy the position of Canadian Trade Commissioner in Japan?

2. Has he been requested to return, or has leave been granted him by this government to return to Canada? If so, for what reasons?

3. Has the government in contemplation the transfer of Mr. Preston to another post? If so, where?

4. Will the government lay on the table of the House the communications from the Kobe Foreign Board of Trade and the Yokohama Foreign Board of Trade protesting against the actions of the said W. T. R. Preston?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for the Minister of Trade and Commerce):

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Yes. Holland and Northern Europe.
4. Yes, if so requested.

GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS.

Mr. WRIGHT asked:

1. Referring to the sale of eighty islands and portion of islands in the Georgian bay, notice for the reception of tenders for same up to the 1st of June next appears in the Ottawa 'Free Press'. Does this advertisement appear in the Toronto 'Globe,' 'Mail and Empire,' and the Midland and Penetang papers?

2. Are these islands known by name or number?

3. Are there maps available showing the location of the islands and portions of islands to be sold, giving a description of the same?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. The advertisement appears in the Toronto 'Globe,' the 'Free Press,' Midland; the Penetanguishene 'Herald,' Penetanguishene, but not in the 'Mail and Empire.'

2. The islands are known by numbers.

3. The schedules of islands and portions of islands to be sold, giving description of each, and maps showing islands are available and are being sent to all applicants therefor, as stated in the advertisement.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence and reports respecting the Colonization and Repatriation Society of Lake St. John from 1900 to this date, and a detailed statement of the moneys paid to the society and of the manner in which they have been expended between these dates.—Mr. Girard.

For a copy of all documents, complaints, correspondence and decisions arrived at relating to a contract of lease entered into between Alphonse Laberge, lessor, and the Government of the Dominion of Canada, lessee, of date 20th day of July, 1904.—Mr. Roy (Montmagny).

For a return of all correspondence between the Marine and Fisheries Department and any person or persons relative to the cancellation of the certificate of Thomas Bibbington, or the removal of his name from the list of certified pilots for the port of Victoria, B.C.—Mr. Barnard.

For a copy of all correspondence, memorials, reports and decisions arrived at respecting the construction of a tank at the Intercolonial Railway station at Cap St. Ignace, and the increased cost to be paid to the Aqueduct Company supplying the water for the engines running on the said railway.—Mr. Roy (Montmagny).

For a copy of all petitions and correspondence, whether by letters or telegrams, and all plans submitted either to the Railway Department or to the authorities of the Intercolonial railway, and of all decisions arrived at, relating to the enlargement of the station of the Intercolonial railway at Cap St. Ignace, or the construction of a new station.—Mr. Roy (Montmagny).

For a return showing the amount of money received from the government by the 'Canada Posten' of Winnipeg during the years 1907 and 1908.—Mr. Bradbury.

For a return showing the names of all persons residing in the town of Liverpool, Nova Scotia, or in its vicinity, who were paid fishing bounties in the year 1908, and the names of all persons residing in Liverpool, Nova Scotia, or in the vicinity thereof, to whom seine trap licenses were issued in 1908, and the amounts paid for the same in each case.—Mr. Crosby.

For a copy of all papers, letters and correspondence relating to, and an itemized statement of, the account of Mr. H. M. Howell in regard to the surrender of St. Peter's reserve.—Mr. Smyth.

For a return showing how many seining licenses for fishing in Pacific coast waters are now current; to whom they have been granted; the area covered by each license, and how many of these licenses are being operated by the original licensees, and how many by aliens.—Mr. Cowan.

For a copy of all correspondence, reports, papers, and communications in the possession of the Dominion Lands Office at Prince Albert and the Department of the Interior at Ottawa, in connection with the application for patent for the n.e. ¼ section 10, tp. 47, r. 1 w. 3rd meridian,—of A. A. Strachan and the performance of his homestead duties.—Mr. Lake.

TERMINAL AND TRANSFER ELEVATORS—GOVERNMENT OPERATION.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). I beg to move the following resolution which stands in my name:

That in the opinion of this House the present system of operating terminal and transfer elevators is detrimental to the interests of the western grain producers, and that the government should take immediate steps to operate terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and the transfer elevators between those terminals and the Atlantic seaboard

I cannot help saying at once that I feel my inability to present the subject covered by this motion in the manner in which it should be presented; at the same time, I cannot help saying also that I feel honoured in having the opportunity to move a resolution so important as this. Having spent a little time in the study of the subject, I am thoroughly convinced that the grain elevator question is one of the most important to come before this parliament and I am equally convinced that, in a few years, the country will so regard it. We have been all day talking on transportation questions. I do not say that we have spent too much time. Everybody admits, who has been in this parliament a few years, that the transportation question of necessity and rightly occupies a great deal of the time of the House. This question of grain elevators is so closely allied with the question of transportation that we cannot separate the two, and, when we take up so much time in discussing transportation, our time cannot but be well spent when we discuss the pros and cons—if there are any cons—of this resolution dealing with this vitally important question. Sometimes we are criticised because our resolutions are local or sectional. I do not think that criticism applies to the resolution which I now place before you Mr. Speaker. This resolution affects Canada from the Pacific to the Atlantic, and I for one hope that soon it will affect Canada from Hudson bay to our southern boundary. Let me say at once that I have no desire to make this a party question; I believe it is too big and too far-reaching to be considered in that light. I am confident that, at least so far as the members of the House from the western provinces are concerned, I shall have their sympathetic support regardless of their party affiliations.

This question of grain elevators is one which has agitated the minds of western people for a very long time. I find, in talking the matter over with eastern men, with the men of our financial centres if you like, that they have heretofore failed to grasp the importance of this question of our grain elevators as it affects the producers, and not only as it affects the producers, but also as it affects our financial centres as well.

You will observe that my resolution is confined, so far as its words are concerned, to terminal and transfer elevators. But the internal elevators are so closely allied to terminal and transfer elevators, that I hope you, Mr. Speaker, and this House, will not consider me out of order if I incidentally refer to this class that are not specifically mentioned in the resolution. I find—not on the part of western members, but of eastern members,—the lack of a clear definition in their minds of the three sets of elevators to which I have referred. Without occupying unnecessary time, let me give a definition of these three classes. We have, first, our internal grain elevators, scattered all over the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Wherever there is a railway, even a branch railway, the first thing that appears in some places and sometimes the only thing that appears,—I was going to say in a town, but I will say in a settlement is a grain elevator. Before I get through I intend to show though briefly how many of these elevators existed up to 1908. If our point of observation could be high enough, and our range of vision long enough, we could see a very large number of elevators scattered all over the western provinces. These elevators are the buildings in which the farmer deposits his grain from the wagon in which he has hauled it. There are loading platforms, of course, and according to the Act farmers are permitted to load their grain on to cars direct. But, as a rule—and I personally believe it is a legitimate and proper way and most convenient way to handle grain—the grain is put through the elevator. The veins of circulation by which this grain is brought to Winnipeg are numerous. After it reaches Winnipeg, there are two great arteries to carry it to the head of the lake. We hope soon to have three. We have the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Canadian Northern, and I hope from the bottom of my heart—and it cannot be too soon,—we shall have the Grand Trunk Pacific. This will give us three great arteries emptying the grain from these three provinces into what is called the terminal elevotors at Port Arthur and Fort William. We have also what are called transfer elevators. After this grain reaches Port Arthur and Fort William and is placed in the terminal elevators, it is either carried by boat to Kingston, Montreal, Goderich or some other port, or it is taken all-rail to St. John. The transfer elevators are the links between the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William and the Atlantic coast where the grain is shipped to go to the markets of the world. The House can easily see what a complete chain there is in these elevators. And, so far as the producer is concerned, it is absolutely im-

possible to separate these elevators in our argument.

I do not stand here to say that government ownership is to be the great panacea for all alleged grievances in the state to-day. But I do say that according to the great law of selection, there are industries to which government ownership is applicable, and I believe there is no industry more so than this one of terminal elevators. I do not minimize for a moment the tremendous difficulties that surround this question, I admit at once there are difficulties that will have to be overcome in connection with the government ownership of these terminal and transfer elevators, but I believe that when this government makes an honest and earnest effort to meet those difficulties, they will find them to be far less formidable than they appear. As to this question of terminal elevators, I am sure that every western man who has been in that country for some time will agree with me that it is a source of great agitation. Having spent about twenty-five years of my active life in the west, and having spent some years before that in the far east, I think I can realize perhaps better than some others how closely the west is connected with the east. I realize to-night, and I have realized many times in this House, how these two sections of our country are mutually dependent on each other. Within the last few days I have heard the remark: Why are these men talking all the time about the west? Why, there would not be any west if there were no east. That is quite true. I say that western Canada and eastern Canada are to-day component parts, and interdependent. You have your great financial centres, you have your manufacturing institutions that are absolutely necessary for us in the west. Only the other day an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, a gentleman whom I very much respect, a gentleman who is engaged in a very large industry, came to me and said: Have you people in the west yet determined the amount of grain that you produced last year?' He said, 'You have made estimates during the summer, but what I would like to know as a manufacturer is whether you people have as yet realized to its full extent the amount of grain your country will produce?' He said, 'I do not believe you of the west understand how we people in the east are dependent upon your crops. When you have a good crop I can sell my machinery, and I can get my pay for it.' Well, I think that bears out a sentiment which I wish to express, that it is not a question of the west against the east. All the east has to do is to recognize the importance of the west, and especially the importance of this great question of grain elevators, and then there will be a common feeling between us.

But some one will say, 'How is it that although this question of government-owned elevators has been so many years a source of agitation, you have never yet reached any conclusion about it? Well, the reason to my mind is just this: The farmers up to a few years ago had not recognized this great principle of concerted action, they failed to apply the great principle of co-operation in order to get the best results, either for capital or for labour. Had the farmers co-operated, as they might have done, and as other industries in Canada have co-operated, they would not now be in the position in which they find themselves. Let me give one or two examples. Take the manufacturers. Have they been going for the last dozen or twenty years on their own hook, as the individual farmer apparently has been. The manufacturers in each line of business have associations among themselves, but there is one great association comprising them all, called the Manufacturers' Association. What do they do? What are some of the problems these manufacturers have solved? They have their freight rates, they have their competition, they have the tariff, and many another problem coming before them for solution. But they have adopted concerted action, they co-operate, and are thereby able to meet these problems more successfully. When the Finance Minister of this country talks about changing the tariff, we find the manufacturers getting together, coming down here with delegation after delegation to visit the Minister of Finance and members of the government, and placing before them their propositions. They go further. They know that people are human, and I have not the slightest doubt in the world that the ministers of this government are just as human as anybody else. The Manufacturers' Association have every year a great banquet to which they invite the Prime Minister and other ministers of the government, and they also invite leading members of the opposition. What is the first thing they do? The first thing they do is to dine and wine these hon. gentlemen, get them feeling good, and then present their wishes to them—all which is absolutely legitimate, I am not claiming for a moment that their course is not perfectly legitimate. But the fact remains that the Manufacturers' Association recognize what co-operation will do for them. What do we find in the Railway Committee? What do we find around these corridors almost every day of the session? A private member has a railway he wants built or a company has a railway it wants built. You find them, not coming as they formerly did on their own hook, and trusting to providence that their railway scheme will go through as they desire to have it, but they employ the very best lawyers in this country to come and plead for their

undertaking—all of which is perfectly legitimate.

Now apply that method of action to the farmers. I say that the farmers, for some reason or other, have been slow to recognize this principle of co-operation. But I assure you there is not a gentleman here from the west to-night but will bear me out in saying that the farmer is waking up, he is beginning to realize his needs and his power. I would advise this government, as I did the other day, and I would advise the leader of the opposition, that if they want to be in the running they had better pay more attention to what the farmers say and what the farmers are doing than they appear to do at present. In my own constituency of Souris I will guarantee that there are twenty associations of grain growers. What is true of my constituency I am sure is true of every western constituency. These men seem to be very much in earnest, and all they have to do to get their rights is to go about it in earnest, and tell the government that if they want to get their votes they must give them what they want. The twenty associations in the constituency meet together. They elect delegates to the provincial association. Saskatchewan does the same thing. The association there is under the same name, while in Alberta, although it is practically the same organization, it is called, I think, the farmer's association. But, they are not content with that. They have what they call an interprovincial association which is made up of delegates from the different associations. The one question that has received the most careful consideration of this association during the past three years is the elevator question, not only as affecting internal, but also as affecting terminal and transfer elevators. As far as internal elevators are concerned the question was considered so important by the farmers of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan that they called upon the premiers to meet them in conference and discuss it. This meeting is rendered still more interesting by the fact that these premiers are not all upon the same side of politics, there being a Conservative government in the province of Manitoba and Liberal governments in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. I do not think these premiers, Grit or Tory, were particularly anxious to meet upon this question, but they did. They met because they have begun to feel in that western country that the farmer has to be listened to. They met delegates from the farmers' association. They sat for some time and then, like the wise judge who is not sure of what he is going to do, they reserved judgment. They did not give the farmers an answer at that time. It was not very long, however, before these three premiers gave judgment, and it was adverse to the taking over of the internal elevators. But that did not end it and this I consider to be an important point. Notwithstanding that these gentlemen did not grant what the farmers of these three provinces asked, the premier of Manitoba and Mr. Rutherford, of Alberta, did not think it well to allow the matter to drop there. They said: We cannot deal with this question, it would be unconstitutional, it is a matter for the Department of Trade and Commerce, it will have to be dealt with by the Dominion government. What did they do? I had Mr. Rutherford's resolution, but I am sorry to say that I cannot lay my hand on it at the moment, but I know that all western men will agree with me when I say that it was absolutely similar to the resolution introduced into the Manitoba legislature. Mr. Roblin thought he had better make the matter public in that country because he knew very well that these farmers are not to be put down. Here is the resolution that Mr. Roblin moved in the House within the last four weeks:

Resolved, that a memorial be presented to His Excellency the Governor in Council setting forth that:

Whereas the farmers of Manitoba are dissatisfied with the present arrangements for storing grain at initial points, the elevators being in the hands of the grain dealers;

And whereas, the farmers believe that it would be in their interests and in the interests of the public generally that the initial elevators be publicly owned and controlled;

And whereas, under our constitution the power to control and regulate the storage and handling of grain, the weights and grades, the power to control and regulate the transportation companies and make the provision for the granting of elevator sites on railways, as well as the distribution of cars and generally all matters relating to the grain trade in Canada, rests in the federal parliament and not in the provinces, as provided in the British North America Act;

Therefore, this assembly begs to call Your Excellency's attention to the desirability of the government of Canada dealing with the initial elevator situation either by (a) making provision for government ownership and operation of the grain elevators in Manitoba; or (b) by having conferred upon this province, either by Dominion or imperial legislation, the power to fully deal with the question of storage transportation and grading of grain.

Perhaps the members of this House do not see the same significance in this resolution that I do, but I would like to say that practically the same resolution has been introduced into the Alberta House by the First Minister of that province. It is to me an indication of what I have seen coming for some time, and that is that these men think it is proper to get right with the farmers, and they are good politicians for seeing that.

What they are asking for was not only possible but was highly desirable in the interests of the grain growers of this country.

This is what Mr. Roblin says:

No utility or public service that has been taken over by any government and operated by them has been what has been called or is known as a monopoly, a public monopoly, such service as could best secure the convenience of it to the general public when in the form of a monopoly.

One of the excuses which these three premiers gave us was that it was establishing a monopoly. But while they said it was establishing a monopoly it was not very long until they secured the adoption of resolutions asking this government to take over these initial elevators or to give them the power to take them over. So, their reasoning and their conclusion are not very logical.

Under the provisions of the British North America Act it is specially provided that in all matters pertaining to trade and commerce the federal authorities shall be, and are, supreme. The fact that in holding or operating elevators it was requisite to weigh and to inspect grain put the proposition immediately in opposition to that portion of the British North American Act that refers to weights and measures and the inspection of grain. Further, under the general law, transportation companies, such as we have in this western country, are subject also to federal law.

In the event of the Dominion parliament failing to take that position, then the provinces would be justified in assuming functions they did not possess. . . . We therefore felt that it is necessary for us, being in full sympathy with the purposes and objects the grain growers have in securing conditions that will secure them the fullest and largest measure of reward for their industry and their labour, to take such action as would indicate the position we have taken in this connection. To this end the government of Alberta, led by the Hon. Mr. Rutherford, introduced a resolution exactly the same as I have on the Order Paper to-day, and it was passed unanimously through. I am submitting it the same way as being part of the arrangement made by the premiers to this legislature for their endorsement. . . . Speaking for the government of Manitoba and the legislature of Manitoba, we are in the fullest accord with every legitimate constitutional movement that may be made to better the conditions of the grain growers in the province, and the actions of this House in the past is evidence of the bona fides of this statement. I therefore move the resolution.

I do not think anything could be clearer, and I think it means a great deal that these three gentlemen who are in close touch with the farmers of that western country consider that this question is one of such importance that it is incumbent upon them to deal with it. They believe that these initial elevators are just as important as the terminal and transfer elevators. I do not need to tell our western men why, because they know all about it, but in order to make my argument as complete as I can make it, I would like for a moment to state how closely allied all these elevators are and how important they are to the farmer. The manufacturer and the railway man have problems to solve, but does any one present to-night imagine that the farmer has not greater problems to solve than any other class of our citizens? He has to decide how best to cultivate the soil, and like the manufacturer he has to meet strong competition whether it comes from his own or from a foreign country. True, only the fringe of the western prairie is yet cultivated, and, comparatively speaking, but a little patch of land here and there is under crop, but we grow 200,000,000 bushels of grain in Canada, and when cultivation extends over a larger area that production will be enormously increased. But the Canadian farmer has competition from Russia, which grows 500,000,000 bushels, and from India, which grows 300,000,000 bushels, and from Argentine, which grows 200,000,000, and all that grain enters into competition in the British market with the grain grown by the farmers of Canada.

In view of this strenuous competition it is exceedingly important that the Canadian should be able to get his grain from the farmers' wagon to the British market under the most reasonable conditions. If he can save 2 cents per bushel it means $100 to the farmer who grows 5,000 bushels, and that will buy him a good suit of clothes, and his wife a pretty fair dress, and a good many pairs of boots for the children. You see how important then is this 2 cents a bushel saved at the elevator, or in the freight rates. No one denies that the great problem with the farmers' associations during the past two or three years has been the elevator question. Last year the interprovincial association sent three or four delegates to Ottawa to meet in one of the most important conferences that was ever held here. That conference was held in the office of the Minister of Trade and Commerce with Sir Richard Cartwright in the chair, and it was attended by representatives of the railways, of the grain exchange, and of the banks and other financial institutions. The representatives of the farmers presented their case for terminal elevators, and it is not flattering them too much to say that they held their own with the representatives of the other great institutions present. These representatives tried to get a condition of affairs which will enable the farmer to get the best possible price for his products under the keen competition which there will be in the world's market. The purpose I have in view is that the wheat as the farmer sells it from his farm shall arrive at the ultimate market in the condition in which he sells it. This can be accomplished only by full government control of internal term-

inal and transfer elevators. The farmers did not get exactly what they wanted; they never do at first; it is the man who keeps persistently at it who gets what he wants, and these farmers will keep persistently at it until they do get what they want. They know what they want and the people of eastern Canada will understand it when they take a little time to study the question. These farmers' delegates made a plea for government operation of terminal elevators and I quote from the pamphlet which was prepared by them:

We the undersigned members of the delegation representing the organized farmers of the three prairie provinces, at the request and on behalf of the whole delegation, beg to submit the following re-statement of the requests and recommendations made by us on behalf of our people at the conference held last week, with a view of putting them and the arguments advanced in their support, in a more orderly and concise form.

These farmers' delegates as I have said met with the members of the government and the representatives of the financial and transportation interests, and believing they did not get what they deserved, they prepared, after they returned home, the pamphlet from which I quote. It will be remembered that in the dying hours of last session at four o'clock in the morning some members of this House referred to the conference which had just been completed and they endeavoured to convince the government that the farmers of the west asked what was proper and fair:

At the outset it is proper that we should state whom we represent, the circumstances which led up to a delegation being appointed and our mission to Ottawa.

There are three large organizations of farmers in the west—the Grain Growers' Association of Manitoba, the Grain Grower's Association of Saskatchewan and the Alberta Farmers' Association, the aggregate membership of which is in the neighborhood of ten thousand.

I would point out that the farmers are scattered throughout the west; the manufacturers are close together, and they have the impetus of contact which means a good deal in discussing any question. Supposing we had 10,000 farmers, and I would like to see it, marching up the street and taking their place in front of this building, then would the government of this country begin to realize that the farmers are a force in our national affairs. I hope the farmers of this country will never have to do that:

But we do not represent these alone. As the direct representatives of these ten thousand organized farmers who embrace the most intelligent and articulate portion of the farm population, we claim the right to be regarded as representatives of the whole body of western agriculturists.

Our presence as a delegation at Ottawa is the outcome of a conference of the representatives of the above mentioned farmers' associations which met at Saskatchewan last February and which after passing a number of important resolutions, arranged that two delegates should be sent from each association to press for the legislation required by these resolutions.

I think no one will deny that these gentlemen represented the sentiments of the western farmers as a whole:

We may add with respect to all the important resolutions passed at the conference, that they had been thoroughly discussed in approximate forms and agreed to by each of the provincial associations prior to being dealt with by the conference, so that most emphatically they represent the sentiments of the western farmers as a whole.

The resolution growing out of this asks that the Dominion government operate the transfer terminal elevators. Another resolution asks for the special binning of grains at the terminal elevators in order that a satisfactory market might be developed in Winnipeg for the common benefit of the farmer and the miller. I am not dealing to-night with the question of a sample market.

It is sometimes said that the farmers are not very definite in their requests and statement of grievances. I think their requests are definite. On four definite points which they believe to be grievances they are agreed: first, they believe that there is improper or too low grading of their wheat; second, they believe there is dishonest weighing; third, they believe there is excessive dockage, and fourth, they believe that there is loss of identity of the wheat. Any one familiar with the grain trade will realize that these are definite grievances. The hon. member for Regina (Mr. W. M. Martin) the other night referred to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. If it would not be too much of a digression I would say that my position on the Grand Trunk is and always has been that we must have the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, we need it in that western country and no man can show that I have ever said anything to the contrary. The hon. member said that grain was being taken across the line, and I inferred from his statement that it was taken into the United States for transportation because it was not possible to secure transportation on the Canadian side. If that condition exists in Manitoba, it exists to a very limited extent. Our wheat is going across the border for quite a few miles north of the boundary although that movement was larger in the first part of the season than it was towards the last. Why was it going into the United States? Because it secured a better grade there than in Canada. Wheat that would grade in Boissevain, Waskada and Lyleton as No. 3 Northern

can get a No. 1 Northern under American grading.

The farmers are anxious to avoid the manipulation of their grain by these grain dealers who are always trying to make people believe that they have such tremendous interest in the farmer. Last year when the Roblin government introduced legislation in connection with the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, I happened to be in Winnipeg, and two of the first men I met, both pronounced Tories, spent two hours trying to convince me that the Roblin government had wronged the grain exchange, had ruined it. The Grain Exchange had commenced the erection of a great building and they said it would never be finished. What occurred? The Grain Exchange men fired off a little hot air, but it was not very long before they got together and the fine building went on and to-day the Grain Exchange is going on just as before. What does it mean? It means that when they could not fool the farmer in that particular respect they accepted what the farmer desired, and what was not absolutely against the interest of the Grain Exchange. The farmers believe that the only way in which their grievances and difficulties can be overcome is by having the whole system for the handling of the grain from the farmers' wagon to the markets of the world under the control of a staff of men who are not interested in the grain trade. They believe that the government should control the interior, terminal and transfer elevators, so that they may avoid injustice in reference to grades, weighing, dockage and the preservation of the identity of grain. If the government owned the internal elevators only, then when the grain reached the terminal elevators at the head of the lakes it would be mixed, there would be loss in weight and excessive dockage. I shall not deal to-night with the question of weight in relation to shipping between Port Arthur and the transfer elevators as I believe an hon. member who will follow me is far more familiar with that part of the question than I am. A very serious condition has arisen in connection with this link in the train of transportation. If the government controlled the elevators as far as the head of the lakes only, then the grain would leave the terminal elevators properly graded and unmixed, but the mischief would be done in the transfer elevators, so that the farmers are convinced that the only remedy is to have government control throughout the whole system. The farmers say with reference to that:

That the fact that our wheat is now received by eastern Canadian and British millers out of the terminals not cleaned as required by the Act, and sometimes showing evidence of being tampered with, although put out under the supervision of a government inspector,indicates that so long as those elevators are operated by parties who may profit by evading the provisions of the Act, no system of supervision can be relied on to prevent such practices nor in the light of such past experience, restore the public confidence.

That the government supervision and private operation would require two sets of employees under different control. Apart from the danger of friction between the operators and supervisors, the cost of maintaining two sets of employees where only one would be required under government operation, is a strong argument in favour of our contention.

What occurred after that convention of last year? The government did not give us what we asked, they did not say that they would operate the elevators—and the delegation did not ask the government to buy the elevators but to lease them to carry on the experiment for a few years. The government put on more inspectors, adding at Port Arthur and Fort William 25 additional men. That meant an unnecessary number of men to be paid ultimately out of the price of the wheat. It will be seen at once that under this system two set of men are employed to do the work that one set of men could do. The grain dealer will have his set of men and there is also the government staff, and no matter by whom they are employed, these men have to be paid out of the price of the wheat. Then we have perhaps too many elevators. I do not know whether that statement will be accepted by this House, but that nevertheless is the case. It may not exist to such an extent in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, but it certainly exists to some extent in Manitoba. An ordinary elevator can take care of about 150,000 bushels of grain during the season. Every little town in Manitoba—take for instance Miami—will have about four or five elevators. Well, if one elevator can take care of 150,000 bushels of grain, the strong probability is that three out of the four or five elevators in Miami last year did not handle more than about 30,000 bushels each. Nevertheless, each one has to keep its full staff of officers and it costs just as much to maintain it as if it handled 150,000 bushels. If that condition of affairs exists, it must add to the cost of transporting our grain, and the way to avoid that would be by government control. If we had government control, we would have just sufficient elevators in one town to take care of the grain shipped from that town and just sufficient men employed to take care of these elevators. Every one who has lived in the western provinces knows how the business is done. A farmer comes in with a load of grain.. If there are five or six elevators in the town, there are five or six men on the street. They run out to meet the farmer. They jump on to his wagon and make a grade; and 90 times out of a 100, the grade which the first man puts on the wheat is the grade that goes,

and the price which the first man offers is the price that goes. Only about two years ago, I believe there was a pooling system, and one of the results of this conference was to do away with that system. If we have in all these towns too many elevators and too many men employed, we are put to too much expense and we can lessen that expense by having one control of the wheat, by having a man to weigh and grade and ship our wheat, who has absolutely no interest in it. To-day a man takes the wheat off the farmer's wagon at a low grade. Perhaps he pays the farmer for grade three. Then he mixes that wheat with other wheat grade number one or two, and sells it for grade number one. It makes of course quite a difference to the farmer whether he gets paid for grade one or grade three. In that country we get very little number one hard. The great bulk of the grain last year was number one northern or number two northern.

Let me give an illustration of this taken from the United States, because I believe the same condition exists in Canada as exists on the other side. In the state of Dakota the farmers, believing that something was going wrong in connection with the milling of their wheat, appealed to the Bankers' Association and that association appointed five bankers, prominent men—and no doubt considered by the farmers reliable men—and sent them to Duluth to take charge of an elevator for three months. I wish to place on 'Hansard' what these men discovered, as I believe similar conditions exist on this side. They took charge of this elevator and they bought:

99,000 bushels of No. 1 northern.
141,000 of No. 2 northern.
272,000 of No. 3 northern.
201,000 of No. 4 northern.
116,000 of no grade.
59,000 rejected.

That is what was shipped into this elevator at Duluth. What came out:

196,000 No. 1 northern.
467,000 No. 2 northern.
215,000 No. 3 northern.

How much number four northern? How much no grade? How much rejected? Absolutely not a bushel. Not a bushel of these three last grades went out of this elevator. There was on hand 12,733 bushels. This with the amount shipped out, equalled the amount taken in. These bankers signed their names to the report they made in connection with that elevator for three months. That same condition of things exists on this side and will continue until this government takes some means whereby we can establish the identity of the grade of our wheat from the time it leaves the farmer's wagon until it reaches market. Those who were here in 1906 will remember that up in the Agricultural Committee, there was an agitation, and this government was induced to appoint a commission of three men, consisting of Mr. Millar, Mr. McNair and Mr. Goldie. What were they asked to do? They were asked according to their commission:

To take into consideration all or any matters connected with the Inspection and Sale Act and the Manitoba Grain Act; and in connection therewith have power to visit the grain growers, the elevators all over the great wheat-growing regions, the methods of handling the grain at the various stations, farmers' elevators, as well as companies' elevators, the distribution of cars.

And right here there is something I forgot to mention. These farmers, by their co-operation, have been able to secure the privilege of loading their grain direct onto the cars, and secure a more equitable distribution of cars. But our grain dealers, who are so mightily interested in the farmers, made a tremendous effort last year to take away this privilege from the farmers. The farmers, believing that, though the system may not be perfect yet it is the best we have ever had, put up a determined opposition and insisted that the present system of the distribution of cars should be maintained. They got another very important improvement, in relation to the transportation of coarse grains, which were carried at a higher freight rate than wheat, and on which they got a reduction. This was a very important concession, and made it possible to ship the coarser grains in many cases where it would otherwise have been impossible.

To take into consideration all or any matters connected with the Inspection and Sale Act and Manitoba Grain Act, and in connection therewith shall have power to visit the grain growers, the elevators all over the wheat-growing region, the methods of handling the grain at the various stations, farmers' elevators as well as companies' elevators, the distribution of cars, methods of the grain dealers in Winnipeg, Toronto and Montreal, and the system of government inspection and collection of fees, selection of grades, and the methods of handling the grain at Fort William and Port Arthur, at the lake ports, at Montreal, St. John and Halifax, and also the condition existing as to the manner of handling the grain upon its arrival in England.

That was pretty broad. If these men were competent,—I have no reason for saying they were not—and if they spent the necessary time in their work, and did their work efficiently, then this report ought to have some weight with this government and with the country. I shall read but little of the report, but I desire to take a few sections of it:

Proceeding to Fort William and Port Arthur, we inquired into the operation and status of the terminal elevators there, and then followed the course of the grain to the

Georgian bay and Lake Huron elevators, investigating the system of handling, binning, storing and weighing of the grain.

Sittings were held in Toronto, Kingston and Montreal, and after considering the marketing and the handling of grain at those points, we returned to Winnipeg via Buffalo, Port Huron, Chicago, Minneapolis and Duluth, having conferences at those places with inspectors, weighmasters, elevator operators and other persons in the grain trade, for the purpose of comparing our system of handling grain with the systems in vogue in the United States. We wish here to acknowledge the many courtesies extended to us in these cities, and to express our appreciation of the assistance afforded us.

During our eastern tour, we were in communication with the Grain Growers' Associations of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, with reference to places and dates of meetings in those provinces.

I would particularly call attention to the next quotation:

The private corporations operating the terminal elevators at Fort William are composed largely of the shareholders, officers and directors of grain firms and country line elevator companies in Winnipeg, and as such having a direct financial interest in much of the grain passing through their elevators at Fort Wiliam.

That is, a firm might control the grain from the time it left the farmer's wagon through the initial elevator terminal and transfer elevator.

Regarding the operation of these elevators in general it is very difficult, and in fact impossible, for a commission following from public sittings and inspection of the elevators to determine whether they are being operated strictly according to the provisions of the Manitoba Grain Act and the Inspection and Sale Act, but from the evidence received in Ontario, and from samples submitted to us there, and from samples taken directly by the commission from arrivals at bay ports, it is quite clear that there is not sufficient supervision or control of the cleaning of grain at Fort William. There is a very general complaint throughout Ontario that they do not get the regular grades of Manitoba grain, of wheat especially, in as clean a condition as is called for by the inspection department. We also found from examination of arrivals in Great Britain that the grain as received there contains too great a percentage of foreign matter. It is quite evident to us that there should be a complete supervision of the cleaning operations of these elevators. . . .

To Kingston and Montreal we find that the weights are much more regular and closer to those given by Fort William and Port Arthur. At Buffalo, from statements issued by the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce Weighmaster, we find that in nine out of the past ten years Fort William and Port Arthur shipments have shown a surplus at this point on the grain weighed in by this weighmaster, but even there we find some very large individual overages and shortages. The shipments to the Georgian bay and Lake Huron ports show a heavy shortage, and it seems to us advisable that a special weighing department should be created.

This is a very important matter, and my hon. friend (Mr. Lake) may deal with it when he speaks.

This would indicate that the weighing is very irregular, and it seems to us advisable that a special weighing department should be created. . . .

As our whole system of inspection and the handling of grain under the Inspection and Sale Act and the Manitoba Grain Act depends upon the forwarding of our grain through the channels of transportation to final destination with identity of grade preserved, it seems to us that the system is imperfect, owing to the fact that east of Fort William there is no control whatever of grain going forward under government inspection certificates. As it is of the utmost importance when the trade is doing business on the western inspection that lots of grain so bought in the east or in foreign countries should go forward the exact grade and in the condition in which it leaves Fort William and Port Arthur, we would therefore suggest that all public elevators which handle grain grown in the Manitoba inspection division, east of Fort William for storage or transhipment should be placed under restrictions similar to those of terminal elevators in the Manitoba division as to licensing, bonding, binning and weighing of grain.

A gentleman from the east said to me the other day—and I believe that when he gives this question further study he will change his opinion—that he thought I ought to stop at the Fort William and Port Arthur and not include these transfer elevators. But we miss the point if we do not include all these elevators in the great system that our farmers are trying to carry on to-day of having their grain placed on the market.

Some hon. members may say that the farmer is satisfied with the supervision given. With the addition of these twenty-five men at Port Arthur and Fort William, it may be that some of our farmers are satisfied in the meantime. But I have a letter from the Interprovincial Association, dated January 30, 1909. The writer says:

We take the stand that the Dominion government should acquire, either by purchase or lease, the terminal and transfer elevators, and operate them in the public interest. The government, at the conference, led as to understand that they would not acquire the elevators, but that they would establish a system of supervision. Our reply to this was that no system of supervision would guard grain in transit through those elevators when they were operated by the grain trade.

That should be manifest to any business man in this House.

I believe the government has established a system of supervision this session as perfect as they can make it, yet the condition of grain shipped out of the terminals does not seem to be any better.

And they give the evidence, which is worth paying attention to.

An Ontario miller purchased two cars of 1 Northern wheat shipped out of one of the private terminal elevators at Fort William this month. Samples of the car were sent on arrival to the seller, and then presented to Mr. Horn. He inspected one sample 2 Northern and the other 3 Northern. Both cars carried a government certificate for 1 Northern ex Fort William. This will indicate to you to some extent the situation of the terminal. To those who have given the matter the most earnest consideration, it is quite clear that nothing short of the terminals being taken out of the hands of the grain men will be satisfactory.

Only government operation and government control of our wheat from the time it leaves our wagons until it reaches the British market will bring about the result we have the right to desire to reach in connection with the selling of wheat.

Now, Sir, I had no idea of taking up so much time with this question, but as I said in the beginning, I have no apology to make, for the governments of this country will very soon have to recognize and deal with this question of elevators. The elevator is the proper way of handling wheat. We have the privilege of loading wheat directly on the cars; we have our car platforms all over the country. But the most convenient way to transfer our grain is to transfer it through these elevators.

There is another point that I forgot to mention, and I will mention it now, because I think it will give some information to this House of a useful character. As a matter of fact we only shipped about 78,000,000 bushels of wheat last year, and we have in this country internal and transfer elevators to the capacity of 75,000,000 bushels. We do not need as much elevator capacity as we can grow grain, that is self-evident to anybody. I want to say that these terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, with the exception of the elevators owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, are owned and operated by private companies. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has three elevators at Port Arthur and three elevators at Fort William, with a capacity of 7,777,700 bushels. At Keewatin, the Lake of the Woods Milling Company has one elevator and the Lake of the Woods Manufacturing Company has one. At Port Arthur, Joseph G. King & Co. have a terminal elevator. There we have five elevators with a capacity of over 13,000,000 bushels. The Canadian Northern has two elevators at Port Arthur with a capacity of over 7,000,000 bushels. These are terminal elevators. Then we have transfer elevators, and there are more of them than I supposed. At Kingston the Canadian Pacific Railway have an elevator of the capacity of 500,000 bushels, the Montreal Transportation Company have one with a capacity of 761,000; James Richardson & Son have one with a capacity of 235,000, or a total of 996,000 bushels. Then the Grand Trunk—I am not giving all the figures—at Collingwood, Depot Harbour, Meaford, Midland, Prescott and Tiffin have seven elevators with a capacity of 7,000,000 bushels. Of eastern transfer elevators, there are three at Montreal with a capacity of about 2,500,000. The Canadian Northern has at Quebec four elevators with a capacity of about 3,000,000. The Canadian Pacific Railway have an elevator in St. John with a capacity of 1,000,000. The Intercolonial has one at St. John with a capacity of 500,000; one at Halifax with a capacity of 500,000; total, three elevators with a capacity of 2,000,000. Now, we have in Manitoba 689 elevators with a capacity of over 20,000,000 bushels; Saskatchewan has 615 elevators with a capacity of about 18,000,000 bushels; Alberta has 109 elevators with a capacity of 4,000,000 bushels, totalling over 43,000,000 bushels. Adding the Ontario terminals with a capacity of over 20,000,000 bushels, we have a total capacity in the western division of 63,190,000. Adding those in the eastern division we have, as I have said, a total capacity of 78,000,000 bushels.

When we consider the amount of capital that is invested in these elevators, is it not about time that we had some better system of running the business? Does anybody in this House pretend to tell me that the manufacturers or the railway men would conduct their business in this way? What have the manufacturers of this country been doing for years in order to meet competition? They have tried to manufacture with less expense; they have tried to get better results from the labour employed, and we find combinations formed. We find the Massey Company and the Harris Company combined into the Massey-Harris Company. I am well acquainted with these companies and have known them a good many years. They found that by bringing their men and plants together they could manufacture more machinery, and perhaps better machinery, and could manufacture it cheaper. Now, as we grow more grain in the west we shall need more elevator capacity. Wheat is bringing a good price now, and we do not feel the need of these things quite so much. When the farmer gets $1 a bushel for his wheat he doesn't do quite so much kicking if he has to pay a little more. Everybody in the west has been getting that price for the last couple of years. But for many years previously the farmer sold his wheat at a price that barely paid expenses. Who knows but what that condition of affairs may come again. In all probability it will come. Then I say that now is the time, when things are prosperous and prices are good, that we should set to

work and try to regulate and improve the present condition of affairs in the best interest of the farmers. I say that this elevator question is just as important as any railway question, and I ask the government to give the matter their careful consideration. The farmers deserve it. It would pay our great financial centres, it would pay Montreal, St. John, Toronto and every other city to give this matter their consideration. While eastern Canada is a very important part of confederation, everybody admits that if Canada is going to become a great nation it depends upon the west. At some future time we may have to go into mixed farming, and perhaps dairying; but to-day, and for a number of years to come, the great industry of that country will be the growing of wheat. Consequently it becomes of the utmost importance that we should get our wheat to the market as cheaply as possible. Nine-tenths of the products of the soil that we export in Canada go to the British markets. What are we doing as legislators? We are sent here by the farmers to look after their interests, and it is our duty to see that they get their products to the foreign markets under the best possible conditions and at the lowest possible rates. In conclusion, I believe that a tax of 1½ cents or 1¼ cents per bushel for grain going through an elevator would pay the cost of operation, pay the interest on bonds necessary to purchase the present system and also create a sinking fund which would pay the bonds off when they come due. I ask the government to give this matter their very serious consideration, and if they can help the farmers in any way they will not only be benefiting them, but the whole country.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). As the hour is getting late I shall not trespass long on the patience of the House. I feel that my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) has dealt so exhaustively and with so much ability with this subject that there is very little to be added in favour of the motion he has placed on the Order Paper. Let me say first of all that it is universally admitted that it is a matter of the very first importance that the grain grown in the northwestern part of Canada should be carried to the point of debarkation in as nearly as possible the same condition as it was grown by the producer. After it has received the government inspection, been graded by the government and received the government certificate there should be no tampering with the grain. As a matter of fact I think it will be conceded that this has been the aim of the legislation in connection with the grain trade for many years past. All grain for export has to be examined by a government official whose headquarters are at Winnipeg and graded by his inspectors. It is of the utmost importance that the certificate which these inspectors give should command the respect and confidence of the buyers in the great markets of the world and that these certificates should be accepted by them without any demur whatever. Under the present system government-control is actually effective only until it reaches the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. After the grain arrives at these terminal elevators the government-control, in so far as the evidence before us shows, is no longer effective. The evidence which has been placed before this House in the report of the Royal Grain Commission and in the report of the conference with those gentlemen who assembled at the invitation of the Minister of Trade and Commerce last year and gave evidence before him, shows that there is a weakness somewhere and that a great deal of the grain, after reaching these terminal elevators and after having received the official stamp of the government, is tampered with before it is placed on the markets of the world. According to the evidence which my hon. friend from Souris gave with regard to it, the system at the present time, the system which was elaborated last year and which entailed the employment of a large number of official inspectors, it has been found to be defective and the manipulation of grain is still going on after it has been inspected by the government. I have not yet seen any report by the inspectors of the government in regard to the way in which this special inspection is working out, but I think it could be readily understood, quite apart from the evidence which we have already had to support that view, that it is quite impossible that it can work out as satisfactorily as a complete system of government operation would. If the terminal and transfer elevators were all in the hands of great transportation companies and were kept under the control of their officials the situation would not be nearly so bad as it is at the present time, because the transportation companies would have no particular interest in allowing the grain to be tampered with. In fact, their interests would be the other way. But the tendency, of late years, has been for these terminal elevators to pass into the hands of large private corporations. It is perfectly obvious that a careful and judicious system of mixing may be of immense benefit to the exporters if they succeed with that pernicious system. My hon. friend from Souris has given a concrete instance of the manner in which that is worked out in connection with the terminal elevators at Duluth. It was found that grain which was purchased by the exporters there at low values, being grain of low grade, was so judiciously mixed with smaller proportions of grain of high grades that it was graded out at a considerably higher figure than it was graded in. The profits on these

transactions, lasting over a period of three months, must have been simply enormous to the exporter. These profits were absolutely illegitimate and contrary to the spirit and intention of the laws of the country. That must mean a loss to the producer in two ways; in the first instance, because he is unable to get the best price which his grain should legitimately command, and, secondly, because, by this system of mixing, the general standard of the grain is bound to be lowered to a certain extent. The purchasers in the great markets of the world and in Great Britain especially will find that they are not getting the grain which they buy up to the standard which they have a right to expect and which they should receive in view of the fact that it has received the certificate of the government inspector. I contend that no system of inspection could guard against this system of mixing.

There is a further loss involved in the present system, a loss which was referred to briefly by my hon. friend from Souris. It involves the employment of a double system of officials. The owners of the elevators themselves have to employ one set of officials for the purpose of operating their elevators. The government has to employ another set of officials, probably very nearly as numerous as the officials who are operating the elevators, in order to supervise the operation and to watch the grain from step to step as it passes through these elevators. There is no need whatever for two sets of officials. Government operation would do with one of these sets of officials. The government operators themselves could attend to the inspection and that would mean an immense saving to the producer of the grain, because, after all, the amount which is paid for the operation of these elevators and for their inspection has ultimately to come out of the value of the grain itself. That is a proposition which, of course, will be universally recognized. So, the fact of having two sets of officials only means so much loss to the producers. In addition to that, the fact that the terminal elevators are passing into the hands of the large corporations who are themselves exporting grain and members of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, which is known all through this country as a wealthy and powerful association, militates against the facilities which are given to the independent buyers for shipment through the terminal elevators. I think that also would be quite clear to the members of this House. The fact that the large elevators are in the hands of large corporations who are themselves purchasing grain, dealing in it and exporting it, means that they are not likely to give the same facilities to independent buyers as would be given under a system of government operation when naturally the government operators would give the same facilities to all no matter whether they were the wealthy and influential members of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange or whether they were the smaller and more struggling concerns known as the independent buyers. The independent buyers have been of immense benefit to the grain producers of the north west. In my opinion their action enormously increased the value of the grain to the producer by giving really effective competition as against the members of the Winnipeg grain exchange who at one time though comparatively small in numbers, regulated, very much to the disadvantage of the farmers, the price paid for grain for export. Government operation would make it absolutely certain that an independent buyer would be able to get all the facilities he required for the export of grain, and so enable him to stay in the field against the grain buying corporations. Another question which has quite recently come up, and which I think points to the advantage and the necessity almost of the government operating these elevators, is the question of weighing. Circulars are now being sent out by the Winnipeg grain exchange stating that a new form of bills of lading has been adopted by the Dominion Marine Association, and under these bills of lading the lake boats refuse to be responsible for more than a very small shrinkage in the weight. It is pointed out that the government weigh master weighs the grain into these boats but that the grain is weighed out of these boats at the various transfer elevators by men employed by the different elevators and not by employees of the government. If you extend the system of government operation not only wouid the grain be weighed into the boats, but it would also be weighed out by government officials. If the Dominion Marine Association is allowed to enforce these bills of lading, it is stated that the Winnipeg Grain exchange and all grain dealers will have to make a deduction from the export price of the grain so as to ensure themselves against losses. That reduction, of course, must come out of the pockets of the unfortunate producer of the grain who will not only have to pay for the operation of the elevators and for the inspection at the elevators but who will also have a fine levied on him to ensure the exporters against shrinkage. Only within the last few weeks we have seen that a further increase in grain rates has been made by the government to meet the additional cost of the inspection provided for last session of parliament. To my mind, and I think to the mind of any one who studies the question, government operation is the only possible solution which is likely ever to prove satisfactory both to the producers and to the exporters. I think

I have said enough to prove the first part of the resolution, that the present system is detrimental to the western grain producers. The second part of the resolution reads:

That the government should take immediate steps to operate terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and the transfer elevators between these terminals and the Atlantic sea-board.

I take it, that we are first likely to be met with objection on the score of expense, but that objection can only be urged by those who have not closely studied the question. To my mind there will be no expense whatever incurred. The fees charged for having grain inspected by the public inspectors usually meets the whole cost of that inspection so far as the western part of the inspection is concerned. In addition to that there will be the cost of operating, but that comes out of the grain itself now, and it will so continue if the government take charge of the operation. The government will still charge probably very much the same fees which are now charged by the private corporations, but the cost of inspection will be saved. The system of government operation should be and would be self-supporting, and would be no charge whatever on the country.

A second objection which may be urged by the government is the old stock objection, the question of government ownership. In this connection I would point out that the government already is the owner of a transfer elevator at Port Colborne and as the proprietors of the Intercolonial Railway, they own elevators at some of the eastern ocean ports. In addition to that I would point out that through the Prime Minister the government have made a definite promise when the Hudson Bay Railway is completed the government will build and own and keep under their own ownership the terminals and the elevators which will be erected at the Hudson Bay port. The Prime Minister, as it will be clearly remembered, made a great speech at Niagara in the early part of the recent campaign That speech was considered and treated by speakers throughout Canada as the great exposition of the policy which the government was prepared to carry into effect if they were returned to power. It has already been quoted in the House by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) as a statement of what the policy of the government will be in one respect, and I have no doubt whatever that it will be confirmed by other members of the government as an exposition of the government's policy in regard to the ownership of terminal elevators at the Hudson's Bay port. Speaking at Niagara on September 16, 1908, Sir Wilfrid Laurier is thus reported in The 'Globe': Speaking of the Hudson's Bay railway, he said:

The government will build the railway or rather somebody will be entrusted with the building but whatever we do, all the terminals and all the elevators shall be built by the government and retained, under all circumstances, by the government so as to ensure the largest measure of benefit possible to the Canadian people in the northwest provinces.

There is a most definite and distinct promise of government ownership and operation of the elevators which are to be constructed on the shores of Hudson bay and so the Prime Minister and head of the government having adopted the principle of government ownership in connection with terminal elevators at one ocean port, surely he cannot see any insuperable difficulty in adopting the same principle in regard to terminal elevators and transfer elevators at other ports. It would be only an expansion of the system which they themselves proposed of their own volition to carry into effect in the Hudson bay, and it would certainly be an anomaly to have the government adopting one system on the Hudson bay and a miscellaneous series of systems in other parts of the Dominion. There would, I think, be no objection on the part of the present elevator owners. We had that from the mouths of some of them who gave evidence before the Minister of Trade and Commerce at the conference which took place last year. The great transportation companies, I think, would actually welcome the government coming in and operating their elevators. Their great fear in connection with this increased system of inspection was that the dual system of control would probably be an obstacle in the way of the efficient and speedy operation of the elevators. I was personally told by a representative of the railways who was then present that he would be very glad to see the government step in and operate all these elevators so long as they did it efficiently, and I think there ought to be very little difficulty in having an efficient administration at any rate of an elevator system by the government. A gentleman who attended that conference representing the Winnipeg grain exchange and also representing the owners of some of these private-owned terminal elevators at lake ports, stated that there would be no objection so far as he could see to the government taking these elevators over and operating them; in fact the impression made on my mind by his evidence was that these private corporations would welcome government operation. I am quite confident, to sum up this matter, that there would be no objection to it on the part of the trans-

portation companies and there should be no objection on the part of the grain exporting companies who intend to do a legitimate business, and the objections of those who do not intend to do a legitimate business I do not think should be considered. The action called for is the corollary of the position which is taken by the government in the matter of grading and inspection, it is the logical sequence to the inspection by the government of all grain, and the granting of government certificates, that the grain should remain under the absolute control and in the hands of government officers so long as it remains within the borders of the Dominion and until it is placed on the ocean-going steamers. That seems to be the logical sequence of our system of grading and certificating grain.

I believe, as I have said that the whole business would be self-supporting. It would cost no more than the present system, in fact it would be a less costly system as it would be all under the government operation and the fees charged at the present time would more than cover the whole cost. No burden whatever would be placed on the government in carrying the system through.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members of the House appreciate the very great importance of the subject that has been brought to our attention by the hon. members for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) and Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake). We are aware that the grain question is of prime importance to the western Canadian farmer. Whatever other products may be raised, we must all recognize this fact that wheat is, par excellence, the product of western Canada. We are all aware of the enormous amount to which the production of grain, and particularly of wheat and the coarser grains, has increased throughout the three prairie provinces. In the province of Saskatchewan, from which I come, the production this last year was in round numbers over 100,000,000 bushels of coarser grains, of which over 50,000,000 bushels was wheat. In Manitoba the amount was somewhat smaller. In Alberta the grain growing industry has not been developed to the same extent, but the amount each year is rapidly increasing. We therefore can all appreciate the great importance to the western farmers of everything which has any bearing on the price of their chief commodity. I have before me some statistics furnished by the Department of Trade and Commerce, in its weekly report of March 15, 1909, which show how rapidly the production of grain is increasing in western Canada. For the six months ending in February of this year, from September, 1908, to end of February, 1909, the total amount of grain received in the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur was something over 60,000,000 bushels. For the same period in 1907-8 the amount was a little under 40,000,000 bushels. So that in one year alone, we have increased the amount of grain shipped in these corresponding periods of six months 50 per cent.

Of course anything which affects the price of wheat must necessarily be of great interest to the western grower, and any movement made in this House or outside it for the purpose of procuring to the western farmers a proper price for their grain must have the cordial sympathy and support of this House, especially of representatives from the west of Lake Superior. There is equally no doubt that the farmers of western Canada are not content with the present conditions surrounding the grain trade, not only as regards the export of grain, by the terminal and transfer elevators at Fort William and eastwards, but also as regards the purchase of grain from the farmers' wagons. The greatest loss to the western Canadian producer does not come from the operations of the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur and the transfer elevator further east but from the very great spread between what are commonly known as track and street wheat. Ever since our farmers have had the privilege of getting their own cars and shipping direct their own wheat, a condition prevails under which the small farmer, who is compelled to sell by the wagon load on the street, gets a very large margin less than the farmer who loads his own car and ships direct to the terminal elevators. The reason given by the elevator companies for this disparity is the great difficulty they experience in getting sufficient cars from the transportation companies to ship out the grain when they want to ship it. They say that when they purchase a wagon load, they do not know when they will get a car to ship it in, and for this they blame the car distribution clause of the Manitoba Act. Therefore, they say, they must sell for a future market and not the market that obtains at the moment, and for that reason have to allow a reasonable spread between the price of street wheat and that of track wheat. To my mind the greatest loss that comes to the farmer does not come from the operations of the terminal or transfer elevators referred to in the resolution, but from the very great spread between the price of the street and the track wheat in the country town where the farmer brings his wheat either for sale or shipment, and I cannot understand why this resolution did not include a recommendation that the government should also take over the interior elevators. If they are going to do the thing at all, why not do it entirely? Therefore, while my sympathy is strongly with any movement tending to enhance the price of wheat to the farmer and give him proper remuneration for his toil, I do not think that the

resolution submitted by my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) would by any means combat all the evils, or even the most important, which the farmer has to contend with. I am quite aware that the Grain Growers' Associations of Manitoba and Saskatchewan and the Farmers' Association of Alberta have made certain representations to this government. One of these is that the government should take over the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur and the transfer elevators further east. So far as the principle involved is concerned, I have no serious objection to offer except this. Canada is a young country and these large elevator interests have vested rights in this country. They have established themselves at Fort William and Port Arthur, they have established transfer elevators further east, and I would like to call the attention of the mover and seconder of this resolution to a series of practical difficulties. They have established these transfer elevators, and I would call the attention of the mover and seconder of this resolution to the fact that there is a serious practical difficulty in the way. Suppose the government did accept this proposition, what should they do? Should they lease these elevators? The owners might not be willing to lease them. Should they expropriate them? That would be a very radical measure to take. Suppose they were to construct opposition terminal and transfer elevators, how would the capitalists all over the world, to whom a young country like Canada must look for necessary capital to carry on great industrial operations, view such a step on the part of the government? I am not objecting to this resolution now, but I am calling attention to this practical difficulty, which, apparently, these hon. gentlemen have not thought of, which, at least, they have not discussed.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) stated that the leader of the government had told the people that when the government of this country built the road to Hudson bay it was their purpose to own and operate the terminals there. That is a very much simpler proposition. There are no terminal elevators there now, and so there will be no vested interests established through the investment of private capital to be affected by these governmental terminal elevators. It would be quite reasonable to ask the government to undertake such a work, and one which we of western Canada are glad the leader of the government has promised the people of the west he will undertake in the immediate future. It strikes me as a very peculiar thing that according to the statements of these hon. gentlemen no system of government control or supervision of these terminals and transfer elevators could successfully meet the difficulties of the western Canadian farmers who think there is manipulation of the grain passing through them. We had a case of an investigation of the practices of terminal elevators at Duluth, and how these elevators manipulate the grain that came from the producers of the western states; so that, whereas a large amount of wheat of low grade went into these elevators, when it was shipped out all these low grades were found to have disappeared and nothing but high grades were shipped. Surely this House is not asked to believe that these elevators were under a system of government supervision such as the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur? I am willing to admit that the farmers of the west have had serious objections to these terminal elevators. One of the strongest objections is that the corporations that operate the majority of these terminal elevators are those interested in the grain trade further back—that is men who are back of the corporations hold elevators at different points along the great lines of railway throughout the three provinces. The contention of the farmers is that on account of these grain dealers having control of the terminal elevators they are in a position to manipulate the grain that passes through and to carry on practices similar to those described as having been carried on in the terminal elevators at Duluth. I admit that the evidence taken before the Grain Commission appointed by this government in 1906 did give support to that suspicion in the minds of the western Canadian farmers. As a result of that commission and its report, and as a result of the inquiry and report made last session, the Department of Trade and Commerce, I understand, has increased the number of officers in the terminal elevators at Fort William, I believe by twenty-five men. Yet the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) tells us that the management of the grain that passes through these elevators is not satisfactory; that wheat shipped out of lots inspected by the grain inspector at Winnipeg, and graded No. 1 Northern, were received at certain points in Ontario and were found to be only No. 2 or No. 3 northern. I cannot understand how such a thing could possibly occur, if the inspectors at Fort William and Port Arthur are doing their work as it ought to be done. If these things are true, to my mind there should be a thorough investigation, and if these men representing the government are doing their work in an unsatisfactory way, it is time we had a change in the government officials at these points. There might be an isolated instance, but if this is a common occurrence it is time for an investigation into the methods of our officials. While I am not opposing this resolution, I think that the present system at Fort William and Port Arthur ought to be given a fair trial. It has had just one year of

operation, and we cannot very well judge of a system of this kind as the result of one year. I think we should be careful in adopting a resolution of this kind, one which, if carried out, entails very serious practical difficulties. Especially should we be careful about advocating this system before we have given the existing system of government supervision a fair trial. I maintain that that system has not had a fair trial; one year is not a sufficient time, and that an isolated instance such as given by the hon. member for Souris when he referred to this grain shipped from the elevators in the month of January and found to be of lower grade is not a sufficient reason why the government should take this important step.

Now in 1906 this government appointed a Royal Commission to investigate the grain trade. Here I want to say that we must not be led by the remarks that have been made here to-night in support of this resolution, to think that all the farmers of the west are agreed on the proposition that the government should own and operate the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur and further east; because, as far as my opinion goes, there is a great diversity of opinion on that question. I want just to read from the last page of the report of the Royal Commission on the Grain Trade of Canada to confirm what I have said; I want to read the conclusions that were arrived at after thorough investigation of this subject by the Royal Commission. After stating that they found the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William were largely in the hands of private companies, this report goes on to say:

8. We believe the operating of terminal elevators by private companies under the present regulations would be detrimental to the interests of the trade, and would tend to destroy public confidence in the results obtained therefrom. Our reasons for believing this are, that the elevator companies (if they so wish) would be able to manipulate the grades for their own benefit and not to clean grain up for the dockage set by the government inspector.

9. The fact that an elevator is owned and operated by a railway company does not with the present regulations, in our opinion, necessarily ensure protection to the public. We would like, however, to see the elevators at present owned, or to be owned, by the railways operated by them.

10. To prevent the evils that are made possible by the operation of terminal elevators under the present system, we do not think it wise to advise the government to go to the length of taking over the terminal elevators or of prohibiting persons engaged in the grain trade being interested in such terminals. We believe it is possible to obtain a good service from these elevators under the present ownership by having a more thorough system of supervision and control.

This report is signed by John Miller, W. L. MacNair and George E. Goldie, the three commissioners who were appointed to investigate the grain trade. They went thoroughly into the whole question, and their view is that the radical step—or what seems so to many of us—of the government taking over all the terminal and transfer elevators from Fort William eastward, is not one on which the western farmers are unanimous. This commission also recommended, as you have noticed, a more thorough supervision and control on the part of the government to meet the needs of the grain trade so far as these terminal and transfer elevators are concerned. I may say that as a result of this investigation into the grain trade of the west, and as a result of their report, and the investigation into the report held last year, some important improvements were made to the Manitoba Grain Act, and some amendments were made to the Inspection and Sale Act that met at least a part of the objections of the farmers to the way in which the grain trade had been handled previous to that time. But I am free to say that there are still some serious handicaps on the grain trade in the way in which it is handled from Fort William eastward. One of the things that is harmful to the grain trade of the west and to the producer, one of the conditions that is injurious, is met by the vessels employed in the carrying trade on the great lakes. When they carry grain from Chicago, or from Duluth, or from ports on the American side, they find at those points, established by the grain trade itself, clearing houses where a vessel can go to one elevator, or to two or three at most, and obtain a full cargo of grain. As a result of these clearing houses for documents at those ports on the American side, a vessel can go to one of those ports and take a load of grain in a few hours, not exceeding in any case half a day. What is the condition of affairs at Port Arthur and Fort William? In a place where they have a dozen terminal elevators, in order to get her cargo a vessel has to go from one to another, she has to go around six or seven, or eight elevators before she has obtained her load. That means, not a matter of a few hours, but a matter of two or three days, in many cases; that means a great increase in the cost of carrying this grain, because the owners of these vessels cannot afford, when so much time is lost in loading the grain, to charge the same freight rates from Fort William as they do from corresponding ports on the American side. Now I think the government should require the grain trade that is interested in these terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, to establish a clearing house for documents whereby a vessel could go to one or two elevators and receive her cargo, and the other elevators interested could use this elevator as a clearing house for the quantity that

they propose to ship. That could easily be done, that would be an easy matter to accomplish, and I think that would remove one of the very serious sources of loss to the producer of western Canadian wheat. Then again the mover and seconder of this resolution have referred to the fact that when these vessels, that are loaded at Fort William and Port Arthur, where the grain is weighed into them by a government weighmaster, reach the Georgian bay and other eastern ports, in many cases very serious shortages are found, and of course the carrying trade refuse to be responsible for those shortages. That again is another slap in the face for the producer of western Canadian wheat. I think there is another instance where the government might do a little something in the interest of the grain trade. It seems to me that if we are to have an effective system, if we are going to have men to weigh out this grain into the vessels at Fort William and Port Arthur, we should also have government weighmasters to weigh this grain into the eastern transfer elevators, and in that way another source of loss to the producer in the west would be removed. In my opinion the grain trade of western Canada is one of absorbing interest and importance, and when we come to consider the amount of grain that is being produced, and that will be produced in those prairie provinces the next few years, anything that will effect a saving to the farmer of a cent a bushel, or half a cent, or even a quarter of a cent, or of a less fraction than that, means the saving of a large sum of money to the people of western Canada.

The farmer works hard, as we know, for his living. He earns his bread by the sweat of his brow, literally, and I maintain that everything that can be done by this government and the House to lighten the burden of the western Canadian farmer, to bring to him a fair and just reward of the toil that is necessary for the production of grain, of wheat, oats and other cereals on our western farms, ought to be done. I am sure that the members of the government who are listening to me do so with sympathetic interest. The farmers of the west appreciate very much what the government have already done along this line. We know that last year, when the farmers interviewed upon this grain question the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce, there were very powerful interests present at that interview, and that these other interests sought in every way possible to influence this government to abolish certain provisions of the Manitoba Grain Act which were in the farmers' interests. I say that it is to the credit of this government that they did not listen to these other powerful interests, but that they listened to the voice of the western Canadian farmers. It would have been a great calamity to the western farmer if the car distribution clause had been altered. I hope the government, even if they do not see their way clear to adopt the resolution of the hon. member for Souris, will manifest a sympathetic interest, as they have done in the past, in the representations made by the people of western Canada in connection with everything necessary to improve and promote the welfare of the grain trade of the west. In conclusion I have to say that I quite agree with the view that government supervision and control should follow the farmers' wheat from the time it is taken off the railway car at Winnipeg or Fort William right through to the Atlantic seaboard. A complete and efficient system of control and supervision should be established, as it has been at Fort William and Port Arthur, in connection with the transfer elevators farther east. If that system is given a fair trial and if it is put into effective working order, if this supervision which has been brought into force as far as the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur are concerned, is extended to the eastern transfer elevators, so as to see that the identity of the farmers' grain, as it is shipped from his own town, is preserved right through to the Atlantic seaboard, the farmers of the west will be very well satisfied with the condition of affairs that will be brought about by this increased supervision and improved control.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk). I did not intend to take any part in this discussion and I do not intend to detain the House at any great length at this late hour. I thought when the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) rose to address this House that I would have been able to have congratulated the west on being united on this very important question. There is no doubt that this is a very important question to the west and every argument that the hon. gentleman has used here to-night in support of a better system of supervision at the terminal elevators has, I think, been a very strong argument in support of the resolution before the House for government ownership of the terminal elevators. I do not intend to detain the House. Everything I might say would simply be a repetition of what has been so well said by the mover and seconder of this resolution. There is no doubt that something ought to be done to protect the farmer, to make it possible that the grain that he ships from the great provinces of the west would reach the markets of the world in the condition in which it leaves those provinces. The information that we have had laid before us to-night and the information that every man from the west has had time and again placed before him proves conclusively that the grain has been tampered with at the elevators en route to market and that the

grain that leaves the western provinces does not reach the consumer in the British market in the condition in which it leaves. This is a very important question not only for the farmers of the west, but for the whole of Canada. We have the reputation of raising the finest grain in the world, and I believe there is no question that we deserve that reputation. Manitoba and the other two great provinces of the west are producing to-day a sample of grain that has no equal in the world and it is the duty of the government to see that from the time it leaves the farmer until it reaches the consumer in the old land it is not tampered with. In conclusion, I had hoped that the west would be united in support of this resolution. I was a little surprised to hear the argument advanced by the hon. member for Humboldt, and I was surprised that he should desire to throw any obstacle in the way of a resolution of this kind. But, while he did not wish to come out openly and oppose this resolution, he went on to say that what the government had done and were doing was sufficient for the present and that the present system of government-supervision should be given a further trial. I do not know what the government are accomplishing upon these lines, but I say that anything that will improve the condition of the farmer and make it possible for his wheat to reach the markets of the world in a better condition than it does at the present time ought to be supported by every hon. member from the great west. I have much pleasure in concurring in the resolution which has been so ably presented by the hon. member for Souris, and seconded by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. The information that has been laid before this House ought to convince every man in the House, if it has not succeeded in convincing the hon. member for Humboldt, of the necessity of doing something along these lines. I hope the time is coming when the government will take action. I regret very much that the provincial governments could not see their way clear to do something in the way of taking over the internal elevators. There is no doubt that there have been very serious complaints made as to the manner in which the farmers have been treated by these elevators. But they have, in their wisdom, decided that they have no power to do this and in fact they have stated practically that it belongs to this parliament to take action in this matter. I can only say that I had hoped that the government would have accepted and made this a government measure, and I am sure that every man coming from the west would have been glad to have seen the resolution accepted and put through in that way. I trust that the speakers who will follow me from the other side of the House—because there are a number of them who are better qualified to speak on this question than I am—will support the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Souris and seconded by my right hon. friend from Qu'Appelle.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina). Mr. Speaker, like other hon. members who have spoken in regard to this subject, I want to state that I thoroughly agree that it is of the utmost importance not only to the farmers of western Canada but also the business men, professional men and inhabitants generally of that western country. If by any legislation that can be passed in this House changing the present method of handling grain, an additional return is obtainable by the producers of western grain, then the whole Dominion of Canada will be benefited. When we consider that the production of grain in the west is only in its infancy and that it is almost impossible to estimate the vast quantity which can be produced in that country, and when we consider that part of that western country is wholly dependent upon the production of wheat and other grain, it must be admitted that this question is of great importance not alone to the people of western Canada but to the people of the east. Now, referring to the question of government ownership which is included in the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Schaffner) I have to say that taking government ownership as a general principle I am opposed to it. But, if it can be shown that under the present system of government control there is dishonest weighing at the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and that grades are being manipulated, and if these abuses should continue to exist after the system of government control has been given a fair chance I would most certainly support government ownership in the interests of the grain producing industry of the west. I congratulate the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) on the manner in which he presented his case to the House, but it does seem to me that he offered no conclusive argument in favour of government ownership as compared with government control. I was not able to gather from the remarks of the hon. gentleman that the defects existed at the terminal elevators of Fort William and Port Arthur, because when he began to find fault with the system he went back to the small country elevators and said that the fault lay there. He spoke of the improper grading of the grain, but where is it graded? So far as I know it is graded at Winnipeg, and I do not see how you can get over improper grading at Winnipeg by adopting a policy of government ownership of terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur. The hon. gentleman spoke of dishonest weights, but I take it that this and other evils are provided against in the amendment to the Manitoba

Grain Act and to the Inspection and Sale Act which were passed by parliament last year. I claim that government control if properly carried out should be as efficient as government ownership, if not more so. Under the present system you have two sets of officials, the government officials and the employees of the terminal elevators, who act as a check upon each other. But if the elevators were owned and operated by the government there would be only one set of officials to weigh in the grain and to weigh it out, so that the present system if properly carried out ought to give us more efficient control than the system of government ownership. I had expected that the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) would give us some concrete instances of the success of government ownership, but in that I was disappointed. No doubt there are cases in which government ownership has been a success but there are many instances in which it has been a failure, and if we look at the examples of government ownership in this country we all have to admit that there is not much comfort for us in the prospect. One of the main arguments against government ownership is that it interferes more or less with individual enterprise, and the moment a government steps into that field it is going beyond what is the primary function of government. A government is intended primarily to legislate and to administer; it is not its function to engage in private enterprise. I hold that the system of government control has not yet been given a fair trial because the Act only came into force on the 1st of September, 1908, and only one crop has been handled under it. I would advocate giving that system a fair chance to work out, and if it is not effective no doubt amendments can be made to the legislation which will make it effective. I believe that so far as terminal elevators are concerned, government ownership should only be adopted as a last resort and after it has been demonstrated that government control will not protect the grain producers of the west. The last part of the resolution moved by my hon. friend would seem to be all right if we once admit the principle of government ownership, but, I cannot at all agree with the first part of the resolution which says:

That in the opinon of the House the present system of operating terminal and transfer elevators is detrimental to the interests of western grain producers.

In the year 1906 we had a grain commission consisting of three prominent western men who followed the grain from the time it was harvested and threshed until it reached the Liverpool market, and that commission presented a report to the government. Following the presentation of that report all the grain interests of the west were represented before the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and as a consequence of the conference then held certain amendments were made last session to the Manitoba Grain Act and to the Inspection and Sale Act, all of which amendments were in the interests of the western grain producers. I therefore cannot subscribe to the first part of that resolution which is in reality a criticism of the legislation passed by the government last session, and which legislation, was, I say, in the interest of the western grain producers. I referred a moment ago to the report of the Grain Commission. As I stated that commission followed the course of the grain from the thresher to the Liverpool market. They made certain recommendations to the government, among them the recommendation referred to by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) that they did not believe it would be to the advantage of the grain trade that the government should take over the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William. At page 9 of their report they say:

Requests were made of us in the country that the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur should be taken over and operated by the government in view of the fact that so many of them were operated by private corporations interested in the grain trade. We also had a communication from the department, under date January 23, 1907, inclosing a petition of members of parliament addressed to the right hon. the Prime Minister, requesting that we be instructed specifically to inquire into and report whether it is in the public interest that terminal elevators continue to be operated by common carriers or allowed to pass into the hands of or be operated by persons, firms or corporations engaged in the grain business.

In reply to this communication we addressed to the Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, Minister of Trade and Commerce, a letter dated February 1, 1907, a copy of which is appended hereto. We can see no reason for changing the conclusions arrived at at that time, and we believe that if our recommendations are carried out they will give to the public the same confidence and protection in the operation of these elevators as if they were owned by the government.

The communication addressed to Sir Richard Cartwright was referred to by the hon. member for Humboldt. The commissioners refer to it on page 19 of their report and say that they had no reason at the time they drew up their report to change their opinion with respect to the government ownership of terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. That is the view of the three men appointed by the government to investigate the conditions of the grain trade; they reported that they were not in favour of government ownership of terminal elevators and did not think it would be in the

interest of the trade to have the elevators taken over and operated by the government.

As I understand, the main objection that can be raised to the present method of handling the terminal elevators at Fort William or Port Arthur is that except the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator they are either leased or owned by private companies engaged in the grain trade. The element of personal gain, of illegitimate gain in some cases, enters into the operation of these elevators, and if we can get some legislation in addition to what we have, eliminating that element of personal gain, I believe we will go a long way towards securing what is desired as to terminal facilities at Fort William and Port Arthur. The commissioners in their report refer to these elevators being owned in this way and I have some evidence here which goes to show that the grain coming out of the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator and going towards the eastern transfer elevators is in better condition than that from private company-owned elevators. The secretary of the Dominion Millers' Association, under date of January 9, 1909, communicated with the Department of Trade and Commerce as follows:

There is a marked difference in the quality of the grain coming out of privately owned or operated terminal elevators as compared with the Canadian Pacific Railway elevators. Both dealers and millers tell me that the wheat out of the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator is on an average one-half to one cent a bushel, and sometimes the difference is considerably greater, better value than out of elevators owned or operated by companies interested in buying and selling grain. All the terminal elevators except those owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway are operated by men dealing in grain and largely controlled by United States concerns and managed by experts from across the line.

That bears out what I said in regard to private gain entering into the management of the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, the evidence going to show that the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator put out their grain in better shape than the elevators operated and owned by private corporations.

To refer again to the report of the grain commissioners, in their letter to Sir Richard Cartwright in the year 1907 they practically bear out what is stated by the Dominion Millers' Association, because they say the terminal elevators would be operated in a better way and more in the interests of the grain producers of the west if they were handled by the transportation companies. Apart from the question of government ownership altogether, there is a method of getting free from this element of personal gain, which will continue as long as human nature exists as it is, for the grain men are not in the business for nothing, they are in it to make as much money as they can. Why should not legislation be passed providing that no warehouse man at either point should be engaged in the grain business, simply make him a warehouse man pure and simple, or instead of that provide that the railway companies must not only build elevators but operate and own them. Take away the element of personal private gain from these elevators, take away from the grain men the gain derived from manipulating the grain in the terminals and I think it will go a long way towards eliminating the difficulties now existing in the handling of grain.

I have referred to the legislation passed last year. I claim that if this legislation is properly enforced under the system of government control, it must remove the difficulties of mixing grades which are alleged to exist at these terminal elevators. For instance, we find in the Act to amend the Manitoba Grain Act of last year, chapter 45 of the statutes of 1908, section 10, the following:

2. Every public terminal elevator warehouseman in the Manitoba inspection division shall receive for storage any grain tendered to him in a dry and suitable condition for warehousing, in the usual manner in which terminal elevators are accustomed to receive grain in the ordinary and usual course of business.

3. Grain so received shall in all cases be inspected and graded by a duly authorized inspector, and shall be stored with grain of a similar grade.

4. No grain shall leave a public terminal point without being officially weighed, unless the owner or his agent orders otherwise.

The Act then speaks of a record to be kept of this grain, and then refers to the preservation of the identity of the grain, the clause reading:

The identity of each parcel or lot of western grain shipped to an eastern transfer elevator shall be preserved, except that different parcels or lots of the same grades may be binned together when there is not sufficient space in the elevator to keep the parcels or lots separate.

8. In no case, whether in a public terminal elevator in the Manitoba inspection division or in an eastern transfer elevator, shall grain of different grades be mixed together while in store.

Provision is also made to prevent the mixing of grain. Also in the Inspection and Sale Act, section 9, there is a provision that the inspector is to have control of the storage and shipping of grain, and shall keep proper records of all grain received into store in any terminal elevator, and the Act prevents the transfer of grain from one bin to another. Then it enumerates the powers which the inspector has with respect to the cleaning of grain in these elevators. So that the provisions of the Act passed last year, if enforced by proper and capable government inspectors would ensure just as good preservation of the grain at these terminals and give just

as much satisfaction as any system of government ownership.

Let me point out that every one in western Canada is not in favour of government ownership of terminal elevators. I do not believe that there is any great agitation among the farmers in that respect, although there is for the government ownership of elevators in the interior. I have yet, however, to find that there is any serious agitation for the government ownership of terminal and transfer elevators. I have here two or three opinions from western men on this very point to which I would like to refer. I have, for instance, the opinion of Mr. John Millar, who was chairman of the Grain Commission, and which opinion he expressed at the grain growers' convention at Weyburn on the 20th of February last:

> The weights both in and out of the terminal elevators had been found to be satisfactory, but the grain going out seemed to contain rather too much extraneous matter as some of the cleaners were not of the best. It was pointed out that there was a tendency for the elevators to go into the hands of private companies who were themselves handling grain and the report of the commission had recommended that these and the transfer elevators farther east should be placed under strict government control. This had been done and he believed the producer now had as much protection as government ownership would give him.

I also have here an opinion on the present situation from the Hon. D. W. R. Motherwell, Minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan:

> The government control secured over these elevators by amendment to the Grain Act last session by the federal parliament has given the producer practically every safeguard and security in the way of control which government ownership could possibly give.

There are just one or two points to which I shall refer briefly before taking my seat. There were certain arguments in favour of government ownership advanced at the grain growers' convention at Weyburn, which were practically the same as those put forward to-day by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner). The first was that government supervision and control is objectionable because you cannot have proper supervision or effective control. But I reply that you would have proper supervision and effective control if the system were properly enforced, as I believe it will be if reasonable time be given the government to work it out.

The next objection is that the warehousemen should have no interest in manipulating the commodity he stores. In that opinion I agree, but I do not agree that to eliminate that interest we require to go the length of government ownership. We can put through legislation which will just as effectively accomplish the same object. Another objection is that manipulation was going on at the terminal elevators before the last change in the Manitoba Act respecting the supervision of binning and is going on still. Well, no evidence has been produced to-night to show that manipulation is going on to-day. I may believe that it is, but before supporting such a radical measure as government ownership, I would require some evidence that these abuses were going on. These are the main objections raised to the present system of government control. At that convention there were many men who were in favour of government ownership of the interior elevators, but no one expressed himself regarding government ownership of terminal elevators to any extent. However the points to which I wish to refer briefly are these. It is said, and I believe truly, that there is a serious shortage in grain shipments going from Fort William and Port Arthur to eastern points, such as Owen Sound and Buffalo and others. It is said that the average shortage during the year 1908, after the grain was weighed by government inspectors, was 44 lbs. per 1,000 bushels from Fort William and Port Arthur as compared with 15 lbs. per 1,000 bushels from Chicago and 10 lbs. per 1,000 bushels from Duluth, and that the total shortage in shipments from these elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur this year amounts to 50,000 bushels. At present the men who ship that grain hold the vessel owners responsible, but the vessel owners claim they should not be responsible, although legally they are, owing to the manner in which the grain is weighed. That surely is a hardship to the vessel owners. I was present at a conference before the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in which the vessel owners, shippers, and grain men from Winnipeg appeared, and all agreed that this grain shortage must be in those elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. Well, if these elevator companies are getting that 50,000 bushels, they are getting what they are not entitled to. According to the Manitoba Grain Act and its amendments last year, they are entitled to a certain amount for binning and a certain amount for storage, but if they are getting that 50,000 bushels they are getting what does not belong to them. Some amendment should be introduced into the Manitoba Grain Act to provide that the surplus be taken over by the government and thus eliminate the question of personal gain. Another matter is that of screening. Before the inspector in Winnipeg grades a car of grain, he marks it so much dockage, sometimes two per cent, and sometimes more and sometimes less. The grain goes into

the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and is supposed to be cleaned to whatever percentage of dockage was set. The elevator men get the screenings. I have heard the amount estimated last year all the way from 300,000 bushels to 1,400,000 bushels. On these screenings the farmers of the west have to pay freight, and they should not belong to the elevator men, but should go to the producer or at least the producer should be re-imbursed for his outlay in freight for what at present he gets no return. It is of course to the advantage of the warehouse men to take every possible bushel of screenings they can get. I am advised that they sold the screenings last year to one firm at $7 per ton and that firm retailed it at $16 per ton. But take the price at $7 a ton, and on 300,000 bushels, that amounted to $63,000. On 1,400,000 bushels, it would be five times that sum. Some legislation should be passed to the effect that the surplus screenings and grain found in the elevators at any time shall be confiscated and taken over by the government and thus you will eliminate the element of illegitimate gain which these elevators are getting at present.

I desire to refer in closing to what the Inspection and Sales Act provides with respect to the surplus of grain in the terminals. Subsection 7 of sec. 9 of chapter 36 of the Inspection and Sales Act of 1908 says that:

In the month of August in each year stock shall be taken of the quantity of each grade of grain in the terminal elevators.

Why do not they go a step further and say that the grain and the screenings found there shall belong to the government? I believe that these difficulties could be removed by these suggestions, and I hope that at some future day legislation of this kind will be introduced into this House. A very simple amendment would effect it, and I think it would cure a great majority of objections raised to the handling of grain in these elevators. I am as much interested as are the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) and others from the west in seeing that a proper system is devised for handling the grain of our western provinces. I am interested in seeing that the producer, no matter how small a producer he may be, gets as much as the market will allow him at the time of sale. I am as much interested as these hon. gentlemen in seeing that no discrimination shall exist between small shippers and large shippers, or, if there is to be an advantage, that it shall be to the small shipper. I believe in the system of government control of these utilities, but I do not believe in the government going aside from its true duty and engaging in mercantile business. I believe that, at least, the government should try in every way to regulate the grain trade of the west before they embark upon the management of terminal elevators and become grain men. As that is my belief, I will move an amendment to that effect, and in doing so I have every confidence that this government—which has been in power since 1896 and under which the Manitoba Grain Act has come into existence and under which the farmers of the west have the right to get cars and ship their own grain—if government control does not prove effective, will be ready to adopt such measures as they deem necessary from time to time to protect the grain interests of western Canada. The amendment I move is as follows:

That all the words after 'that' be struck out, and the following be substituted therefor:

The amendments of last session to the Grain Act whereby all transfer and terminal elevators were put under government control have produced good results. And if, on further experience, it is found that the present system of supervision is not adequate to prevent the undue mixture of grain in such elevators, this House will be prepared to accept such further legislation as may be needed to that end.

In conclusion, I wish to refer to the fact that since September 1, 1908, only one complaint has been received by the Department of Trade and Commerce from men purchasing grain shipped through these elevators, and this in contrast with the fact that many such complaints were received in former years. The complaint referred to was from the Dominion Millers' Association, and I have here a short extract from that complaint. It will be observed that they go so far as to admit that there has been an improvement in the handling of the grain in these elevators, although they state it is not yet all it should be.

While there has been a certain improvement in the grain as it comes from the public elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur since the government took closer control, yet we regret to say that matters are not yet in a satisfactory condition.

If, under the present system, after it has been in existence but a few months the condition of things is better than before, there is every reason to believe that it will still further improve, especially when the system itself is improved as experience may indicate to be necessary.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Do I understand the amendment to say that the terminal elevators were put under government control?

Mr. SPEAKER (reading):

——all transfer and terminal elevators were put under government control——

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is not the case.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Macleod). Mr Speaker, I should not attempt to speak at any length either on this motion or on the amendment, but I wish to put myself on record so that the people of the west may know where I stand on this very important question. I am glad that the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) has introduced this motion. I believe that no motion has ever been introduced into this House, no discussion has ever taken place in the House, of greater importance and interest to the farmers of the western prairies than this. I am much surprised at the hon. member for Regina (Mr. W. M. Martin) stating that the terminal elevators are now under government control. This is the first time I have heard such a statement made. I have always understood that there were government inspectors to supervise the taking in and shipping out of the grain, but so far as general government control is concerned, the idea is entirely new to me. The principal argument put forward by the hon. member on the other side against the government taking actual control of the terminal and transfer elevators seems to be that vested rights stand in the way. Well, I do not know what this House may think of that, but my personal opinion is that, if private corporations invest money in terminal elevators and they are not doing what is honest and just by the farmers, the government is perfectly justified in taking control, or in expropriating, or going into competition with them. And it is the general opinion of the western farmers that they are not getting justice in the terminal elevators. I have not had much experience in the handling of grain myself, and do not pretend to be an authority on the subject, but those from the west who were in the House a year ago, and who took a deep interest in the matter, know what went on before the Department of Trade and Commerce when representations were made by the delegation sent here from the Western Farmers' Associations. That delegation consisted of members from each of the provinces appointed by the different associations, and represented the entire grain growing interest of the three prairie provinces. No one could listen to their arguments without coming to the conclusion that it would be of great advantage to the western grain growers if the government would take over these elevators and control and operate them. I might suggest that, if vested rights are going to be a great obstacle in the way of taking control of the elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William and the transfer elevators further east, the government will have an opportunity to experiment on the Pacific coast. I understand that meetings have been held in Alberta and Saskatchewan recently which have taken up the question of shipping grain to Europe by the Pacific coast. There are no elevators there as yet, so there will be an opportunity for the government to step in and experiment with government-owned elevators. From what I have heard from the farmers who laid the case before the Minister of Trade and Commerce representing the government, I am led to believe that, if the government could see their way clear to take over these existing terminal elevators, they would be rendering one of the greatest services ever rendered to the farmers of the western country. They talk about one or two cents a bushel being taken from the farmers by the manipulation of wheat in these elevators. I have heard it stated that in many cases they take as high as seven cents a bushel from the farmers, at least the farmers think so, I do not know whether that is the case or not.

Mr. NEELY. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the terminal elevators?

Mr. HERRON. Yes, that they are making an undue charge at the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William; in fact it is claimed that they are making almost double the charge they should make, at the terminal elevators in particular. The grain pays for all this. This House need not think that if the government take the action suggested by the resolution they would have to pay the expense, because the country would not be out by it. The grain is going to pay for all the handling, and even if the government did step in and operate the elevators five years as an experiment, no doubt some arrangement could be made by which the government would not be out a cent of money. I think this resolution is a step in the right direction, and I sincerely hope the government will accept it, and make an experiment of controlling and operating the terminal and other elevators on the great lakes.

Mr. NESBITT. As the hour is late, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING. There are one or two motions on the Order Paper that I propose should be called, in case any hon. gentleman wishes to drop them. For instance, No. 4—the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) is not here, but I understood he wished to drop the resolution, in order that he may bring the matter up in another way.

On the order:

That in the opinion of this House, so long as the Canadian tariff affords, incidentally or otherwise, a considerable degree of protection to manufacturers, some protection may fairly and properly be afforded by our tariff to Canadian agriculturists and stock raisers upon hogs, hog products, garden vegetables and such other items as it may appear possible to so protect with advantage to the agriculturist, and without undue injury to the Canadian consumer.—Mr. Sealey.

Mr. FIELDING. Dropped.

On the order:

For a copy of all memorials, reports, correspondence, and documents in the possession of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, in the Department of Trade and Commerce and in any other department, relating to the route of the winter steamers between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Canada, and suggesting and recommending a change or changes in the said route and an increase in the number of trips daily of such winter steamers. Also a copy of all memorials, reports, correspondence and documents relating to the route of the summer mail steamers between Charlottetown and the mainland of Canada, and suggesting or recommending a change or changes in that route, and an increase in the number of trips daily of such summer mail steamers, and also with regard to connecting such suggested new summer route or routes with a point or points on the Intercolonial Railway.—Mr. Warburton.

Mr. WARBURTON. Dropped.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the Grand Trunk Pacific resolution come up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. Later in the day. We propose to begin the day's work by concurrence and a Supply Bill. If that be disposed of early we will take up the Grand Trunk Pacific resolutions.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. Tuesday.

INDEX

FIRST SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1909.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques- Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Assets of Canada in detail on December 31, 1908 (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).

Budget, The, 4663 (iii).

Budget Speech, 1898, Statement *re* Finances, (M. for ret.*), 173 (i).

—— Inquiry for Stmnt., 1321 (i).

Canada Eastern Ry., Original Price, Value, Amount expended for Repair (Ques.) 2149, 2579 (ii).

—— Corrected Answer (remarks) 3364 (ii).

Chicoutimi Pier, Specifications *re* Contract with T. Desbiens, &c. (M. for copies*) 2161. (ii).

Commissions to Bank of Montreal *re* debt (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 399 (i).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) Ques. of Order, 2868 (ii).

Dom. Lands, Expenditures charged to Capital Account (M. for ret.*) 173 (i).

Dominion 4 per cent Loan, Amount of Sinking Fund (Ques.) 545 (i).

Dominion Loans, Amount redeemable, &c. (Ques.) 545 (i).

See 'Loans.'

France and Canada Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5223 (iv).

Funded Debt, Redeemable, Total Sinking Fund (Ques.) 342 (i).

Gaspé-Perce Mail Contract, Expiration of (Ques.) 2596 (ii).

'Glimpses of Northeastern Canada,' Number of Copies circulated, Payments *re* &c. (Ques.) 4640 (iii).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—Con.

Govt. Credit, Cash on deposit, &c. (M. for ret.*) 173 (i).

Govt. Temporary Loans, Liabilities between April, 1907, to Dec., 1908 (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).

—— Inquiry for, 4119 (iii).

G. T. P., Branch Lines, Plans *re* Orillia Branch (Ques.) 1077 (i).

—— Contracts for North Bay Sections, Estimated Cost per mile &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).

—— Guarantee *re* Loan, &c., Security (remarks) 3258 (ii).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., on Res., 3578 (ii); on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 4052; on M. for 2°, 5120; in Com., 5190; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 5593 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Commissioners' Revised Stmnt. as to Cost (Ques.) 1056 (i).

Harbour Commissioners of Mostreal, Interest, Loans, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1734 (i).

Homestead and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold, Moneys received, &c. (Ques.) 482 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6170 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6704 (iv).

I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Earnings and Expenditures for Oct. 1907 and the year 1908 (Ques.) 1415 (i).

I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Items in Public Accounts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 173 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

James Bay and Labrador, Exploratory Party, &c. (Ques.) 4696 (iii).

Liabilities, Contingent or Nominal, on 1st Jan., 1909 (M .for ret.*) 173 (i).

Loans of Jan., 1909, Expenditure *re* &c., (Ques.) 2596 (ii).

Loan of Dec., 1907, &c., Sums available for Public Works, &c. (Ques.) 669 (i).

Loans, Interest on Temporary, for 12 and three-quarter years (Ques.) 4898 (iii).

Loans of Dec., 1907, and Oct., 1908, Information *re* (Ques.) 1075 (i).

See 'Dom. Loans.'

Militia and Defence, Expenditures *re* Capital Account since 1895 (M. for ret.*) 158 (i).

Montcalm Electoral District, Votes polled, Spoiled Ballots, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2597 (ii).

Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 180 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 6629 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Dues, Increase of, Interest due Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1416 (i).

National Trans. Ry., Loans *re* Construction, Eastern Division, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 679 (i).

Natural Resources B. 159 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6382 (iv).

Natural Resources, Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6374 (iv).

Pneumatic Tubes, Montreal, Quantity and Value of Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 1068 (i).

Preston, W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt., Transfer, &c. (Ques.) 3991 (ii).

—— Transfer to Holland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).

Public Works, Hours of Labour B. 35 (Mr. Verville) on M. to dschg. from Order Paper, 4990 (iii).

Ry. Subsidy, C. 40, Edward VII., Reps. *re* Payment of (M. for copy*) 2161 (ii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 1718 (i).

Revenue Details *re* amount of $699,235.52 in November, 1908 (M. for ret.*) 158 (i).

Rivière du Moulin Pier, Pets. Reps., &c., *re* Contract (M. for copies*) 2161 (ii).

Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1116 (i); on Senate Amts., 6788 (iv).

Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1131 (i).

S. A. Land Grants to Teachers, &c. (Ques.) 3986 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 788 (i).

Charges of Management, 399 (i).

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 386; Railways (consulting engineer) 386; Sec. of State (salaries) 459 (i).

Indians—B.C. (destitute) 1140; (schools) 1141 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Labour Dept. (industrial disputes) 655 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and New Zealand) 6651; (contingent fund) 6655; (Gaspé) 6651; (Halifax and Nfld.) 6651; (Magdalen Islands) 6652; (P.E.I. and C.B. and Nfld.) 6652; (Prince Rupert, B.C. and Jedway) 6652; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 6653; (Victoria, &c., and Skagway) 6654 (v).

Militia (supplies) 6664 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Strathcona) 3224 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Nanaimo) 3224 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Grosse Isle) 3211 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 1283; (Halifax) 1289; (New Glasgow) 1291 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston R.M.C.) 1512 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1253; (museum) 1275; (peat testing) 1502; (Royal Mint) 1271 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 1293 (i); (detention hospital) 3221 (ii); (Joliette) 1293; (Knowlton) 1301; (Montreal P. O., enlargement) 1316 (i); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 3211 (ii); (Montreal, postal station) 1306; (St. Johns) 1317; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 1317 (i); (Sherbrooke) 3222 (ii); (Three Rivers) 1318 (i).

Public Works—(contingencies) 3672 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2344; (Bay St. Lawrence) 2455; (Blue Rocks) 2455; (Breton Cove) 2456; (Cow Bay) 2466; (Middle River) 2477; (South Lake, Lakevale) 2480 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 2513; (Anse l'Ilot) 2513; (Batiscan) 3276; (Bonaventure river) 2559; (Bonaventure) 2377; (Chicoutimi) 2523; (Clarke City) 2527, 2540; (Doucet's Landing) 2545; (Douglastown) 2546; (Father Point) 2548; (Gaspé) 2550; (Lake St. John) 2556; (Laprairie ice piers) 2900; (Magdalen Islands) 2557; (Mistook) 2557; (Nicolet) 3246; (repairs) 2554; (Richelieu river) 2559; (Rimouski) 2557; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 2900; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 3288; (St. Francis du Lac) 3285; (Ste. Fulgence) 2906 (ii); (St. Jean des Chaillons) 2906; (St. Maurice) 2900; (St. Michel, Yamaska) 3262; (St. Nicholas) 2908; (Saguenay dredging) 2802, 2887; (Saguenay River) 3284; (Sorel) 3289; (Yamaska) 3291 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (annuities administration) 6660; (Chinese administration) 6655; (commercial agencies) 6657 (iv).

Ways and Means (sugar) in Com., 5101 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J.E., *East Lambton.*

Agriculture Dept., Expenditure *re* Employees (Ques.) 2756 (ii).

Agricultural Fertilizers, B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4447 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act, Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 754 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Books entering Canada under British Preferential Tariff, &c. (Ques.) 2586 (ii).

Budget, The, 4910 (iii).

Canada-France S.S. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4440 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5460 (iii).

Civil Service Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6327 (iv).

Civil Service Salaries, in Com. on Res., 406 (i).

Cochrane Town Site, G. T. P., Interference *re* (Ques.) 2586 (ii).

Cold Storage Plant, Govt. Assistance to (Ques.) 2756 (ii).

Envelopes, Complaints *re* Mutilation of through Mail (Ques.) 349 (i).

Experimental Farms, Location in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1939 (i).

Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Names, Mail routes, &c. (Ques.) 2585 (ii).

French SS. Subsidy: *See* 'Canada,' &c.

Fruit Marks Act, Number of Inspectors, &c. (Ques.) 3477 (ii).

—— Regulations *re* Inspection, on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3376 (ii).

Grand Bend Dock, Approaches (Ques.) 2586 (ii).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5255, 5329 (iii).

G. T. P., Resignation of Mr. Morse, Action of Govt. (Ques.) 345 (i).

Holstein Cattle at Experimental Farm, &c. (Ques.) 2756 (ii).

Mackey's Station Post Office, Complaints *re* Management (Ques.) 545 (i).

Mail and Stage Routes, Total Number of Miles, &c. (Ques.) 481, 813 (i).

Mail Boxes purchased and entered without Duty, Authority *re* (Ques.) 547 (i).

Mail Contracts expiring on April 1, 1909, Renewals, Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 685.

—— Inquiry for Ret., 4801 (iii).

—— Renewals without tender in April, 1909, &c. (Ques.) 477 (i).

Oil, Gas, &c., Borings, Details of Expenditure of $35,000, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 684 (i).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5423, 5565 (iii).

Postoffice Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4249 (iii).

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 741 (i).

Railway Commission Vacancy, Appmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2638 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Royal Mint, Coins manufactured, Sale and Purchase of Silver, &c. (M. for ret.*) 354 (i).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. for Sup. 2774 (ii).

Rural Mail Routes, Location, &c. (Ques.) 347 (i).

Number of routes, &c. (Ques.) 6408 (iv).

Purchase of Boxes, Duty, &c. (Ques.) 179 (i).

—— Total Expenditure on Routes (Ques.) 677 (i).

St. Joseph Wharf Expenditure in 1908 (Ques.) 2586 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking) 455 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 696 (i); (live stock industry) 5871; (tobacco) 5881 (i).

Canals—Lachine (cement) 1566 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 643; Civil Service Commission (salaries) 398, 705; Govt. Railways (salaries) 462; Finance (salaries) 384 (i); Mines (salaries) 3675; Post Office (contingencies) 726; (salaries) 721; Sec. of State (salaries) 461 (i).

Excise (methylated spirits) 448; (Stamps, &c.) 439 (i).

Inland Revenue (electric power export) 455 (i).

Post Office (inspectors' salaries) 1052; (rural delivery) 1714 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1374; (Ottawa, peat testing) 1391 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Au Sable) 3292; Que. (Doucet's Landing) 2546 (ii).

Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 453 (i).

Telephone Rates in Canada, Control of by Govt. on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1788 (i).

Thedford, Arkona and Fort Frank Rural Mail Delivery, Delay in Establishing, &c. (Ques.) 476 (i).

Trade Relations with Germany, Improvements, &c. Total Exports, &c. (Ques.) 482 (i).

ARTHURS, Mr. J., *Parry Sound.*

Burks Falls, and Trout Creek Mail Routes, Contractor, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3193 (ii).

McKenzie, Mr. D., Resignation as Postmaster of Three Brooks, N.S., Apptmt. of a Successor (Ques.) 4640 (iii).

Magnetawan River Improvements, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 476 (i).

Natural Resources Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6378 (iv).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4534 (iii).

Public Works Expenditure *re* Byng Inlet, &c. (Ques.) 1178 (i).

ARTHURS, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Quebracho Extract, Quantity imported, Pet. *re* Duty, (Ques.) 1178 (i).

SUPPLY—

Excise—(inspectors salaries, &c.) 436 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 2311 (ii).
Penitentiaries—Dorchester (supplies) 917; Generally (supplies) 894 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1373 (i); Dredging—Dom. (vessels, repairs) 3338; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Lake Nipissing) 3308; (Little Current) 2973; (Maganatawan) 2981; (Monetteville) 3308 (ii).

Voters' Lists, Parry Sound, Cost of Revision, &c. (Ques.) 669 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B., (Minister of Justice) *North York.*

Bourke, Mr., Retirement of: *See* 'Miner, Bill.'

B. C. Penitentiary, Escape of Convict Bill Miner, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 350 (i).

Buell, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. before Rw Commission (Ans.) 3252 (ii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr Clarke) in Com., 3005 (ii).

C. P. R., Issue of New Stock, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1342 (i).

Coal Oil Explosions, Investigation *re* Deaths &c. (Ans.) 1057 (i).

Cobalt Lake, Disallowance of Act, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1750 (i).

Commissions, Secret or Illicit Payments Prevention (B. 31) 1° m., 325 (i).
See 'Secret,' &c.

Criminal Code Amt. (B. 148) 1° m., 463 (i); 2° m., 6383, 6391; in Com., 6756; on Senate amts., 7085 (iv).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 2°, 556; in Com., 567 (i).

Death Penalty Commutations, Number in the last 25 years (Ans.) 670 (i).

Ewart, Mr. J. S., Emplymt. *re* Hague Tribunal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7061 (iv).

——— Emplymt. re Newfoundland Fisheries (Ans.) 5630 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act (registrar) Amt. (B. 98) 1°m., 2127 (iii); in Com., 5340 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act (appeal) Amt. (B. 151) 1°m., 4695 (iii); in Com., 6744 (iv).

External Affairs Dept., on prop. Res. (Mr. Murphy) 1991 (i).

Extradition Act Amt. (B. 149) 1°*, 4634; in Com., 5236 (iii).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ont. Legislation, on M. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6935 (iii).

Graft and Secret Commissions: *See* 'Secret.'

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Judges in Quebec now receiving Pensions, Date of Apptmts. (Ans.) 5634 (iii).

Judges of District and County Courts, Salaries (B. 193) prop. Res., 6122; in Com. on Res., 6769 (iv).
See 'Yukon.'

Kingston Penitentiary, Number of Prisoners, &c. (Ans.) 4226 (iii).

——— Tenders for Coal, &c. (Ans.) 4226 (iii).

——— Tenders *re* Potatoes (Ans.) 4227 (iii).

Lebel, Mr. Achille, Request *re* Pet. of Right, &c. (Ans.) 3253 (ii).

Man. County Court, Apptmt. of Judge (Ans.) 342 (i).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary, Admission of Detectives (Ans.) 1183 (i).

——— Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1820 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 932 (i), 7046 (iv).

——— Letter *re* visit of Mr. A. D. McIntyre (Ans.) 2595 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Ret., 1192 (i).

——— Moneys received prior to escape (Ans.) 4899 (iii).

N.B. Supreme Court, Vacancies, &c. (remarks) 6687 (iv).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3128 (ii).
See 'Supply.'

New Westminster Penitentiary, Warden from 1876 to 1888, &c. (Ans.) 2769 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4473 (iii); 5994 (iv).

Prisoners, Paroled or Pardoned, Cost of Ret (Ans.) 673 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6213 (iv).

Railway Belt, B.C., Litigation between Dom. and B.C. (Ans.) 3043 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Contract with J. G. Herous *re* Timber, &c. (Ans.) 6405 (iv).

——— Insufficient Number of Guards, &c. (Ans.) 1417 (i).

——— Manufacture of Furniture (Ans.) 673 (i).

Secret Commissions Prevention (B. 31) 1° m., 325; in Com., 1122, 1479 (i); Sen. Amts., 4412 (iii).

Street Car Traffic on Sundays and Dom Legislation (Ans.) 1415 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canal—Trent (Holland River) 1888 (i).
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 440 (i).
Miscellaneous (Hague Tribunal) 7057 (iv).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Penitentiaries—B.C. (salaries) 7046; Kingston (skis) 7057 (iv).

Usury Act, 1908, Prosecutions, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 481 (i).

Waterways Treaty, Amendment by U.S. Senate, Ratification of by Govt. (Ans.) 4288 (iii).

Waterways and Boundaries Treaty and Welland Canal Construction (Ans.) 6292 (iv).

Wells, Judge, Absence with and without Leave (Ans.) 4898 (iii).

Yukon Act Amt. (B. 156) 1° m., 4882; in Com., 5235 (iii).

BARKER, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*

Canadian, Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1685 (i).

Fisheries in B.C., Depletion of, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 6504 (iv).

G.T.P. Loan Bill 128 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to M. for 3°, 5602 (iii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Extension, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2169 (ii).

Ry. Commission Vacancy, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) Ques. of Order, 2662 (ii).

Ry. Level Crossing, Accident near Kingston (remarks) 255 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (cement) 1568; St. Lawrence (district office) 1573; Soulanges (slope trimmings) 1571 (i).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen's Office (extra clerks) 3434 (ii).

Labour Dept.—Miscellaneous (opium conference) 3434 (ii).

Legislation—House of Commons (debates) 3437; (promotions) 3436; (voters' lists) 3436 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lime Kiln crossing) 3438 (ii).

Militia (R. M. College) 3423 (ii).

Post Office (rural mails) 3423 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Clarke City) 2541 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Aston, track scale) 3415; (working expenses) 3421; Miscellaneous (Quebec Bridge) 3421 (ii).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2141 (ii).

BARNARD, Mr. Geo. H., *Victoria, B.C.*

Address, The, 70 (i).

Banfield Creek Lifeboat, Cost, Wreck, &c. (Ques.) 1730 (i).

Bibbington, Thos., Cancellation of Pilotage Certificate (M. for cor.*) 3991 (ii).

B. C. Wharfs, Inquiry for Ret., 3004 (ii).
See 'Wharfs.'

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell), 2874 (ii).

Esquimalt Garrison (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2298 (ii).

BARNARD, Mr. Geo. H.—*Con.*

Esquimalt Naval Fortifications, Expenditure by Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 474 (i).

——— Maintenance by Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 349 (i).

Esquimalt Permanent Corps, Inspection, Total Cost (Ques.) 2764 (ii).

Indian Reserves Reduction, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1734 (i).

Kingston Penitentiary, Revenue from Sales, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1190 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3255 (ii).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3537 (ii).

Pilotage Rates, Scale of Charges for B.C., &c. (Ques.) 3476 (iv).

Robertson, Thos., Suspension by Pilotage Board (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6855 (iv).

St. Joseph's Hospital for Mariners, B.C., Arrangements *re* (Ques.) 3197 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5950 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 654 (i).

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 708 (i).

Indians—B.C. (surveys commission) 1145 (i)

Militia (salaries) 2298 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 6673; (life saving records) 6675; (naval militia) 6683 (iv).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 909 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Prince Rupert quarantine) 2081; (Victoria immigration) 2081 (ii); Yukon (Commissioner's residence) 1594 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 2098; Ont. (Victoria) 2117 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6534 (iv).

Trade Commissioner at Shanghai, Vacancy, Apptmt. (Ques.) 2320 (ii).

Victoria Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2100 (ii).

Victoria Post Office, Pet. from Letter Carriers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1712 (i).

Warships discarded by G. B., Offer to Fisheries Protection Service (Ques.) 2379 (ii).

Wharfs in N. S., N. B. and B. C., Amount expended since 1906 (Ques.) 348 (i).

——— Particulars of Expenditures (M. for ret.*) 1190 (i).
See 'B. C.,' &c.

BARR, Mr. J., *Dufferin.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4448 (iii).

Band of 36th Regiment, Payments to (Ques.) 4892 (iii).
See 'Thirty-Sixth,' &c.

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4443 (iii).

BARR, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Canadian Medical Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Roche) in Com., 4842 (iii).

Civil Service Salaries, M. for Com. on Res., 321; in Com. on Res., 409 (i).

Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5216 (iii).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., Ques of Order, *re* irregular voting, 568 (i).

Customs Seizures for 1904-5-6-7-8, Number, Dates, Sale of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 826 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2773 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1953 (i).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1653 (i).

French SS. Line: *See* 'Canada,' &c.

Gabriel, Capt., Payment *re* Recruiting for 1908 (Ques.) 4893 (iii).

G. T. P. Lake Superior Branch Lines Subsidy B. 30 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 667 (i).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr.Conmee) in Com., 4529; 5384; 5568 (iii).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4252 (iii).

Public Health Bureau, Establishment of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1105 (i).

Ry Act. (level crossing) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2392 (ii).

Railway Act (telephone crossings) Amt. (B. 32) 1° m., 326; 2° m., 876 (i).

Rural Mail Boxes, Number delivered in Dufferin County (Ques.) 341 (i).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2793 (ii).

Seizures by Inland Revenue, Number for 1904-5-6-7-8, Dates, Amounts realized, &c. (M. for ret.*) 685 (i).

Senate, Abolition of, on proposed resolution, (Mr. Lancaster) 1461 (i).

Stork, W. W., Inspector of Animals, Details *re* Expenditures (Ques.) 6092 (iv).

Superior and Ontario Ry. Co.'s incor. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3966 (ii).

SUPPLY—

(i);(cold storage) 3189 (ii); (exhibitions) (i); (cold storage) 3189 (ii); exhibitions) 727 (i); (experimental farms) 5955 (iv); (experimental farm, electric ry.) 3192 (ii); (live stock industry) 5842 (iii); (Year-Book) 702 (i).

Canals—Lachine (cement) 1567; (wharfs and basins) 791 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 643; Customs (contingencies) 591; Post Office (contingencies) 725 (i).

Excise (inspectors, salaries) 436 (i).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7026; (St. Boniface hospital) 7235 (iv).

BARR, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians—B. C. (destitute) 1140; (schools) 1142 (i).

Indians—Ont. and Quebec (legal expenses) 994· (schools) 978 (i).

Indians—P.E.I. (medical attendance) 1000 (i).

Indians—Saskatchewan (farm implements) 1004 (i).

Penitentiaries—Kingston (supplies) 887 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Victoria immigration) 2083 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers) 1619 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1361; (Kingston Vet. hospital) 1534; (R. M. College) 1533 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1259, 1270; (museum) 1275 (i); 3219 (ii); (telephones) 1607 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington piers) 2967; (Cobourg) 2968; Que. (Saguenay dredging) 2814 (ii).

Quarantine (generally) 3193 (ii).

Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 453 (i).

Telephone Lines crossing Railways, Applications *re*, Refusals, &c. (Que.) 335 (i).

——— Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 353 (i).

Thirty-sixth Regiment, Payments *re* Rental for Storage of Arms, &c. (Ques.) 4894 (iii). *See* ' Band.'

Towers in Dufferin County, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 341 (i).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4457 (iii).

Bacon Curing Industry for 1907-8, Number of Hogs condemned, &c. (Ques.) 342 (i).

Hogs killed from Nov., 1907 to Nov., 1908, Condemnation of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 684 (i).

Judge, H. A., Emplymt. as Detective by Govt. (Ques.) 1399 (i).

London and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 102) 1°*, 2318; in Com., 3846; 3983 (ii).

Monarch Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, m. 1648 (i).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G.B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3534 (ii).

Silver Currency, coined in Canada for 1905-6-7-8, Profits, &c. (Ques.) 868 (i).

Street Car Traffic on Sundays, Dom. Legislation re (Ques.) 1414 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5951 (iv); (agricultural grants) 993; Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 893; Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1387 (i); Harbours and Rivers —Ont. (Rondeau harbour) 2979 (ii).

Zinc Discovery in Albermarle Twp., Bounty *re* (Ques.) 1077 (i).

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 2°, 563 (i).

Death Penalty, Commutations, Number for the last 25 years (Ques.) 670 (i).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G.B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3559 (ii).

BELAND, Mr. H. S. *Beauce.*

Natural Resources Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6375 (iv).

Pulp and Paper produced in Can., Quantity exported to G.B. and U.S., (Ques.) 3048 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. Francis) 2554 (ii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Criminal Code (wife beating, &c.) Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 92; 2° m., 556; in Com., 567 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6166 (iv).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Act Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 91 (i).

—— Remarks, 555 (i).

Smith, Thomas L., Patent Relief (B. 71) 1°*, 1318 (i); 3° m., 2578, 2950 (ii).

BLACK, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*

Dominion Atlantic Ry., Examination, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).

—— Interview with Manager (remarks) 3003 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act, Regulations *re* Inspection on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3397 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2205 (ii).

Public Health Bureau, Establishment of by Govt. (prop. res.) 1081 (i).

SUPPLY—

Railways—I.C.R. (original construction) 2927 (ii).

Windsor, N.S., Post Office, Tenders *re* renovating, &c. (Ques.) 4288 (iii).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4467 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 755 (i).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4442 (iii).

Cigarette Prohibition Legislation, &c. (Ques.) 246 (i).

Disraeli Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2357 (ii).

Fishery Regulation Treaty, &c. and Action of Ont. Govt. (remarks) 6531 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4421 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5270, 5493 (iii).

—— on M. for 3° (remarks) 5555 (iii).

Hog Tariff from U.S. to Canada, Increase of (Ques.) 821 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) on M. to rsm. adjnd. debate (remarks) 4414 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6702; in Com. on B., 6704 (iv).

I. C. R., Frauds, Suspension of Officials (remarks) 2673 (ii).

Interior Officials, Dismissals, Charges, &c. (Ques.) 2380 (ii).

Mount Pleasant Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3423 (ii).

N.B. Central Ry. Commission's Rep., Ques. of Privilege *re* Vote, 6409 (iv).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4496, 5300 5308, 5352, 5410, 5559 (iii).

Ottawa Buildings, Payment of Taxes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1609 (i).

Port Credit, Customs Revenue, Superannuation of Collector, &c. (Ques.) 3049 (ii).

Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3329 (ii).

Post Offices in Peel County, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3046 (ii).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 2536 (ii).

Public Works Expenditures, Promises during elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1357 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2391 (ii); in Com., 6207, 6300 (iv).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2797 (ii).

Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 778 (i).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3982 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking 456 (i).

Arts, Agricultural, &c. (census, &c.) 696 (i); (experimental farm electric ry.) 3193 (ii); Gold and Silver Marking Act) 809 (i); (live stock industry) 5834 (iii); (swine commission) 6984 (iv); (tobacco) 5881 (iii).

Canals—Lachine (cement) 1566 (i); St. Lawrence (District office) 1574 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 648 (i); (experimental farm) 6982 (iv); Aud. Gen's Office (extra clerks) 3435 (ii); In-

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

terior (salaries) 6247 (iv); Sec. of State (salaries) 459 (i).
Dom. Lands (advertising) 6285 (iv).
Excise (methylated spirits) 449 (i).
Indians—B.C. (destitute) 1139 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and S. Africa) 6651 (iv).
Militia (supplies) 6664 (iv).
Miscellaneous (maps) 3463 (ii); (patent medicines) 458 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 6670 (iv).
Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 892; St. Vincent de Paul (supplies) 915 (i).
Post Office (rural mails) 3423 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents) 1618 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 1596 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Partridge Island water service) 3207 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 1287 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 1357; (Glencoe) 1367; (Markham) 1387; (Whitby) 1393, 1539 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 621; (grounds) 1600; (peat testing) 1389; (telephones) 1609 (i), 3232 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec citadel) 3213 (ii); (Sherbrooke drill hall) 1317 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 1592; (rents, &c.) 1621 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver) 1623; (Cape Bald) 1625; (Moncton) 1628; (St. John tributaries) 1637 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2748; (Sandy Cove) 3236 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blind River) 3292; (Collingwood) 3294; (Lake Nipissing) 3311; (Spanish River) 3328 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Tignish) 2510 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Batiscan) 3276; (Clarke City) 2540; (Garthby) 2549; (Laprairie) 3287; (Rivière du Loup) 3284; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 3287; (Saguenay dredging) 2803, 2878 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 3349 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Windsor) 3421 (ii).
Railways—N.T.R. (surveys, &c.) 6996 (iv).
Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4160 (iii).

BLONDIN, Mr. P. E., *Champlain.*

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 223 (i).
St. Maurice and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) on M. for 2°, 6083 (iv).
Stone, Broken and Rough for Marine Dept. Tenders, Contracts, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

BLONDIN, Mr. P. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Clarke City) 2527; (Saguenay dredging) 2811, 2885 (ii).

Transcontinental Ry., La Tuque Yard, Site (Ques.) 6292 (iv).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W., K.C.M.G., (Minister of Militia and Defence) *Kings, N.S.*

Algoma Rifles, 97th Reg., Removal from Sault Ste. Marie (Ans.) 1411 (i).
Annual Drill, Discontinuance, &c. (Ans.) 343 (i).
Armouries, supplied by Officers, Policy of Govt. (Ans.) 824 (i).
Armouries, Building, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 2129, 3110, 3937 (ii).
Band of 36th Regiment, Payments to (Ans.) 4893 (iii).
Belleville Drill Hall, Land Site, Officers' Quarters, &c. (Ans.) 674, 818 (i).
Bisley Team, Use of Ross Rifle, &c. (Ans.) 5643 (iii).
Canadian Patriotic Fund (B. 175) 1°*, 5887 (iii); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 6739 (iv).
Dom. Arsenal, Quebec, Names of Bidders, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3050 (ii).
Dominion Atlantic Ry., Examination (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).
Eastern Townships Cavalry Brigade, Site for (Ans.) 5644 (iii).
Esquimalt Garrison (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2299 (ii).
Esquimalt Naval Fortifications, Expenditure by Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 475 (i).
Esquimalt Permanent Corps, Inspection, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2765 (ii).
Fort Cumberland Land, Govt. Ownership, Sale, &c. (Ans.) 3481 (ii).
Gabriel, Capt., Payments for recruiting 1908 (Ans.) 4893 (iii).
Garrison Common, Transfer of Property to Exhibition Ass'n., Delays, &c. (Ans.) 182 (i).
Geodetic Survey Bureau, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 3077 (ii).
Imperial General Staff, Organization, O.Cs., Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Talbot) for Copies, 1420 (i).
Imperial Partnership with G. B. and Her Colonies, on Amt. (Mr. Hughes) 6424 (iv).
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 3866 (ii).
Japanese Immigration, Sir P. Lake's Speech in Toronto (Ans.) 1066 (i).
Kingston Batteries, Tenders *re* Supplies (Ans.) 4225 (iii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Kingston Military Buildings, Tenders, Number of Targets, &c. (Ans.) 546 (i).
See 'R.M.C.'

Lansdowne Drill Shed, Contract *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 5630 (iii).

Lee-Enfield Rifles, Issue of New Barrels, &c. (Ans.) 6088 (iv).

Loggie, W. S. Co., Payments to, by Govt. for 1906-7-8 (Ans.) 480 (i).

Militia, Annual Training, Completion of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 683 (i).

Militia Camps, Eastern Townships, Selection of Site (Ans.) 343 (i).

Militia Estimates (annual statement) 2244 (ii).

——— Items in Estimates (Ans.) 4634 (iii).

Militia at Halifax, Delayed Payments (remarks) 2773 (ii).

Militia, Permanent Corps, Winter Equipment, &c. (Ans.) 2377 (ii).

Military Lands purchased near Kingston, Name of Agent, &c. (Ans.) 547 (i).

N. W. Rebellion, 1885, Grants to R. N. W. M. P. (Ans.) 184 (i).

Ottawa Service Corps, Complaints *re* Padding Pay List (Ans.) 6784 (iv).

Petewawa Camp, Number of Permanent Force, Date of Opening, &c. (Ans.) 5639.

Quebec Camps of Instruction, Date of, Regiments attending, &c. (Ans.) 5641 (ii).

Red River Expedition, Land Grants to Officers, &c. (Ans.) 3991 (ii).

Richmond Rifle Range, Protection *re* Shooting (Ans.) 1723 (i).

Ross Rifle, Authority *re* Adoption by Canadian Govt. (Ans.) 1072 (i).

——— Bayonets, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 344 (i)..

——— Bisley Camp, Description of, &c. (Ans) 344 (i).

——— (remarks) 5644 (iii).

——— Claims for Damages *re* Accidents, &c. (remarks) *re* Form Answers, 548 (i).

——— Factory Bayonets, Installment of Machinery, &c. (Ans.) 670 (i).

——— Factory, Number of Employees, Inspections *re* Standards (Ans.) 1411 (i).

——— Number accepted and rejected by Militia Dept. (Ans.) 245 (i).

——— Number accepted and returned, Payments to Co. for 1903, (Ans.) 329 (i).

——— Reps. *re* Merits or Demerits, Cor. &c., on M. (Mr. Worthington) for Ret., 1190 (i).

——— Small Arms Com. Rep., Date of last Contract, &c. (Ans.) 471 (i).

——— Weight, Length, Diameter, &c. (Ans.) 4891 (iii).

Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. John, Contract *re* Supplies (Ans.) 2767 (ii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Royal Military College, Stables, Erection of (Ans.) 1732 (i).

——— Water Supply, Defects, &c. (Ans.) 682 (i).
See 'Kingston.'

St. John, Military Properties, Leases, Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 672 (i).

Sherbrooke Armoury, Completion, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5643 (iii).

Sherbrooke New Regiment, Construction, Appropriation *re* Band (Ans.) 5643 (iii).

Snider Rifles, Disposition of Old Ones (Ans.) 2383 (ii).

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations (remarks) 2234 (ii).

S. A. Land Grants to Teachers, &c. (Ans.) 3986 (ii).

Strathcona, Lord, Gift to Dom. *re* drilling of school children (letter read) 3198 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St John and Minas Basin) 6654 (iv).

Militia (annual drill) 2311, 2314, 3422; (contingencies) 2307; (ordnance) 2307; (permanent force) 3422; (properties) 2314 (ii); (priv. sec.'s salary) in conc., 4049 (iii); (R. M. C. commandant) 6660 (iv); (R.M. College) 3423; (salaries) 2214 (ii); (supplies) 6661 (iv); (transport) 3423; (warlike stores) 2317 (ii).

Pensions (Fenian Raid) 812; (N.W. rebellion) 812 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 1512 (i).

Targets, Rifles, Supplies, &c., Extension to Schools, &c. (Ans.) 681 (i).

Thirty-sixth Regiment, Payments *re* Storage of Arms (Ans.) 4894 (iii).

Toronto Barracks, Delay *re* Erection on Humber River Site (Ans.) 183 (i).

Toronto Old Fort Property, Reclamation and Restoration, &c. (Ans.) 3984 (ii).

——— Condition of, &c. (statement) 6415 (iv).

Truro Armoury, Apptmt. of Caretaker (Ans.) 186 (i).

University Drill Corps, Establishment of (Ans.) 683 (i).

Woodstock, N.B. Armoury, Bowling Alley Operations, &c. (Ans.) 5157 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Halifax, N.S.*

Address, The, 23 (i).

All-Red Line, Negotiations *re*, Progress, &c. (Ques.) 148 (i).

——— O.Cs., Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 158 (i).

American Tariff, Consideration of, &c. (remarks) 5103 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 240; on M. for 2°, and in Com., 750 (i).

Asiatic Exclusion from B.C., Tel. *re* Denial, &c., 39 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Asiatic Exclusion from B. C., on Ques. of Priv. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 666 (i).

——— Memorandum from Bishop of British Columbia (read) 1394 (i).

See 'Japanese.'

Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 2nd Vol., Inquiry for, 140, 876, 1250 (i).

Bourke, Mr., Retirement: *See* 'Miner, Bill.'

Budget, The, Date of (remarks) 3111 (ii).

B.C. Subsidy, Increase, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 43 (i).

Caledonia and Liverpool Ry. Lines, Construction (M. for cor.*) 1734 (i).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3022, 3028 (ii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Edwards) on M. for 1°, 5891 (iv).

Canadian Medical Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Roche) in Com., 4843 (iii).

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Dubeau) on Senate Amts., 4594 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Aid B. 186 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6739 (iv).

Carleton, Electoral Division, Resignation, &c. (notification) 94 (i).

See 'Comox.'

Cassells, Judge, Investigation *re* Marine, Action of Govt. *re* Report (remarks) 2218, 3003, 3249, 3568 (ii).

See 'Marine Investigation.'

Civil Service Salaries, Classification *re* Schedules, &c., on M. for Sup., 2439 (ii).

——— Inquiry for, 3254 (ii).

Civil Service (increase) Salaries B. 187 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for Com. on Res., 303 (i); in Com. on Res., 411; 962 (i); on M. for 3°, 6829 (iv); on Senate Amts, 7068 (iv).

See 'House of Commons.'

Civil Service Bill, Preparation of Schedules (remarks) 5999 (iv).

Civil Service Commissioners, O. Cs., Deptl. Orders, Regulations, &c. *re* (M. for copies*) 158 (i).

Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1760 (i).

Commissions: *See* 'Secret.'

Committees, Reference of Reports, &c. (remarks) 2024 (ii).

Committees, Standing, Change *re* Rules of Hse., on prop. Res. (Mr. Brodeur) 1320 (i).

——— on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com. 2119 (ii).

Comox-Atlin and Carleton, Writs of Election, Issue of (remarks) 94, 327 (i).

Co-operative Societies, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 2327 (ii).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 569 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Criminal Code (general amts.) B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6392, 6766 (iv).

Dartmouth Post Office, Insufficient Accommodation (remarks) 3255 (ii).

Daylight Saving Bill, on M. to place on Govt. Orders (remarks) 3203 (ii).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 1478 (i).

Debt: *See* 'Net.'

Disallowance of Ontario Act, O.C., Inquiry for, 4882 (iii).

Dog-Fish Reductions Plants, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (M. for ret.*) 158 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3254 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 379 (i).

'Duty of the Hour,' Pamphlet, Distribution of ref., to in Address, 25 (i).

8 Hour Day: *See* Labour.'

Estimates, Inquiry for, 140 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6750 (iv).

External Affairs Dept., B. 90 (Mr. Murphy) on prop. Res., 1999 (i); in Com., 4470 (iii).

Fisheries, Deptl. Rep., Inquiry for, 664 (i).

Fisheries, Jurisdiction with Provinces, Negotiations re (remarks) 2018 (ii).

Fisheries Regulations, *re* International Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6970 (iv).

See 'International,' 'Waterways,' &c.

Fisheries Settlement with Provinces, Rep. of Mr. Bastedo (Ques.) 327 (i).

Fisherman's Union of N. S., Cor. with Govt. (M. for copy*) 2161 (ii).

Fishing Bounties, Delay in sending Forms (remarks) 1187 (i).

——— Forms of Application (remarks) 1022 (i).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ont. Govt. Legislation, on M. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6938 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 6922 (iv).

Foran, Mr. W., Apptmt. of Successor (remarks) 3363 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Announcement *re* Signing (remarks) 140 (i).

——— Approval of Convention by France (Ques.) 148 (i).

——— Delay re Approval by France (Ques.) 166 (i).

——— O. Cs., Cor., between G.B. and France (M. for copies*) 157 (i).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (i).

Franklin Montgomery Gray, Patent Relief B. 132 (Mr. Rankin) in Com., 4884 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Geodetic Survey Bureau, Establishment of, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 3080 (ii).

Gerrymander, Ref. to in Address, 24 (i).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6126 (iv).

Govt. Railways Act (compensation) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 771 (i).

Govt. Tenders, &c., Ques. of Order, Irrelevancy of debate, 280 (i).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crothers) 572 (i).

—— on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) 575 (i).

Gowganda Postal Facilities (remarks) 1325 (i).

G. T. Ry., Major Hill Park, Conveyance of, O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 352 (i).

—— Negotiations *re* (remarks) 13 (i), 6412 (iv).

G.T.P., Amount of Guaranteed Bonds of N.T.R., Western Div., &c. (Ques.) 1398 (i).

G.T.P., Legislation (remarks) 2219 (ii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3583 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5103; in Com., 5189, 5261, 5309; on M. for 3°, 5537; (amt.) 5544; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 106) 5592 (iii).

G.T.P. Loans, Cor., Reps., &c., Particulars, &c. (remarks) 2771 (ii).

—— Details *re* (remarks) 3111 (ii).

G.T.P., Mileage Construction of N.T. Ry., Cost per Mile, &c. (Ques.) 1184 (i).

—— Number of Miles of Western Div. completed, Amounts paid by Govt. (Ques.) 1398 (i).

—— Prairie and Mountain Sections, Detailed Stmnt. of Expenditure (remarks) 3256 (ii).

—— Pusher Grades, Information *re* (remarks) 4883 (iii).

—— Total Expenditure *re* Construction of N.T.R. (Ques) 1181 (i).

Halifax and Southwestern Ry. Subsidy, Negotiations *re* Construction (Ques.) 1561 (i).

Hecate Strait, Statute, &c., Cor. with U.S Govt. (remarks) 4882 (iii).

—— Further Information, 4990 (iii).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6099 (iv).

—— in Com. on Res., 6112 (iv).

Hudson Bay Ry. Surveys, on M. (Mr. Meighen) for Ret., 686 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6169 (iv).

Imperial Defence, Conference *re*, Action of Govt. (remarks) 6942 (iv).
See 'Naval.'

Insurance Act Amt. (B. 97) on M. for 1°, 2125 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6704; in Com., 6816 (iv).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Insurance Legislation, Ref. to in deb. on Address, 31 (i).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2701, 2725 (ii).

—— Board of Management, Apptmt. of (remarks) 4803 (iii).

—— Branch Lines, Printing of (remarks) 664 (i).

—— Employees Settlement *re* Conciliation Act (remarks) 6686 (iv).

—— Freight Clerks, Investigation *re* Labour Disputes, Rep. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3258 (ii).

—— I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Employees, Number for each month, 1908 (Ques.) 1173 (i).

—— I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Employees, Salaries, &c., for 1908 (Ques.) 243 (i).

—— Proposal *re* Sale or Leasing, &c. (Ques.) 164 (i).
See 'Govt. Rys.'

International Fisheries Commission, Names, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 1073 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'

International Waterways Commission, on M. (Mr. Lancaster) to Com. of Sup., 6644 (iv).
See 'Waterways.'

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3863 (ii)

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 3852

Japanese Immigration, Ques. of Priv. *re* Telegram to Victoria 'Colonist,' 290 (i).
See 'Asiatic.'

Japanese Treaty with G. B., Date of Effect, Termination, &c. (Ques.) 2152 (ii).

Judges of District and County Courts B. 193 Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6769 (iv).

Kingston Military Buildings, on Ques. of Order, 2497 (ii).

Labour Dept., B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), on prop. Res., 5350 (iii); in Com., 6717 (iv).

Labour Hours for Working Men, on M. (Mr. Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5939 (iv).

Latchford Dam, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3321 (ii).

Level Crossing Accidents, on Inquiry for, Ret., 1117 (i).

—— Orders of Ry Com. of Privy Council, Inquiry for, 549 (i).
See 'Ry. Act,' &c.

Lobster License, Refusal to W. C. Henley, Cor., &c., Inquiry for, 4803 (iii).

Mail delivered in Towns, &c., Rural Free Delivery, &c. (M. for ret.*) 157 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension (remarks) 2240 (ii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Delay in Printing Evidence, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 632 (i).

—— Inquiry for, 402, 549 (i).

—— Inquiry for Report, 6 (i).

See 'Cassells,' 'Supply—Marine.'

Marine Dept. Number of Employees in Halifax County (Ques.) 667 (i).

—— Remarks, 875 (i).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1830 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).

Mission River Piers, Advertisement for Tenders, &c. (remarks) 6919 (iv).

Naturalization Act Amt. Bill, (remarks) 971 (i).

Natural Resources of Canada, Conservation of, Apptmt. of Sel. Com. (M.) 355 (i).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 159 (Mr. Fisher) on prop. Res., 6379 (iv); on M. for 1°, 4989 (iii).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3513 (ii).

See 'Imperial.'

N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, on M. (Mr. Foster) to lay on Table, 5624 (iii).

—— on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5646; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 5681 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Calvert) *re* Vote, 6414 (iv).

Net Debt of Canada, Present Amount, Increase, &c. (Ques.) 147 (i).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3121, 3173 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1043 (i); in Com., 4473 (iii); in Com., 5974 (iv.) on M. for 3°, 6001 (iv).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6315 (iv).

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Transfer to Holland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).

—— (remarks) 5999 (iv).

Private Bills, Extension of Hour of considering, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—(remarks) 5774 (iii).

Public Accounts Com. Calling of Meetings, &c. (remarks) 663, 1188 (i).

—— 12th Rep., on M. to conc., 6559 (iv).

Pulpwood Papers, Duties, &c., Negotiations with U.S. (remarks) 2384 (ii).

Pusher Grades on I.C.R., &c., Ref. to in Com. on G.T.P. Bill, 5290 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, Rebuilding, Estimated Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 165 (i).

Ry. Act (electric power) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1118 (i).

—— (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 3°, 523 (i).

—— (level crossings, &c.) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2399 (ii); in Com., 6201, 6294; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 6307 (iv).

Ry. Capitalization of Stock, Regulations by Ry. Commissioners (remarks) 1187 (i).

Ry. Level Crossings, Accident near Kingston (remarks) 255 (i).

Railway Level Crossings, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1205 (i).

Railway Subsidies Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 5628 (iii).

Restaurant Committee, on M. to adopt 2nd Rep. of Com., 401 (i).

Revenue for December, Details of 'Miscellaneous' (Ques.) 149 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, System, &c. (Ques.) 148 (i).

Scotch Farmers, Report of Visit to Canada (remarks) 6060 (iv).

Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1123 (i).

Sessions of Parlt., Length of, &c. (remarks) on Address, 27 (i).

Sissiboo River Bridge, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup., 6843 (iv).

Smith, John Denison, Relief (B. 157) in Com. 6070 (iv).

Speaker, Election of, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4 (i).

Standing Orders Com., on M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to conc. in 1st Rep., 2019 (ii).

Strathcona, Lord, Gift to Dom. *re* drilling of school children (remarks) 3201 (ii).

Supply—One-fourth of Estimates (remarks) 3936 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 695; (census, &c.) 698; (Year-book) 705 (i).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s office (extra clerks 3435 (ii); Customs (contingencies) 607; Indian Affairs (salaries) 971; Post office (salaries) 613; Public Works (salaries) 614 (i).

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 705 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (travelling expenses) 608 (i).

Dom. Lands (surveys) 3464 (ii).

Fisheries (International Fisheries commission) 3443; Miscellaneous (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 3455 (ii).

Indians—Nova Scotia (medical relief) 3462 (ii)

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians, Que. (medical relief) 3461 (ii)
Legislation (members indemnity), 7067 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) 6650; (contingent expenses) 6655; (P.E.I., C.B. and Nfld.) 6654; (St. John, Halifax and Yarmouth) 6654 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries (investigation) 3450 (ii).
Militia (ordnance) 2308 (ii); (supplies) 6661 (iv); (warlike stores) 2317 (ii).
Mines (geological specimens) 7063 (iv).
Miscellaneous (seed grain) 3466 (ii); unprovided items) 3467 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 6670; (patrol boats) 6682; (tidal surveys) 6679; (wrecking plant) 6680 (iv).
Pensions (Mrs. Wilmot) 884 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (R. M. College) 1384, 1512 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. and Que. (Batiscan) 3276; (Bonaventure) 3277; (Montreal river) 2976 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 2931 (ii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese administration) 6656; (commercial agencies) 6656 (iv).

Tenders: *See* "Govt."
Thessalon and Northern Railway Co's B. 104 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 6064 (iv).
Treaties between U. S. and G. B., O.Cs., Regulations, &c (M. for copies*) 1081 (i).
Trent Canal, Damages in Peterborough County, Inquiry for statement, 5777 (iii).
Wake, John Relief (B. 178) in M. for 2°, 6081 (iv).
Water Carriage of Goods B. 105, on M. for 2°, 6774 (iv).
Water Carriage of Goods Bill, (remarks) 6847 (iv).
Water Powers, Leases on Canals, Records, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2038.
Waterways Treaty, Announcement *re* Acceptance (remarks) 2494 (ii).
—— Acceptance of U.S. Senate Amts. (remarks), 4471 (iii).
—— Date of Signing, Date of Receipts, &c., (Ques.) 1074 (i).
—— Delay in Placing before Canadian Parlt. (remarks) 174 (i).
—— Despatch from Sec. of State for Colonies (remarks) on M. for Sup., 633 (i).
—— Discussion by Mr. Gibbons (remarks) 1563 (i).
—— N. B. Fisheries, Regulations *re* (remarks) 1248 (i).
—— O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1087 (i).
—— Publication by Newspapers (remarks) 1187 (i).
—— Inquiry for 7, 158, 292, 402, (i), 2019 *See* 'International.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Ways and Means (sugar) in Com., 5100 (iii).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2135 (ii).
Yukon Ordinances (beer tax) on prop. res (Mr. Oliver) 5892 (iv).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C. *Algoma, West.*

Algoma Rifles, 97th Reg., Removal from Saulte Ste. Marie to Sudbury, &c. (Que.) 1411 (i)
Algoma Steel Co., Contracts with N.T.R. *re* Rails, &c. (Ques.) 336 (i).
Caughnawaga Indian Reserve, Grants to Churches (Ques.) 1410 (i).
Caughnawaga—Iroquois Indian Reserve, Returns of Fine for Stealing, &c. (Ques.) 1410 (i)
See 'Jacobs.'
Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1744 (i).
Experimental Farms, Location, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1946 (i).
Farm and Garden Produce, Quantity imported into Sault Ste. Marie, &c. (Ques.) 339 (i).
Fish Hatchery, Establishment at Sault Ste. Marie, &c. (Ques.) 337 (i).
Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4424 (iii).
Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 209 (i).
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3883 (ii).
Jacobs, F. Macdonald, Complaints *re* Caughnawaga Fines and Conviction (M. for cor.*) 1420 (i)
Lighthouse Keepers, Lake Huron, Increases to (Ques.) 336 (i).
Loggie, W. S. Co., Payments to for 1906-7-8 by Govt., Dates, &c. (Ques.) 479, 668 (i).
Marine Inquiry: *See* 'Investigations'
Michipicoten River Wharf, Expenditure, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 338 (i).
National Art Gallery, Expenditure *re* Pictures, &c. (Ques.) 6087 (iv).
Natural Resources, Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6372 (iv).
Nipigon River Dredging, Expenditure for 1908 (Ques.) 3653 (ii), 4223 (iii).
—— Estimated Quantity, &c., (Ques.) 5635 (iii).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1026 (i); in Com., 4502, 5570 (iii).
Port Arthur Harbour Dredging, Mission River, &c., Contractors, Inspectors, &c. (Ques.) 5775 (iii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Railway Mail Clerks, Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 4223 (iii).

Red River Expedition, Land Grants to Officers, &c. (Ques.) 3990 (ii).

St. Joseph's Island Wharfs, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 337 (i).

St. Nicholas Island Indian Reserve, Disposal of by Govt. (Ques.) 1410 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Channels, Contracts *re* Buoys, Competition, &c. (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Sea Gull Wharf, Amounts expended, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 338 (i).

Sec. of State, Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor, &c. (Ques.) 185 (i).

Steel Importations, from March 31, 1908, to Jan. 31, 1909 (M. for ret.) 355 (i).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3963 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1909; (dredging) 1909 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating) 1615; Ont. (Glencoe) 1367; (Leamington) 1386; Ottawa (telephones) 1606 (i); 3231; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Little River) 3234; Que. (Doucet's Landing) 2543 (ii).

Tenby Bay Wharf Warehouse, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Voters' Lists, Electoral District of Thunder Bay, &c., Cost, &c. (Ques.) 340 (i).

Waterways Treaty, Amendment of U. S. Senate, Ratification by Govt. (Ques.) 4288 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Magrath) to Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).

——— Conditional Ratification (remarks) 2335 (ii).

——— Ratification of by U.S., &c., on M. for Sup., 1353 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*

Carillon Dam Water Power, Lease of, &c. (Ques.) 1557 (i).

Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 2120; in Com., 3404, 3472, 3605 (ii).

Census and Statistic Bulletins, French Translation, &c. (Ques.) 1404 (i).

Census Vote for 1910, Intention of Govt., &c. (Ques.) 531 (i).

Debates, Official, Cost of Printing (Ques.) 1720 (i).

——— French Translation Staff, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1722 (i).

Deslisle River Fishway, Reps., Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1733 (i).

Dom. Lands Act, French Translation, &c. (Ques.) 532 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G.—*Con.*

French Translators, Number, Amount of Work (M. for ret.*) 1733 (i).

Quebec Bridge Report, French Translation (Ques.) 1722 (i).

St. Anne de Bellevue Locks, Pet. *re* Dredging (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

St. Justine Mail Delivery, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Number of Employees. Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 869 (i).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H., *Selkirk.*

Budget, The, 5044 (iii).

'Canada Posten' Winnipeg, Amounts received from Govt. (M. for ret.*) 3992 (ii).

C.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 3155 (ii).

C.P.R. Gimili Branch Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2965 (ii).

Colclaugh, F. W., Cor., Pets., &c., re Fishery Operations with Commercial Companies (M. for copies*) 1191 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2674, 3202, 3655 (ii).

Dredge on Lake Winnipeg, Expense *re* moving Str. 'Mikado' from Sandbar, &c. (Ques.) 869 (i).

Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William, Govt. Operation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 4024 (ii).

Fisheries of Man., Cor. with J. H. Davies. Cor., Pets, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1190 (i).

Fishing Leases on Nelson, &c., Rivers, Great Slave Lake, &c., Cancellation of (Ques.) 340 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 354 (i).

Fish caught in Summer, Incomplete Return (remarks) 2128 (ii).
See 'Whitefish.'

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1662 (i).

Gimli, Hiransa, &c., Light, Placing of (Ques.) 1403 (i).

Govt. Employees, Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6876 (iv).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4433 (iii), 5908 (iii).

G.T.P. Winnipeg Terminals, Cor. between Rothwell & Co. and Govt. *re* Purchase from Matthews & Kerns (M. for copies*) 1081 (i).

Halfbreeds living in U. S., Allotment of Scrip, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1735 (i).

Hazel Ridge Post Office, Application *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Homesteads west of Lake Winnipeg, Rep. *re* Unfitness for Settlement (Ques.) 3251 (i).

Icelander River Dredging, Total Cost (Ques.) 347 (i).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Lake Winnipeg White Fishing, Extension of Close Season, &c. (Ques.) 340 (i).

Logberg Printing Co., Payments to by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 1191 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2674, 3255, 3938 (ii).

Manitoba Fisheries, Apptmt. of Icelander *re* Commission (remarks) 3255 (ii).

——— Depletion by American Fishermen, on M. for Sup., 6475, 6942 (iv).

Otonabee River Dredging, Amounts paid, Quantity done, &c. (Ques.) 3044 (ii), 4221 (iii).

Political Partizanship: *See* 'Govt. Employees.'

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4253 (iii).

Red River Settlers, Deputation *re* Land Grants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6278 (iv).

St. Andrew's Lock, Bridge Approaches (Ques.) 2159 (ii).

——— Completion of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3000 (ii).

——— Completion of (remarks) in Com. of (Ques.) 531 (i).

St. Peters Indian Reserve, Instructions of Mr. Vaughan, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 354 (i).

——— Patents *re* Surrender (M. for ret*) 1191 (i).

——— Treaty Cor., Instructions, &c. (M. for copies*) 1421 (i).

——— Surrender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1017, 1139 (i).

——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 2128 (ii).

Selkirk Post Office, Estimated Cost, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 347, 530 (i).

Snag Boat at Selkirk, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 474 (i).

Steamers on Lake Winnipeg for Indian Dept., Lease, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1403 (i).

Sturgeon Breeding in Lac du Bonnet, Sale of Fish, &c. (Ques.) 531 (i).

SUPPLY —

Indians, B. C. (destitute indians) 1139; Generally (general expenses) 1017; Man. (seeds, &c.) 1005 (i).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 893, 907; St. Vincent de Paul (supplies) 914; Stony Mountain (supplies) 918 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 1543; Man. (Winnipeg P.O.) 1550; Ont. (Kingston R.M.C.) 1508; Ottawa (peat testing) 1501 (i).

Public Works—Harbour and Rivers— Man. (Lac du Bonnet) 2116, 2985; Man. (St. Andrews rapids) 2097; Man. (Winnipeg Beach) 2986 (ii).

Railways—N.T.R. (surveys, &c.) 6985 (iv).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1316, &c., Applications, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 2162 (ii).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Ward, Fleetwood Howard, Relief (B. 182) 1°*, 5997 (iv).

Whitefish, Sturgeon, Winter and Summer caught, Quantity, Value exported, &c. (M. for ret.*) 826 (i).

See 'Fish.'

Winnipeg Beach Pier, Removal of Obstruction in Manitou Rapids, &c. (Ques.) 335 (i).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2133 (ii).

Winnipeg P. O. and Ry. Station Mail Contract, Tenders, Changes, &c. (Ques.) 869 (i).

BRISTOL, Mr. E., *Center Toronto.*

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to M. for 3°, 5600 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Res., 6697 (iv).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp., B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5420 (iii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6232 (iv).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*

Cold Storage Instalment (remarks) on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2662 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Location, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1949 (i).

Geodetic Survey Bureau, Establishment of, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 3079 (ii).

I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2741 (ii).

Natural Resources Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6367 (iv).

Nation River Drainage, Cor. O. Cs., &c. (M. for ret.) 686 (i).

——— Rep. of Engineer *re* (Ques.) 1178 (i).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp., B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1050 (i).

Railway Level Crossings, Prevention of Accidents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1212 (i).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking) 456 (i).

Civil Govt—Customs (Board of Customs) 588 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 1598; Man. (Dauphin) 1544 (i).

Telephone Rates in Canada, Control of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1769 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Rouville.*

Address, The, 63 (i).

Aids to Navigation on N. S. Coast, Applications *re*, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 5640 (iii).

'Anticosti' Str., Amount of Work done, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 671 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Banff Fish Hatchery, Establishment of, Representations *re* (Ans.) 871 (i).

Banfield Creek Lifeboat, Cost, Wreck, &c. (Ans.) 1730 (i).

Cable between Vancouver and Mainland, Application re (Ans.) 1073 (i).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy (B. 146) in Com. on Res., 4437 (iii).
See 'France.'

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Taylor) 5459 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 131 (1° m., 4124; in Com., 5218 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Edwards) on M. for 1°, 5891 (iv).

Canadian Coasting Trade, Number of British and Canadians (Ans.) 5633 (iii).

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Dubeau) on Senate Amts., 4165 (iii).

Cassells, Judge: *See* 'Marine,' &c.

Colclough, F. W., on Inquiry for Ret., 3202, 3656 (ii).

Committees, Special, Ref. to of Reports of Depts., &c. (remarks) 2025 (ii).

Committees, Standing, Prop. Res. (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Rules of the Hse., 1319 (i).

Desjardins, Capt., Emplymt. by Marine Dept., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4696 (iii).

Dixon's Entrance, Prince Rupert, Rep. from Imp. Govt. *re* (Ans.) 2590 (ii).

Dogfish Reduction Plant, on Inquiry for Ret., 3254 (ii).

East Point Lighthouse Keeper, Resignation of L. McDonald, Apptmt. of Successor, &c. (Ans.) 3194 (ii).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance by Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 349 (i).

Fagin, Thos., Emplymt by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 2154 (ii).

Falconer, Mr. K., Total Payments *re* Marine Bookkeeping, &c. (Ans.) 1730 (i).

Fish Hatchery, Establishment at Sault Ste Marie, &c. (Ans.) 337 (i).

Fish Hatchery at Lake Winnipegosis, Amt. expended, Qualifications of Inspector, &c. (Ans.) 820 (i).

Fish Hatcheries, Number in Canada, &c. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

Fish Island, Lighthouse Keeper, Appmt. of (Ans.) 6786 (iv).

Fishing Bounty Forms, Application for (remarks) 1022, 1249 (i).

Fishing in Lake Winnipegosis, Pet. *re* Closing in Summer (Ans.) 2381 (ii).

Fishing Leases in N. W., Cancellation of (Ans.) 341 (i).

Fishing Seasons, Leases, &c. (Ans.) 169 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Fishing Seine Licenses, Number on Pacific Coast (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

Fishing Weirs in Passamaquoddy Bay, Investigation *re* Ownership (Ans.) 6088 (iv).

Fisheries in B.C., Depletion of, &c., on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 6504, 6519 (iv).

Fisheries Cruiser for Pacific Coast, Tenders *re*, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 2156 (ii).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Select Com., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 514 (i).

Fisheries Officers at Port Joli, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 4697 (iii).

Fisheries Regulations *re* International Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iv).

——— Action of Ont. Govt. (remarks) 6519 (iv).
See 'Waterways.'

Fisheries Report, on Inquiry for, 664 (i).

Fisheries Settlement with Provs., Rep. of Mr. Bastedo (Ans.) 328 (i).

Fishery Commission Regulations, Adoption of (remarks) 6412 (iv).

Fishery Cruisers, Number owned by Govt. (Ans.) 2769 (ii).

Fishery Wardens in Victoria County, N.S., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 5637 (iii).

Fishery Inspector for Cape Breton Island, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 5632 (iii).

France and Canada SS. Subsidy (B. 146) in Com., 5219 (iii).
See 'Canada, &c.'

Gimli, Hiransa, &c., Placing of Lights (Ans.) 1403 (i).

Glace Bay Range Lightkeeper, Salary, Applications, &c. (Ans.) 5636 (iii).

Government Harbours and Piers Act Amt. (B. 89) 1° m., 1972 (i); in Com., 4414 (iii), 5896, 6123 (iv).

Govt. Ships purchased from G.B., since 1896, Expenditure, &c., *re* Repairs (Ans.) 3196

Honora Dock, Yearly Receipts (Ans.) 7072 (iv).

Ice Breaker for Northumberland Straits, Contractor's Name, Price, &c. (Ans.) 674 (i).

Ice-breaking Steamers, Superannuation of Officers, Crews, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 1473 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6176 (iv).

Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 846 (i).

Investigations in Depts., by Mr. Justice Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3723 (ii).
See 'Marine.'

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Johnston, Capt., Repayments of Money *re* Hestia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).

Lac du Bonnet, Opening of for Summer Fishing (Ans.) 1728 (i).

Lake Ontario Fishing Industry, Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 381 (i).

Lake Winnipeg White Fishing, Extension of Close Season (Ans.) 340 (i).

LeBlanc, O. J., Dismissal as Fishery Overseer, Complaints, Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 2596 (ii).

Lighthouse Board, Reorganization of (Ans.) 1974 (i).

Lighthouse Keepers, Lake Huron, Increase of Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 337 (i).

Lobster Fisheries, Violation of Act (remarks) 3705 (ii).

Lobster Licenses in P.E.I., Number, Pets., &c. (Ans.) 1076 (i).

Lobster License refused to W. C. Henley, Cor. *re* (remarks) 4803 (iii).

Lobster Packing Licenses granted in N.S. for 1908, Names and Addresses (Ans.) 328 (i).

Lobster Packers and Difficulties with Fishermen, &c. (remarks) 6062 (iv).

Loggie, W. S. Co., Payments to by Govt. for 1906-7-8, Dates, &c. (Ans.) 480 (i).

McPhaiden, Capt. D., Resignation *re* Position (Ans.) 1973 (i).

Marconi Stations between Montreal and Quebec, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 2762 (ii).

Margaree Island Lighthouse, Expenditure *re* Road (Ans.) 6090 (iv).

Marine Agent, Georgetown, P.E.I., Name, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 3194 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 738 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Book-Keeping, Results of change in Methods (Ans.) 1919 (i).

Marine Employees, Number in Halifax County (Ans.) 667 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Answer, 875 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, Judge Cassel's Rep. (presented) 14 (i).

See 'Investigations,' &c., 'Patronage,' "Ques. of Priv." "Supply-Marine," &c.

Marine and Fisheries, Number of Employees, (Ans.) 1080 (i).

Marine Supplies purchased since Investigation, Names (Ans.) 3473 (ii).

——— Purchase of by Tender (Ans.) 168, 1974 (i).

Meteorological Stations in Ont., Number erected in 1908, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3195 (ii).

——— Situations, &c. (Ans.) 3985 (ii).

"Montcalm," Icebreaker, Number of Crew, &c. (Ans.) 167 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

'Montcalm,' Name of Engineer *re* Investigations, &c. (Ans.) 548 (i).

——— Res. of Chamber of Commerce, Quebec, &c. (Ans.) 328 (i).

Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 180 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 6629 (iv).

Montreal as a Free Port, (remarks) 4802 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissionners Act Amt. (B. 154) 1° m., 4798; in Com., 5234 (iii); 6559 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 192 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6743 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal of Employees (Ans.) 874 (i).

——— Promises re Wharfage Dues, &c. (Ans.) 874 (i).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3552 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection (B. 152) 1° m., 4797; in Com., 5225 (iii); 3° m., 6128 (iv).

Niagara Ice Jam, Assistance by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 4703 (iii).

Northwest Fish Company, Leases, &c. (remarks) 6777 (iv).

Oshawa Port, Appointment of Officers by Marine Dept., &c. (Ans.) 3201 (ii).

Patronage List, Abolition of, Comn. to Judge Cassels, (remarks) 876 (i).

Pictou Fishery Overseers, Prosecutions *re* Salmon illegal Fishing (Ans.) 5633 (iii).

Pilotage Rates, Scale of Charges for B. C. (Ans.) 3476 (ii).

Plaster Mines Lighthouse, Dismissal of Hector McRae (Ans.) 6784 (iv).

P. E. I. Winter Communication with the Mainland, on M. (Mr. Warburton) 6466 (iv).

Public Works by Marine Dept., Tenders *re* (Ans.) 2766 (ii).

Ques. of Priv. *re* Quotations from Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (Mr. Taylor) 4041 (iii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 375 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 2674 (ii).

Robertson, Thos., Suspension by Pilotage Board, B.C. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6861 (iv).

St. Joseph's Hospital, B.C., Arrangements for Sick Mariners (Ans.) 3197 (ii).

St. Lawrence Channel, Amount expended, Continuation of Work (Ans.) 2150 (ii).

Sault Ste Marie Channels, Contracts *re* Buoys, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).

Shanghaiing in Vancouver, Investigation, Rep., &c. (Ans.) 3481 (ii).

Soulanges Island, Change of Name (Ans.) 2757 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Sorel Ship Yards, Repairs of Boats owned by Marine Officials, &c. (Ans.) 4703 (iii).

'Stanley' and 'Minto' Strs., Names and Residences of Officers (Ans.) 675 (i).

——— Officers off duty from 12th to 17th Feb., 1909 (Ans.) 1976 (i).

Statutes, French Translation, &c. (remarks) 2022 (ii).

Stone, Broken and Rough, Tenders, Contracts, &c., from Marine Dept. (Ans.) 2593 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 3702; (McLeod, Mr. O. L.) 3436 (ii); (salaries) 380 (i), 3687 (ii).

Fisheries (bait freezers) 6950 (iv); (biological stations) 3438 (ii), 6953; (breeding establishments) 6946; (commissions) 6957; (contingencies) 6981 (iv); Miscellaneous (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 3450 (ii); (customs licenses) 6958; (dog fish plant) 6950; (fish curing) 6952 (iv); (international commission) 3439, 3688 (ii), 6960; (oyster culture) 6949; (protection cruiser) 6947; (transportation) 6956; (Young, Mr. W. S., compensation) 6982 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 6889; (buoy steamer) 6910; (Clarke, Mrs. A. G., compensation) 6981; (construction) 6904; (ice breaking) 6915; (lightkeepers' salaries) 6981 (iv); (Lime kiln crossing) 3438 (ii); (maintenance) 6902; (meteorological service, L. F. Gorman) 6982 (iv); (pilot pensions) 3437 (ii); (property in St. John) 6915; (salaries) 6889; (West coast trail) 6981 (iv).

Marine—Dredging (plant, &c.), 6885 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (hydrographic surveys) 6916 (iv); (investigation) 3450 (ii); (meteorological service) 6916 (iv).

Marine Hospitals (sick seaman) 3438 (ii); 6946 (iv).

Marine—Public Works (piers on St. Lawrence) 6888; (St. Lawrence ship canal) 6877; (Sorel ship yard) 6885 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 6670 (iv); (ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits) 3437 (ii), 6673 (iv); (life saving rewards) 6675; (naval militia) 6683; (obstructions, removal, &c.) 6679; (patrol boats) 6682; (wrecks, investigations) 6679; (wrecking plant) 6680 (iv).

Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation, &c.) 2055 (ii).

Tadousac and Riviere du Loup Winter Navigation (Ans.) 344 (i).

Telephone Stations between Quebec and Montreal re Navigation (Ans.) 2594 (ii).

Warships discarded by G. B., Offer to Can. for Fisheries Protection (Ans.) 2379 (ii).

Waterways Treaty, International N. B. Fisheries, Par. in St. John 'Globe' (remarks) 1244 (i).

See 'Fisheries.'

Wharfs Bill: *See* 'Govt. Harbours,' &c.

Whitefish Spawn for Lake Winnipegosis, Contract *re* (Ans.) 1403 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1402 (i).

BUREAU Hon. J. (Solicitor General), *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Bourke, Mr., Retirement: *See* 'Miner, Bill.'

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 6389 (iv)

Extradition Act Amt. B 149 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5243 (iii).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).

Immigration to U. S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 853 (i).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 925 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1833 (i).

Political Weekly Letter, Franking and Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 1921 (i).

St. Maurice and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 176 (Mr. Blondin) on M. for 2°, 6084 (iv).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Manufacture of Church Pews (remarks) in Com of Sup., 900 (i).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries—B.C. (retirements) 924; (Dorchester electric lighting plant) 884 (supplies) 916; Generally (salaries) 886; Kingston (supplies) 886; St. Vincent de Paul (supplies) 914; Stony Mountain (supplies) 918 (i).

BURRELL, Mr. M., *Yale-Cariboo.*

Address, The, 72 (i).

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4449 (ii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 767 (i).

Bourke, Mr., Retirement: *See* 'Miner, Bill'

Cariboo Mail Service, Payments *re* (Ques.) 1731 (i).

———(remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3424 (ii).

Civil Services Salaries, in Com. on Res., 963 (i).

Comox-Atlin Election, Issue of Writ for 11th Parlt., Date of Nomination, Instructions to Returning Officer, &c. (Ques.) 682 (i).

——— Remarks, 825 (i).

Deferred Elections, Notice of Motion, 2815; (prop. res.) 2818; Amt. neg. (Y. 69; N. 115) 2876 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1932 (i).

Fishery Regulation, &c., on M. (Mr. Taylor) 6528 (iv).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1672 (i).

Fruit Imports to B.C. from U.S., Quantities, Values, &c. (Ques.) 3250 (ii).

BURRELL, Mr. M.—*Con.*

Fruit Marks Act, Regulations *re* Inspection on M. for Sup., 3364 (ii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5173; in Com., 5327 (iii).

Greenwood and Grand Forks Post Office Sites, Options *re* (Ques.) 814 (i).

Kelly-Douglas Contracts: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Yukon,' &c.

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 96) 1°*, 2120 (ii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1839 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4482 (iii).

Quesnel Telegraph Station Supplies, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 1919 (i).

Railway Commission, Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr Staples) 2663 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking) 456 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 730 (i); (experimental farms) 5949 (iv); (tobacco) 5881 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 655 (i).

Post Office (miscellaneous) 1716 (i); (rural mails) 3424 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Vernon) 2075 (ii); Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 1512 1532; Que. (Joliette) 1298 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C (Okanagan) 6544; (Quesnelle, &c.) 6544 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraphs—B. C. (Kamloops) 3348 (ii).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 3352 (ii).

Telephone Rates in Canada, Control of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1807 (i).

CALVERT, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*

N.B. Central Ry. Commission, Vote *re*, Ques. of Priv., 6412 (iv).

Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 626 (i); in Com., 2063 (ii).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G., *Dauphin.*

Address, The, 132 (i).

Budget, The, 4866 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 4956 (iii).

Burrows, T. A., Timber Permit *re* sections in twps. 30 and 31 (Ques.) 2592 (ii).

C.P.R. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 3156 (ii).

File Hill Indian Agency, Resignation of Mr. Godfrey, Charges against Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 3045 (ii).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Fish Hatchery, Lake Winnipegosis, Amount expended, Qualifications of Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 820 (i).

Fishing in Lake Winnipegosis, Pet. *re* Summer closing (Ques.) 2381 (ii).

Irrigation Propositions for Land by Percy Aylwin, &c. (Ques.) 2380 (ii).

Lac du Bonnet, Opening for Summer Fishing (Ques.) 1728 (i).

Lake Manitoba, Rep. *re* Lowering of Waters, Pet. from Settlers, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries Question, Notice of Discussion, 3802 (ii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1882 (i).

Mossy River Dredging, Expenditure of Appropriation, Delays, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).

Northwest Fish Co., Leases, &c. (remarks) 6776 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of, Bribing Deptl. Officials, &c., 6777 (iv).

Railway Commission, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2643 (ii).

Squatters Claims on Dauphin Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6287 (iv).

——— Burning of Buildings, &c. (Ques.) 3045 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 725 (i).

Dom. Lands (timber protection) 6288 (iv)

Legislation (members indemnity) 7066 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (investigation) 3450 (ii).

Militia (salaries) 2298 (ii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 3465 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 2997 (ii).

Timber Berth, No. 1122, Original Applications, Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 353 (i).

Whitefish Spawn for Lake Winnipegosis, Contract *re* (Ques.) 1403 (i).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2130 (ii).

Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1402 (i).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*

Canadian, Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1690 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6766 (iv).

Extradition Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5241 (iii).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).

Franklin Montgomery Gray Patent Relief B. 132 (Mr. Rankin) in Com., 4889 (iii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 5579 (iii).

Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4359 (iii).

N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., (remarks) 5657 (iii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5393 (iii). 5975, on M. for 3°, 6004 (iv).

Royal Victoria Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 177), M. to place on order paper for 2°, 6082 (iv).

Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1127 (i).

Smith, John Denison Relief B. 157 (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com., 6071 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John survey) 1642 (i).

Telephone Rates in Canada, Control of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1794 (M.) to adj. debate, 1810, agreed to (Y. 101; N. 47) 1811 (i).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*

Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co's (B. 43) 1°*, 626 (i); in Com., 2067 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co's. (B. 81) 1°*, 1648 (i); in Com., 3844, 3942 (ii); on Senate Amts., 5486 (iii); 6073 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. A. W., *Inverness.*

Budget, The, 5085 (iii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *East Huron.*

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4441 (iii).

C.P.R. Additional Stock, Distribution of, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 427 (i).

East Huron Public Works, Expenditure during 20 years (Ques.) 3477 (i).

Foot and Mouth Disease, States quarantined, Prevention, &c. (M. for ret.*) 684 (i).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 4094 (iii).

Immigration Agents, Bonus Commissions, &c. (Ques.) 1407 (i).

Lands in Man., and N.W., Number of Acres undisposed of (Ques.) 2374 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3947 (ii).

Peterborough West, Expenditure re Public Works for twenty years (Ques.) 4636 (iii).

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 746 (i).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 2533 (ii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*

Public Health Bureau, Establishment of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1091 (i).

Public Works in Middlesex, Expenditures for twenty years (Ques.) 4228 (iii).

Public Works in South Wellington, Expenditure for last 20 years (Ques.) 3655 (ii).

Savings Bank Deposits, Increase of Interest (Ques.) 1396 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals Welland (repairs) 2035 (ii).

Welland County, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 3990 (ii).

Wingham Post Office Clock (Ques.) 4637 (iii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. Wm., *Antigonish.*

I.C.R. Branch Lines Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2215 (ii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 930, 949 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2347 (ii).

CLARE, Mr. G. A., *South Waterloo.*

I.C.R. Machinery at Moncton Shops, Purchase of &c. (M. for ret.*) 1191 (i).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *South Essex.*

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 56) 1°*, 868; 2° m., 1147 (i); in Com., 2571, 3004 (ii), 5481 (iii), 5995, 6006, 6028 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. Henderson) to refer back to Special Com., 5434 (iii).

——— on Order for Com., 4164 (iii).

——— (M.) to disch. Order, 4472 (iii).

Canadian Medical Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Roche) in Com., 4844 (iii).

Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of (M. for cor. &c.) 1735 (i).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1955 (i).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ontario Legislation, on M. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6939 (iv).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) on Sen. Amts., 6074 (iv).

Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. Molloy) in Com., 5483 (iii).

——— Objections, &c., 5483 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act, Applications *re* Exemptions, Instructions to Carriers, &c. (Ques.) 156 (i).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5358 (iii).

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 743 (i).

Public Accounts Com., (M.) to ref. Pub. Accounts, Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 1479 (i).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H.—*Con.*

Public Accounts Com., 11th, 12th and 14th. Reps. (M.) to conc., 6559 (iv).

Ry. Act (fires) Amt. (B. 7) 1° m., 94; 2° m., 375 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6229 (iv).

Standing Orders Com., 1st Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 2019 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Markham) 1388 (i).

Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Ry. Co.'s (B. 120) 3802 (ii).

CLARK, Mr. M., *Red Deer.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act. Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 769 (i).

Budget, The, 4687, 4703 (iii).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1677 (i).

Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4381 (iii).

—— Ques. of Order, 4395 (iii).

Par. in Toronto 'World' *re* Mr. Foster, Ques. of Priv., 3941 (ii).

Railway Commission, Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer from N.W., on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2641; (amt.) 2659, agreed to (Y. 94; N. 54) 2669 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c., (live stock industry) 5861 (iii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7027 (iv).

CONGDON, Mr. F. T., *Yukon.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4469 (iii).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2838 (ii).

External Affairs Dept. B. 90 (Mr. Murphy) in Com., 4470 (iii).

Extradition Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 5246 (iii).

Mines and Minerals (M.) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6919 (iv).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3523 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6221 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 6900 (iv); N.W.M.P. (force) 3664 (ii); Yukon Govt. (administration) 6273 (iv).

Yukon Ordinances (beer tax) on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 5893 (iv).

Yukon Ordinances (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7079 (iv).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4465 (iii).

Allegash River, Diversion of Waters, on M. (Mr. Michaud) for Reps., 3086 (ii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. Edwards) on M. for 1°, 5891 (iv).

Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1746 (i).

Election Act (ry. employees) Amt. (B. 112) 1° m., 3468 (ii).

G. T. P. Lake Superior Branch Subsidy B. 30 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 667, 1025 (i).

G.T.P. Loan, B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3622 (ii); Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 5544 (iii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 3850 (ii).

London and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3847, 3983 (ii).

Mayes Affidavit, on Reading of Original, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4271 (iii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 150) 1°m., 4690 (iii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 3° (amt.) 6128 (iv).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 34) 1°*, 465; 2°m., 1026 (i); in Com., 4472, 4485, 5296, 5352, 5360, 5559 (iii), 5958; 3° m., 6000; agreed to (Y. 76; N. 39) 6005 (iv).

—— Ques. of Order, 4522 (iii).

Prudential Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 91) in Com., 5484 (iii).

Ques. of Privilege, *re* 'Special Trains,' 4290 (iii).

Ry. Act (cattle-guards) Amt. (B. 99) 1°m., 2127 (ii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2388 (ii).

Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1131 (i).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 78) 1°*, 1479 (i); in Com., 3845, 3963 (ii).

Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 5484, 5574 (iii), 6062 (iv).

Water Powers leased on Canals, Records, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2142 (ii).

COWAN, Mr. G. H., *Vancouver City.*

Address, The, 57 (i).

Bank of Vancouver (B. 52) 1°*, 738 (i); in Com., 2147 (ii).

COWAN, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

British Columbia Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 55) 1°*, 868; 2°m, 1147 (i).

Budget, The, 4751; (personal explanation) 4751 (iii).

Central Park, B.C., Mail Delivery, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 2590 (ii).

Civil Service Salaries, on M. for Com. on Res., 306 (i).

Dixon's Entrance, Prince Rupert, Rep. from Imp. Govt. *re* (Ques.) 2590 (ii).

Fishing and Seining Licenses on Pacific Coast, Number granted (M. for ret.*) 3992 (ii).

Fishing Seine Licenses, Number on Pacific Coast, &c. (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Grain Elevator at Vancouver, Construction of (Ques.) 2590 (ii).

G.T. Ry., Indebtedness to Canada, Payments made, &c. (Ques.) 3046 (ii).

Kitsilano Indian Reserve, Tel. to Mr. McInnes *re* Transfer to City (Ques.) 1973 (i).

Lighthouse Board, Reorganization of (Ques.) 1974 (i).

McPhaiden, Capt. D., Resignation as Shipping Master, Applications *re* Position (Ques.) 1973 (i).

Marine Supplies, System of Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 1974 (i).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1844 (i).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G.B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3554 (ii).

Shanghaiing in Vancouver, Investigation *re* Rep., &c. (Ques.) 3481 (ii).

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations (remarks) 2225 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1372 (i); Telegraph Lines Yukon—(Ashcroft-Dawson) 3349, 3350 (ii).

Vancouver Election Poll Clerks, Delay in Payments to (Ques.) 1418 (i).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*

Courtney Bay Dredging Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Customs Collector at Bathurst, N.B., Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 5157 (iii).

Customs Collector at Fredericton, Superannuation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 605 (i).

Govt. Railways Act (damages) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 242 (i).

Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to Prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 265 (i).

Indian Point Dredging, Tenders *re*, Rock Prices, &c. (Ques.) 1397 (i), 2763 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Wallberg Contract, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3475 (ii).

LeBlanc, O. J., Dismissal as Fishery Overseer, Complaints, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 2595 (ii).

Mayes Affidavit reading Originals, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4347 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order to Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 4258, 4317 (iii).

——— Ref. to in debate on Govt. Tenders, 265 (i).

Meagher, Mathias, Apptmt. to Customs Staff at Debec, N.B., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3655 (ii).

N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., 5756, 5777 (iii).

N.B. Supreme Court Vacancies, Apptmts, &c. (remarks) 6686 (iv).

Oromocto Wharf, Total Cost, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 2319 (ii).

Queens and Sunbury Mail Service, Established in Oct., 1908, &c. (Ques.) 2375 (ii).

Queens and Sunbury, Wharfs Construction, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2320 (ii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2393 (ii).

St. John River Channel Survey, Rep., Letters, Instructions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 881 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3254 (ii), 5249 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Customs (Board of Customs) 585; (contingencies) 606 (i).

Fisheries (international fisheries commission) 3440; Miscellaneous (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 3453 (ii).

Indians—N.B. (medical relief) 3462 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries (fisheries conference) 3689; (investigation) 3450 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Dorchester (electric lighting) 885; (supplies) 916; Generally (supplies) 887 (i).

Public Works—Buildings —B.C. (Victoria immigration) 2085 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 1598 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Partridge Island water service) 3206 (ii); (St. John, drill hall) 1293 (i); (St. John, hospital fittings) 3210 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Westville) 1292 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1253; (museum) 1275; (Royal Mint) 1272 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Commissioner's residence) 1593 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Dom. (vessels, repairs) 3338; Mar. Provs. (plant) 3340 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews rapids) 2106 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2511 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Beaver) 1622; (Buctouche) 1623; (Cape Bald) 1625; (Cummings Cove) 1625 (i); (Dorchester) 3237 (ii); (Dover) 1625; (Harvey Bank) 1626; (Heron island) 1626; (Mill's Point) 1626; (Moncton) 1627; (North Head) 1629; (Quaco) 1629; Richibucto, 1629 (i), 3238 (ii); (St. John surveys) 1641 (i); (St. John tidal waters) 3238 (ii); (St. John tributaries) 1637; (Shippigan harbour) 1645; (Whitehead wharf) 1646 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 2093 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Gibson siding) 3418 (ii).

Tenders: *See* 'Govt.'

Waterways Treaty, N.B. Fisheries Regulations *re* (remarks) 1247 (i).

Wharfs in Queens and Sunbury, Tenders called in Oct. 1908, Estimates, &c. (Ques.) 2374 (ii).

Woodstock Armoury Bowling Alley, Operations, &c. (Ques.) 5157 (iii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B., *Halifax.*

'Anticosti' Str., Amount of Work, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 671 (i).

Bounty on Steel Shipbuilding, Delegations *re* (Ques.) 6090 (iv).

Cariboo Breakwater, N.S., Amount of Expenditure (Ques.) 2152 (ii).

Civil Service Act (letter carriers) Amt B. 137 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6329 (iv).

Coasting Trade, O.C. *re* Privileges to Foreign Ships (remarks) 6123 (iv).

Cold Storage Establishments in Halifax, Res. from Commercial Committee (remarks) 3567 (ii).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 2°, 566 (i).

Fenian Veterans, Land Grants to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6281 (iv).

Fishing Bounty, Forms of Application (remarks) 1021 (i).

——— Delay in sending Blank Forms (remarks) 1249 (i).

Fishing Bounties, Payments to in Liverpool County (M. for ret.*) 3992 (ii).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 491 (i).

——— Ques. of Order, 519 (i).

Govt. Employees and Interference at Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6869 (iv).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5903 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 215 (i).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 5585 (iii).

Halifax Custom House, Total Cost, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 815 (i).

Halifax Post Office, Contract *re* Reconstruction, &c. (Ques.) 814 (i).

I.C.R., Annual Stmnt. (remarks) 2684 (ii).

——— Freight Clerks, Conciliation Board, Rep. (M. for copy*) 2597 (ii).

——— Investigation *re* Labour Disputes (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3261 (ii).

——— Settlement *re* Arbitration (remarks) 2127, 3568 (ii).

Johnston, Capt., Repayment of moneys from Str. Hestia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).

Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wifrid Laurier) in Com., 6735 (iv).

Labour Hours for Workingmen, Restriction, &c., on M. (Mr. Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5945 (iv).

Militia at Halifax, Delay in Payments (remarks) 2672, 2773 (ii).

Political Interference: *See* 'Govt. Employees,' &c.

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Transfer to Holland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).

'Scotia,' SS., Subsidy Terms, &c. (Ques.) 4895 (iii).

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations (remarks) 2227 (ii).

Spry Bay Govt. Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4895 (iii).

Supply—Harbours and Rivers, N.B., Ques. of Order, 1635 (i).

SUPPLY

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage for fruits, &c.) 6983; (experimental farms) 5952 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Customs (Board of Customs) 586; (contingencies) 600 (i).

Fisheries (commissions) 6958 (iv); (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 3453 (ii); (customs licenses) 6959; (cruisers) 6947; (transportation) 6956 (iv).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7032 (iv).

Indians—Generally (inspectors) 1164; (relief) 1167 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 6889 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and G.B.) 6650; (Canada and Nfld.) 6651; (contingent fund) 6655; (Halifax and Canso) 6651; (Halifax and Nfld.) 6651; (Halifax and Spry Bay) 6652; (Magdalen Islands) 6652; (P.E.I. and C. B., and Nfld.) 6652 (iv).

Marine—Dredging (plant, &c.) 6886; Public Works (St. Lawrence ship canal) 6877 (iv).

Militia (permanent force) 3422 (ii); (supplies) 6661 (iv); (warlike stores) 2317 (ii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous (Canada and W. I. Trade Relations) 6556 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 6671; (icebreaker for Northumberland Straits) 6673; (naval militia) 6683; (obstructions, removal, &c.) 6679; (wrecks investigations) 6679; (wrecking plant) 6680 (iv).
Post Office (rural mails) 3423 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Victoria immigration) 2086 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Halifax) 1289; (Shelburne) 1292 (i).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 1510; (Whitby) 1528 (i).
Public Works—Buildings, Ottawa (additional wing) 1258; (Royal Mint) 1274; (telephones) 1611 (i).
Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6554 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2343; (Cow Bay) 2467; (Peswick) 2474; (Portuguese Cove) 2480; (Sorel) 3291; (Spry Bay) 2474; (Tangier) 2484 (ii).
Quarantine ("Challenger") 5883 (iii).
Railways—G.T.P. (Quebec Bridge) 2053 (ii); I.C.R. (extensions) 6557 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese administration) 6656; (commercial agencies) 6656 (iv).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W., *West Elgin.*

Civil Service Salaries Increases B. 187 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 6341 (iv).
Govt. Tenders, Opening, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 579 (i).
—— Ques. of Order, 571 (i).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5266; on M. for 3°, 5530 (iii).
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3756 (ii).
Letter Carriers at St. Thomas (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3428 (ii).
N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, *re* Hon. Mr. Pugsley (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5645; Amt. neg. (Y. 63; N. 90) 5830 (iii).
Port Stanley Pier, Wage of Labourers, Delays in Payment (remarks) 4047 (iii).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4248 (iii).
—— (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 744 (i).
Secret or Illicit Commission Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1125, 1482 (i).
S.A. Bounty Act (remarks) 2223 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 646; Customs (contingencies) 591; Inland Revenue (salaries) 429 (i).
Excise (inspectors salaries) 436 (i).
Penitentiaries—Dorchester (supplies) 917; Generally (supplies) 910; St-Vincent de Paul (supplies) 914; Stoney Mountain (supplies) 921 (i).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (rural mails) 3428 (ii).
Printing and Stationery (salaries) 808 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Shelburne) 1292 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Simcoe) 1392; (Whitby) 1524 (i).
Westville Post Office, Contract Price, Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 2755 (ii).
Yukon Ordinances (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7077 (iv).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A., *North Simcoe.*

Adulteration Act Amt. (B. 107) 1° m., 2490
Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4450, 5203 (iii).
Ammonal Explosives Patent Relief B. 93 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 2179 (ii).
Bonuses and Subsidies overdue, &c. (Ques.) 2763 (ii).
Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 2571 (ii).
Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1692, 1865 (i).
Canadian Ships Docking for Repairs, Res. *re* (Ques.) 3053 (ii).
Canadian Ships, Duty *re* Repairs in Foreign Countries (Ques.) 2762 (ii).
Coal conserved for Home Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 3108 (ii).
Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1740 (i).
Cold Storage Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6742 (iv).
Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5208 (iii).
Dominion Atlantic Ry., Examination by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2928 (ii).
Dumping Clause, Orders from Treasury Board (remarks) 4412 (iii).
External Affairs Deptl. B. 90 (Mr. Murphy) on prop. Res., 1998 (i); in Com., 4436 (iii).
Fishery Commission Regulations, Adoption of (remarks) 6411 (iv).
Fishery Regulations with U. S. and Action of Ont. Govt. (remarks) 6532 (iv).
Foreign Correspondence, Number of Letters, &c. (Ques.) 3986 (ii).
Fort Malden, Representations *re* Sale, &c. (Ques.) 6087 (iv).
Geodetic Survey Bureau, Establishment of, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 3071 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Pet. *re* Expenditure (remarks) 6415 (iv).
Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4415 (iii).
Govt. Ships purchased from British Shipbuilders since 1896, Expenditure in Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3195 (ii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

G. T. P. Prairie Section Contracts, Names of Contractors, &c. (Ques.) 3987 (ii).

Holland River at Newmarket, Rep. *re* Flow of Water (Ques.) 472 (i).
See 'Trent,' &c.

Ice-Breaker for Northumberland Straits, Contract with Messrs. Vickers, Sons & Maxim (M. for cor.*) 3056 (ii).

Imperial Partnership with G. B. and Her Colonies, on Amt. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 6446 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6798 (iv).

Lake Transportation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).

Lee-Enfield Rifles, Issue of New Barrels, &c. (Ques.) 6088 (iv).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 173) 1° m., 5626 (iii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3954 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6079 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 192 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6744 (iv).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3543 (ii).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3133 (ii).
See 'Holland,' &c.

Priv. Ques. of (Mr. Conmee) *re* 'Special Trains,' 4292 (iii).

Public Works by Marine Dept., Tenders *re* (Ques.) 2765 (ii).

Railways and Canals (remarks) on Annual Stmnt., 2691 (ii).

Railway Act (trainmen) Amt. (B. 172) 1° m., 5625 (iii).

Railway Commission, Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2668 (ii).

Ross Rifle, Weight, Length, Diameter, &c. (Ques.) 4891 (iii).

Royal Casualty and Surety Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. H. H. McLean) in Com., 2577, 2718 (ii).

S.A. Veteran Land Grants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5976 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 728 (i); (live stock industry) 5866 (iii).

Canals—Beauharnois (water power) 1911 (i)

Canals—Generally (staff, &c.) 2072 (ii).

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 790 (i).

Canals—Trent (construction) 2074, 3178 (ii); (Holland River) 1579, 1587 (i); (Newmarket) conc., 4049; (amt.) neg. (Y. 52; N. 80) 4049 (iii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 1907; (surveys) 1909 (i).

Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 605 (i); Mines (salaries) 3680 (ii); Post Office (salaries) 613, 722 (i).

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 717 (i).

Fisheries (cruisers) 6947 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (surveys commission) 1159

Indians—Generally (inspectors) 1165 (i).

Indians—Ont. (legal expenses) 996; (surveys) 989 (i).

Interior (St. Mary's and Milk River diversions) 6269 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamer) 6910 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (fisheries conference) 3688 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Stoney Mountain (supplies) 922 (i).

Printing and Stationery (salaries) 806 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (power) 1617 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Cornwall) 1360; (Glencoe) 1373; (Kingston R.M.C.) 1381, 1509, 1534; (Markham) 1387; (Whitby) 1525 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 620; (peat testing) 1390, 1499 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6536 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Okanagan) 6545 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John survey) 1645 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Cow Bay) 2466; (Middle River) 2479; (Yarmouth) 2485 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 3294; (Owen Sound) 3316; (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bonaventure) 3279; (Sorel) 3290 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Moncton, cut-off) 2921 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (McGill school) 2071 (ii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (litigation) 2070 (ii).

Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 452 (i).

Telephones in Canada, Control of Rates, &c. on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1775 (i).

Trent Valley Waterways, Extension to Georgian Bay, &c. (Ques.) 473 (i).
See 'Holland,' 'Supply—Canals,' &c.

Waterways Treaty with U. S., Changes in Draft Treaty *re* Intersection of Islands, on M. for Sup., 1490 (i).

Weights and Measures *re* Vessel Owners and Rys., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3683 (ii).

Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s B. 37 (Mr. Knowles) in Com., 2564 (ii).

Wharfs, Govt.: *See* 'Govt. Harbours,' &c.

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 29) in Com., 2067 (ii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4158 (iii).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John City.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 752 (i).

Canada-France S.S. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4441 (iii).

Carter, Edward S., Emplymt. as Sessional Clerk (Ques.) 5094 (iii).

Civil Service Salaries, Classification *re* Schedules, &c., on M. for Sup., 2447 (ii).

Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5207 (iii).

Courtney Bay, Contracts *re* Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 506 (i).

Fishing Weirs in Passamaquoddy Bay, Investigation *re* Ownership, &c. (Ques.) 6088 (iv).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1697 (i).

French SS. Line: *See* 'Canada,' &c.

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6126 (iv).

I. C. R., Branch Lines (remarks) *re* prop. Res., 2162 (ii).

—— Freight Clerks, Investigation *re* Labour Disputes (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3260 (ii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries, Violation of Act, Par. in St. John Standard (remarks) 3705 (ii).

Maritime Dredging Co., Tender *re* St. John Harbour (Ques.) 6787 (iv).

Mayes Affidavit, Reading of (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4253 (iii).

—— Reading of Original, Document (read) 4300; (Amt.) 4311; Amt. neg. (Y. 60, N. 100) 4409 (iii).

—— Ques. of Order, 4313 (iii).

Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3330 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6208 (iv).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2129, 2493 (ii).

St. John Dredging, Apptmt. of Supt., &c. (Ques.) 5632 (iii).

St. John Harbour and Courtney Bay Surveys and Borings, Cor. Reps. O. Cs. Advestisements *re* Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 826 (i).

—— Contract with Mayes, John Moore & Co., Cor., (M. for copies*) 826 (i).

St. John Postmaster, Superannuation of, Apptmt. of Successor, &c. (Ques.) 871 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Sissiboo River Bridge, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Jameson) on Com. of Sup., 6845 (iv).

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) 2222 (ii).

S.A. Land Grants, Number located, Apptmts. of Substitutes, &c. (Ques.) 6404 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5947 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 387; Finance (salaries) 384; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 381 (i).

Fisheries (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 351; (international fisheries commission) 3440 (ii).

Indians—N.B. (medical attendance) 999; N.S. (seed grain, &c.) 998; Ont. (legal expenses) 995; (surveys) 991; P.E.I. (medical attendance) 1000 (i).

Labour Dept.—Miscellaneous (Opium Conference) 3434 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 6897 (iv).

Militia (ordnance) 2307; (rifle shooting) 2297; (salaries) 2272; (transport) 3423 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Dorchester (electric light plant) 884 (i).

Post Office (letter carriers) 1653, 1697 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Victoria immigration) 2088 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John drill hall) 1293 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1264; (Royal Mint) 1271; (telephones) 1605 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Dom. (vesesls) 3338; Mar. Provs. (plant) 3339 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 1293 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver) 1622; (Buctouche) 1623; (Campbellton) 1625; (Campobello) 1646; (Cape Tormentine) 1626; Kouchibougouac) 1626; (Leonardsville) 1626; (Moncton) 1627; (Point du Chene) 1629 (i); (St. John) 2109 (ii); (St. John harbour) 1645; (St. John River tributaries) 1633; (Seal Cove) 1645; (Shippegan) 1646 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 2094 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bonaventure) 3282; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 3287; (Saguenay) 3275 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (McGill school) 2071 (ii).

Telephones, Provincial Control of by Ry. Commission (Ques.) 1418 (i).

Telephone Rates in Canada, Control by Govt.; on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1770 (i).

Vessels, Govt. Inspection B. 73 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 1319 (i).

Waterways Treaty, International and N.B. Fisheries, Par. in St. John Globe, 1243 (i).

DELISLE, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*

Quebec Judges now receiving Pensions, aDte of Apptmts., &c. (Ques.) 5634 (iii).

DEMERS, Mr. M. J., *St. John and Iberville.*

Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 864 (i).

Investigations into Dept. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3893 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Richelieu) 2560 (ii).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*

Civil Service Salaries, on M. (Mr. Fisher) for Com. on Res., 320 (i).

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, on prop Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1950 (i).

Hull Customs Duties, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 1418 (i).

Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 857 (i).

Investigation into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3871 (ii).

Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 49) 1°*, 738 (i).

DOHERTY, Mr. C. J., *Montreal, St. Anne.*

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6744 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6178.

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) 6816 (iv).

Investigations into Depts. by Mr. Justice Cassels (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3706; Amt. Neg. (Y. 54; N. 94) 3934 (ii).

Judges of the District and County Court B. 193 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6772 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 154 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6560 (iv).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4248 (iii).

Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, (amt.) 6310 (iv).

Robertson, Thos., Suspension by Pilotage Board, B.C. (remarks) on M. for Sup. 6864 (iv).

Secret or Illicit Commission Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1487 (i).

Security Life Insurance Co. of Canada B. 188 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 6782 (iv).

Statutes, French Translation, &c. (remarks) 2024 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7029 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal postal station) 1313 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Francis river) 2898; (Yamaska) 2900 (ii).

DONNELLY, Mr. J. J., *South Bruce.*

Central Bank of Canada, Liquidation of (Ques.) 2151 (ii).

Chesley Post Office, Amount of Vote *re* (Ques.) 543 (i).

——— Site, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 4089 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Cornwall) 1359 (i).

Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 738 (i).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 465 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4164, 4593, 5486 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1956 (i).

Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization and Ry. Co.'s (B. 126) 1°*, 4041 (ii); in Com., 4836 (iii).

ECREMENT, Mr. A., *Berthier.*

Immigration Agents in France, Number, Reps., Resignation of J. E. Cyr (Ques.) 1414 (i).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3771 (ii).

Marconi Stations between Montreal and Quebec, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 2762 (ii).

Montreal Bridge and Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 180) 1°*, 5997; in Com., 6628 (iv).

St. Lawrence Channel, Amount expended 1908, Continuation, &c. (Ques.) 2150 (ii).

Telephone Stations between Montreal and Quebec *re* Navigation (Ques.) 2594 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W., *Frontenac.*

Agriculture. Expenditures for (Ques.) 1070 (i).

Barriefield Camp, Par. in "Military Gazette," Ques. of Priv., 5622 (iii).

Budget, The, 4760 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 179) 1° m., 5889 (iv).

Fish Hatcheries, Number in Canada (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

Hay from U. S., Entries at Kingston, &c. (Ques.) 1177 (i).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3927 (ii).

Kingston Batteries, Tenders *re* Groceries, &c., (Ques.) 4225 (iii).

Kingston Military Buildings, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 546 (i).

——— Correction of Figures (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2540 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Kingston R. M. Buildings, Excessive Expenditures (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2495 (ii). *See* " Military," " R. M. C.'s &c.

Kingston Penitentiary, Dep. Warden's Residence, Plans, &c (Ques.) 2589 (ii).

——— Number of Prisoners, Guards, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 4226 (iii).

——— Potatoes purchased, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4227 (iii).

——— Tenders for Coal, &c. (Ques.) 4227 (iii).

Military Buildings at Kingston, (M.) for Original Tenders, 1922 (i). *See* " Kingston ".

Military Lands purchased near Kingston, Name of Agent, &c. (Ques.) 546 (i).

Pork, Bacon, &c., from U.S., Entries at Kingston, &c. (Ques.) 1177 (i).

Post Office Revenue at Kingston, Brantford, Sherbrooke and Quebec, Salaries of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 5633 (iii).

Public Health Bureau, Establishment of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1104 (i).

Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 3°, 523 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2391 (ii); in Com., 6227 (iv).

Railway Level Crossing Accident near Kingston, (remarks) 251 (i).

Railway Level Crossings, Prevention of Accidents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1225 (i).

Royal Military College Cottages, Estimated Total Cost (Ques.) 1732 (i), 2319 (ii).

——— Stables, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1732 (i).

Royal Military College, Total Cost of (Ques.) 1733 (i). *See* ' Kingston,' &c.

Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2800 (ii).

Sherbrooke Drill Hall, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

S. A. Veterans' Warrants, Number, Homesteads issued, &c. (Ques.) 2818 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Fisheries (contingencies) 6980 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers' salaries) 6981 (iv).

Militia (annual drill) 2312; (ordnance) 2308; (properties) 2314 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 909 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston artillery park) 3223 (ii); (R. M. College) 1507, 1533 (i); conc. (amt.) 4049 (iii); (Whitby) 1532 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Rideau Hall grounds) 1611 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec citadel) 3213; (Sherbrooke) 3223 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wolfe Island canal) 3302 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P. E. I. (bridges) 2508 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a l'Ilot) 2514 (ii).

Veterans of 1866, Land Grants to (Ques.) 668 (i).

Veterinary Hospital, Kingston, Dimensions, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2150 (ii).

Wolfe Island Canal, Construction, Contribution *re* Maintenance by Govt. (Ques.) 3043 (ii). *See* ' Supply.'

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4157 (iii).

ELSON, Mr. P., *East Middlesex.*

Hickory and Ash Handles for Farm Implements, Number imported for 1908 (Ques.) 1239 (i).

Mail Service between Hyde Park Post Office, &c., in Middlesex County, &c. (Ques.) 3251 (ii).

Polling Booths in Ont., Payment *re* Rents, &c. (Ques.) 3251 (ii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2400 (ii); in Com., 6224 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 5873 (iii).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*

Canadian, Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1687 (i).

Courtney Bay Dredging Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2114 (ii).

Govt. Railways Act (compensation) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 772 (i).

Harvey-Salisbury Railroad incorp. (B. 35) 2° m., 775 (i).

I.C.R., Applications *re* Running Privileges (Ques.) 351 (i).

——— on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 2737 (ii).

——— Board of Management, Apptmt. of (remarks) 4803 (iii).

——— Branch Lines, Extension of Feeders, &c. (prop. res.) 2162 (ii).

——— Branch Lines Rep., Inquiry for Copy, 664, 1718 (i).

——— printing, &c. (remarks) 875 (i).

——— (M. for copy) 882 (i).

I.C.R., Employees at Moncton, Number, &c. (Ques.) 330 (i).

——— Proposal *re* Leasing, &c. (Ques.) 164 (i)

——— Speed of Special Mail Trains, Instructions *re*, &c. (Ques.) 872 (i).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

London and Lancashire Plate Glass Co.'s incorp. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2146 (ii).

McAvity-Mayes Dredging Contract, Ques. of Order, Irrelevancy of debate, 276 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 154 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6559 (iv).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1039 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6246 (iv).

Railways and Canals, (remarks) on Annual stmnt., 2700 (ii).

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep., Inquiry for, 1250 (i).

Ry. Employees Provident Act Amt. B. 164 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6741 (iv).

Salisbury and Harvey Railroad Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 465; in Com., 1363, 1513 (i).

SUPPLY.

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Minas Basin) 6654 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. Campobello) 1647 (i); N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2370 (ii).

Williams, Thos., Employee of I.C.R. at Moncton, Superannuation, &c. (Ques.) 330 (i).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Rv. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2139 (ii).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*

Central Ry. of Canada (B. 166) 1°*, 5623 (iii).

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 1476 (i).

Franklin Montgomery Gray, Patent Relief B. 132 (Mr. Rankin) in Com., 4887 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5154 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6140 (iv).

Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 861 (i).

Private Bills, Refunding of Fees (M.) 5889 (iv).

——— (M.) to conc. in 8th Rep. of Com., 5997 (iv).

St. Maurice and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 1°*, 5777 (iii).

Salvation Army Council B. 142 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6069 (iv).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S., (Minister of Finance), *Shelburne and Queens, N.S.*

Aerial Navigation, Experiments by Canadians (Ans.) 2383 (ii).

Alberta and Saskatchewan, Annual Allowance, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 2588 (ii).

American Silver, Exportation of (remarks) 6780 (iv).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

American Tariff, Consideration of (remarks) 5103 (iii).

Annuities Act Amt. (B. 109) 1°*, 2670 (ii); 2°m., 6773 (iv).

Annuities Act, Number of Applicants, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 3477 (ii).

Armouries, Returns, Inquiry for, 3937 (ii).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Part O (presented) 1393 (i).

Bank Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1732 (i).

Beet Root Sugar, Refineries, Duty *re* Preferential Tariff (Ans.) 3047 (ii).

Bills of Lading Bill, Discussion *re* (remarks) 6918 (iv).

Bonuses and Subsidies overdue, &c. (Ans.) 2763 (ii).

Bounties on Steel Shipbuilding, Delegation *re* (Ans.) 6091 (iv).

Bowden, Annie, Relief, B. 194 (Mr. Sproule) on M. for 1°, 6918 (iv).

Budget, The, 4546 (iii).

——— (announcement) 4220 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 5060 (iii).

Budget, The (remarks) 1813 (i), 3111, 3649 (ii).

Budget, Speech of 1898, on Inquiry for Stmnt. 1321 (i).

Business of the Hse., Adjournment for Easter (remarks) re Assent to Bills, 4119 (iii).

——— Motions to be dropped (remarks) 4036 (ii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3033 (ii).

——— on M. to ref. to Standing Orders Com., 3041 (ii).

——— on order for Com., 3411 (ii).

Canada SS. Service with Germany, Negotiations *re* (Ans.) 2589 (ii).

Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 76 (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com., 2578 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 3410 (ii).

Central Bank of Canada, Liquidation of (Ans.) 2151 (ii).

Chartered Banks, Unpaid Balances for more than five years (Ans.) 2592 (ii).

Civil Service, Inside Employees, Payments to in 1896 (Ans.) 1913 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, Names of those receiving no Increases (Ans.) 1726 (i).

See 'House of Commons.'

Coal conserved for the Home Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 3108 (ii).

Coasting Trade, O. C. *re* privileges to Foreign Ships (remarks) 6123 (iv).

Coinage at Canadian Mint, Date of, Circulation, Profit, &c. (Ans.) 1401 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Co-Operative Societies, on Question of Order (Mr. Speaker) 2327 (ii).

Customs Tariff Amt. (B. 162) 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 5103 (iii).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2840 (ii).

Dumping Clause, Orders from Treasury Board (remarks) 4412 (iii).

Easter Adjournment (remarks) 3650 (ii).

Equity Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6626 (iv).

Estimates, Suppl. (presented) 2597 (ii).

—— (1909) presented, 6092 (iv).

—— (1910) presented, 7065 (iv).

Estimates, Passing of (remarks) 3203 (ii).

Expenditures and Receipts, for 1908-9, N. T. R. Cost, &c. (Ans.) 4289 (iii).

Financial Statement—The Budget, 4546 (iii).

Fishery Regulations and Action of Ont. Govt. (remarks) 6528 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Minimum Tariff on Farm Products (Ans.) 5158 (iii).

—— Present Condition (Ans.) 4896 (iii).

—— Treaty, on Inquiry for, 1977 (i) 3254 (ii).

—— Supplementary, Mess from His Ex. (presented) 2148 (ii).

—— (stmnt.) 7070 (iv).

German and Canadian Treaty, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 4125 (iii).

Govt. Loans (B. 191) Res. prop., 6292; in Com. on Res., 6709; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 6711 (iv).

Govt. Loans, Amounts and Dates falling due prior to 1913 (Ans.) 3654, 3704 (ii).

—— Expenditure *re* Negotiations (Ans.) 1724 (i).

See 'Loans.'

Govt. Savings Banks, Amount of Deposits in Oct. 1889, 1896, 1897, 1898 (remarks) 1724 (i).

Grain Elevator at Vancouver, Construction of (Ans.) 2590 (ii).

G. T. P. Loan (B. 128) prop. Res., 2670 (ii); on prop Res. (remarks) 4060, 4096; in Com. on Res., 3569; 2° m., 5103; in Com., 5189, 5251, 5323, 5488; on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to M. for 3°, 5597; on Amt. (Mr. Middlebro) 5611 (iii).

G.T.P. Bonds guaranteed by Govt., Available for Prairie Section (Ans.) 2589 (i).

G.T.P., Legislation *re* (remarks) 2219 (ii).

—— Loan Res., Details *re* (remarks) 3111 (ii).

——Loans, on Inquiry for Cor., &c., 2772 (ii).

—— Negotiations *re* Loan prior to Oct., 1903 (Ans.) 4290 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Prairie and Mountain Sections, Detailed Stmnt. of Expenditures (remarks) 3257 (ii).

See 'Expenditures,' &c

G.T.Ry. Co., Indebtedness to Govt., Interest due &c. (Ans.) 2759, 3046 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Taylor) for Papers, 3056 (ii).

G.T.Ry. Co., Prior Lien on Assets, Opinion of Mr. Shepley (Ans.) 4228 (iii).

Grand Trunk Stock, Outstanding Interest, Liabilities, &c. (Ans.) 3651 (ii).

Great West Permanent Loan Co.'s incorp. B. 40 (Mr. A, Haggart) in Com., 2569 (ii).

Harbour Commissioners of Montreal (B. 192) in Com. on Res., 6743; in Com., 6744 (iv).

See 'Montreal.'

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6101 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6159 (iv).

Industrial Disputes Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 1°, 3567 (ii).

Insurance Act (B. 97) 1° m., 2121; 2° m., 2564 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6657; in Com., 6704, 6788 (iv).

Insurance Bill, Discussion (remarks) 6290

Insurance Act Amt. Bill, Progress in Senate (remarks) 7069 (v).

Johnston, Capt., Repayment of Moneys *re* Str. 'Hestia' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6892 (iv).

Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6724 (iv).

Lancashire and London Plate Glass Co.'s incorp. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 2147 (ii).

Loans by Govt., Expenses *re* (Ans.) 1922 (i).

Loans, Expenditures *re* (remarks) 4124 (iii).

Loans of Jan., 1909, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2596 (ii).

Loans of 1874, four per cent, Date of first Notice (Ans.) 3654 (ii).

Loans, Temporary, Details of $20,606,333 for Jan. 31, 1909 (Ans.) 1498 (i).

—— Interest for twelve and three quarter years, &c. (Ans.) 4898 (iii).

Loans issued since 1907, on Inquiry for Ret., 4125 (iii).

Loans, Return, on Inquiry for, 1562 (i), 2129, 2674, 3110, 3937 (ii).

See 'Govt.,' 'G.T.P.'

Lobster and Fishing Licenses in P.E.I., Number issued in 1904, Pets., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2160 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co. (B. 81) Correction, Permission to Clerk of Senate (remarks) 5886 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4400 (iii).
See 'N.B. Central Ry.'

Militia at Halifax, Delay in Payments (remarks) 2672 (ii).

Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s (B. 180) on Senate Amts., 6917 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners (prop. res.) 3197 (ii).
See 'Harbour,' &c.

Montreal Harbour Dues, Interest due Govt., Increases, &c. (Ans.) 1417 (i).

Montreal Woollen Mills, Closing *re* Tariff Laws (Ans.) 2591 (ii).

Muir Memorial Fund, Request for Govt. Aid (Ans.) 5095 (iii).

N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, O. Cs., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to lay on Table, 5625 (iii).

Nickel Ore, Export Duty *re* (Ans.) 5634 (iii).

Old Age Pensions: *See* 'Annuities,' &c.

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5564 (iii).

Pensions: *See* 'Annuities.'

Proportional Representation, House of Commons, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 2623 (amt.) 2624 (ii).

Prudential Life Ins. Co.: *See* 'Security,' &c.

Pugsley, Mr., and Mayes Affidavit: *See* 'Mayes.'

Quebec Tercentenary, Amount subscribed, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1721 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 1718 (i).

Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 63 (Mr. Ames) on Senate Amts. 6788 (iv).

Royal Casualty and Surety Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. H. H. McLean) in Com., 2575, 2717 (ii).

Royal Life Insurance Co.'s B. 177 (Mr. McCraney) on M. for 1°, 5885 (iii).

Savings Bank Deposits, Increase of Interest (Ans.) 1396 (i).

Security Life Insurance Co.'s B. 188 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 6782 (iv).

Silver Currency coined in Can. for 1905-6-7-8, Profits, Amount of U.S. Silver circulated, &c. (Ans.) 868 (i).

Sissiboo River Bridge, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup., 6844 (iv).

SS. Line to Germany: See 'Canada,' &c.

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) on order for Com., 4592 (iii).

Supply (B. 117) in Com. on Res., 1°, 2°, 3°*, 4051 (iii).

Supply (B. 195) Prop. Res., 7080, 1° m., 7081 (iv).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Supply, One-Fourth of Estimates (remarks) 3936 (ii).

Supply—Conc., Reading of Items (remarks) 4048 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 5857 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (extra clerks) 3434; Finance (contingencies) 3436; Gov. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 3434 (ii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) 3464 (ii).

Immigration, 5832 (iii); (agents, &c.) 7012; (G.B. agents, &c.) 7018 (iv).

Legislation (members indemnity) 7065 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamer) 6912; (construction) 6908 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and G.B.) 3437 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Canada and W. Indies Trade Relations) 6556; (Hague Tribunal) 7062 (iv); (legal expenditure *re* Chinese seizure) 3466 (ii); (Parliamentary Guide) 7064 (iv); (unprovided items) 3466 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Victoria immigration) 2089 (ii); (Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John tributaries) 1638 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Aston track scale) 3415 (ii).

Tariff Changes *re* Tin (remarks) 4126 (iii).

Temporary Loans: *See* 'Loans.'

Thos. L. Smith, Patent Relief B. 71 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 3°, 2950 (ii).

Toronto Old Fort, Pets. *re* Transfers (remarks) 4122 (iii).

Vancouver Bank B. 52 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 2147 (ii).

Water Carriage of Goods between Can. and G.B., Regulations *re* (Ans.) 2764 (ii).

Water Carriage of Goods Bill (remarks) 6846 (iv).

Ways and Means—The Budget (annual statement) 4546 (iii).

Ways and Means (sugar) in Com., 5099 (iii).

Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. Knowles) in Com., 2564 (ii).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4146 (iii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A., (*Minister of Agriculture*) *Brome.*

Agriculture Committee of 1908, Printing and Distribution of Rep. (remarks) 3938 (ii).

Agriculture, Deptl. Employees, Names, Position, Salaries, Increases, &c. (Ans.) 1058 (i).

—— Outside Service at Ottawa, Names, Position, &c. (Ans.) 823 (i).

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 12 (i).

Agricultural Estimates, Delay in considering (remarks) 4412 (iii).

Agriculture, Expenditure for (Ans.) 1070 (i).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Agriculture, Expenditure *re* Employees (ii).

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4469 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 240; in Com., 750 (i).

Animals, Health of, Inspection, &c., Total Expenditure (Ans.) 821 (i).

Campbellford and Brighton Mail Contract (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

Canning Factories Inspectors, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 822 (i).

Census Vote for 1910, Intention *re* (Ans.) 532 (i).

Civil Service Act, Delays, &c. (remarks) 5895 (iv).

Civil Service Commissioners' Rep., on Inquiry for, 1022 (i).

Civil Service Resolutions, Conc. before Easter (remarks) 3703 (ii).

Civil Service Salaries (B. 187) prop. Res., 160; M. for Com., 292; in Com. on Res., 403, 953, 1135 (i); 1° m., 6330; in Com., 6346; 3° m., 6822; on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 6824; on Senate Amts., 7068 (iv).

Civil Service Salaries Schedules, on Inquiry for 2009 (i); 2336 (iii), 5998 (iv).

——— Classification Schedules, &c., on M. for Sup., 2423 (ii).

——— Senate Schedules, &c. (remarks) 6061 (iv).

See "House of Commons."

Cold Storage Act Amt. (B. 147) 1° m., 4471 (iii); in Com., 6742 (iv).

Cold Storage Establishments at Halifax (remarks) 3567 (ii).

Cold Storage Plants, Govt. Assistance to (Ans.) 2756 (ii).

——— Shipments of Fruit, &c., Amount, &c. (Ans.) 2818 (ii).

Conservation of Resources: *See* "Natural."

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6757 (iv).

Exhibitions subsidized by Dom. Govt., Amount, Officials, &c. (Ans.) 544 (i).

Experimental Farms Live Stock, Number, Estimated Value, &c. (Ans.) 546 (i).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1957 (i).

Experimental Farming Stations, Establishment of (Ans.) 823 (i).

"Farm Weeds" Number distributed, &c. (Ans.) 2758 (ii).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1677 (i).

Franklin Montgomery Gray Patent Relief B. 132 (Mr. Rankin) in Com., 4883, 5028 (iii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

French Translation of Documents in Dept of Agriculture (Ans.) 2762 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act, Number of Inspectors (Ans.) 3477 (ii).

——— Regulations *re* Inspection, on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3380.

Gretna Quarantine Building, Total Cost, Price of Land, &c. (Ans.) 824 (i).

Hogs dressed, Inspection *re* (Ans.) 2758 (ii).

Holstein Cattle at Experimental Farms, &c. (Ans.) 2756 (ii).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6096 (iv).

Mail Contracts, Renewals in April, 1909, without Tenders (Ans.) 477 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Purchases, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Taylor) Ques. of Order, 4045 (iii).

Mayes Affidavit, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Daniel) 4315 (iii).

Nappan Experimental Farm, Number of Employees, Rate of Pay, &c. (Ans.) 5640 (iii).

Natural Resources Conservation Commission (B. 159) prop. Res., 5249 (iii), 6363 (iv); 1° m., 4988 (iii); in Com., 6382 (iv).

Plank, Mr. M. W., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3252 (ii).

Public Health Bureau, Establishment of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1112 (i).

Railway Commission, Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2635 (ii).

Registered Stock, Regulations *re* Importation from U. S. (Ans.) 2379 (ii).

Rutherford, Dr. J. S., Resignation, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1720 (i).

Scotch Farmers, Report of Visit to Canada (remarks) 6060 (iv).

Stork, W. W., Inspector of Animals, Details of Expenditure (Ans.) 6092 (iv).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4538 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 688; (census, &c.) 696 (i); (cold storage) 3188 (ii); (cold storage for fruits) 6983 (iv); (exhibitions) 727 (i), 5947 (iv); (Experimental Farm, electric ry., 3192; (fruit transportation) 3187 (ii); (fumigating stations) 809; (Gold and Silver Marking Act) 809 (i); (International Institute) 5882; (live stock industry) 5833 (iii); (Patent Record) 3186 (ii); (Public Works Health Act) 810 (i); (swine commission) 6984 (iv); (tobacco, Canadian) 5881 (iii); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 809; (Year-Book) 702, 726 (i), 3187 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 643 (i); (experimental farm) 6982 (iv); Inland Revenue (salaries) 429 (i); Mines (salaries) 3674 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 715 (i).
Legislation (members' indemnity) 7068 (iv).
Miscellaneous (conservation commission) 7064 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Victoria immigration) 2089 (ii); Generally (experimental farms) 1598 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Yarmouth) 2487 (ii).
Quarantine (Challenger, Str.) 5883 (iii); (quarantine) 8193 (ii).

Tuberculosis Congress, International, Delegates to (Ans.) 1186 (i).

Yarmouth Harbour Buoys (remarks) 1115 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *North Toronto.*

Address, The, 46 (i).

Agriculture, Deptl. Employees, Name, Position, Salary, Increases, &c. (Ques.) 1058 (i).

——— Outside Service at Ottawa, Names, Position, Increase of Salary, &c. (Ques.) 823 (i).

——— Sums voted (Ques.) 1409 (i).

All Red Route, Information *re* (remarks) 7070 (iv).

American Immigration Agents, Duties *re* (remarks) 2244 (ii).

Armouries built since 1896, Number, Cost, &c. (M. for ret.*) 157 (i).

Bell, Charles F., Conditions of Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2322 (ii).

Budget, The, Reply to Financial Statement, 4585 (iii).

——— Remarks, 1813 (i), 4125 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3030 (ii); 5995, 6026 (iv).

——— on M. to ref. to Com. on Standing Orders, 3042 (ii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5218 (iii).

Canadian Economic Lubricant Co., Payments to since 1906 (Ques.) 176, 188 (i).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 2129 (ii).

Cassells, Judge: *See* 'Investigations,' 'Marine.'

Central Railway of N. B., Action of Govt. *re* Rep. of Commission (remarks) 4125 (iii).
See 'N. B. Central.'

Civil Service Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6325 (iv).

Civil Service Bill, Preparation of Schedules (remarks) 2336 (ii); 5998 (iv).

——— (remarks) 2009 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, Increase B. 187 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for Com. on Res., 311; in Com. on Res., 403, 953, 1136 (i); on M. for 2°, 6334; in Com., 6346; on M. for 3°, 6823; (amt.) 6824 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Civil Service Salaries: Circular Letter *re* Election Campaign (read) 318 (i).

Civil Service Resolutions, Conc. before Easter (remarks) 3702 (ii).

——— Delay, &c. (remarks) *re* Blocking, 5895 (iv).

Civil Service Apptmts. since July, 1908; Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 142 (i).

——— since Sept. 1908 (Ques.) 143 (i).

Civil Service Act, Promotions, Transfers, Apptmts. under (M. for ret.*) 352 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, Classification Schedules, Inconsistencies, &c., on M. for Sup., 2404 (ii).

Civil Service Temporary Clerks, Classification under sec. 7 of C. S. Act, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 354 (i).

Civil Service, Increases from April 1, 1908, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1069 (i).

——— Inside Employees, Total Payments in 1896 (Ques.) 1913 (i).

——— Names of those receiving no Increases (Ques.) 1726 (i).

Civil Service Reorganization, Temporary Clerks, &c. (Ques.) 142 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, O.C. *re* Increases Ret. (remarks) 1395 (i).

——— Defective Ret. (remarks) 1562 (i).

Civil Service, Payments in 1896 and 1909-10 at Ottawa (Ques.) 2148 (ii).
See 'Supply—Civil Govt.'

Civil Service Bill, Schedule of Senate (remarks) 6061 (iv).
See 'House of Commons.'

Civil Service Commissioners' Rep., Inquiry for, 874, 1022 (i); 2241, 3111 (ii); 4047 (iii).

Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1736 (i).

Commercial Negotiations *re* Senatorships, Ref. to in debate on Address, 52 (i).

Committees, Special, Ref. to of Deptl. Reps. (remarks) 2026 (ii).

Conservation of our Resources: *See* 'Natural.'

Deferred Elections, on prop. res. (Mr. Burrell) 2857 (ii).

Deptl. Statistical Publications, Inquiry for Ret., 4642 (iii).

Dredging Contracts, Inquiry for O.C., 255 (i).
See 'St. John,' &c.

Dredge, Govt.-owned, employed in N.S. under Contract, Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 2320 (ii).

Dredges purchased by Public Works Dept., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 145 (i).

Estimates, Passing of (remarks) 3203 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Ewart, Mr. J. S., Emplymt *re* Hague Tribunal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7059 (iv).

Expenditures and Receipts of Dom. for 1908-9, N.T.R. Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4289 (iii).

External Affairs Dept., on prop. Res (Mr. Murphy) 1983 (i).

'Falcon' and 'Fearless,' Strs., Purchase of. Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 187 (i).

Fenian Veterans, Land Grants, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6277 (iv).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 511 (i).

Fisheries Regulations *re* International Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6964 *See* 'Waterways.'

Fishing Seasons and Leases, Extensions, &c. (Ques.) 169 (i).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ont. Govt. Legislation, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 6921 (iv).

Forests, Waterways, &c., on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6919 (iv).

France and Canada Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5220 (iii).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1673 (i).

—— Names of Ministers (Ques.) 2585 (ii).

French Treaty, Information *re* (remarks) 7070 (iv).

—— Inquiry for, 1977 (i); 2148 (ii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take Mondays, 3938 (ii); 4041 (iii).

Govt. Employees, Interference with Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6871 (iv).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5898, 6124 (iv).

Govt. Loans or Advances, since Dec., 1908, Purposes for, &c. (Ques.) 163 (i).

Govt. Loans, from July, 1896, Amounts, Conditions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).
See 'Loans'

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 227 (i).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 4104 (iii); in Com. on Res., 3572 (ii); in Com., 5283, 5323, 5488; on M. for 3°, 5496 (iii).

G.T.P. Bonds, Guaranteed, available for Prairie Section (Ques.) 2589 (ii).

G.T.P., Eastern Div., Expenditure *re* Loans, &c. (Ques.) 4634 (iii).

—— Lands sold along Route, Prices, Names, &c.: (M. for ret.*) 352 (i).

—— (Ques.) 143 (i).

—— Papers, &c., Printing of (remarks) 2950 (ii).
See "Expenditures."

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Harbour and River Works, Piers, &c., Procedure *re* Construction by day labour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2513 (ii).

House of Commons, Additional Wing, Cost *re* Construction, Disposal of Rooms, &c. (Ques.) 140 (i).

—— Expenditure for Deptl. Labour (Ques. 2149 (ii).

House of Commons, Additional Rooms (remarks) *re* answer to Ques., 170 177 (i).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6094 (iv).
See "Civil Service."

Imperial Conference, on Production of Cor. (remarks) 7069 (iv).

Imperial Defence (remarks) on M. for 3° of Supply Bill, 7081 (iv).
See "Naval."

Imports and Exports of Merchandise for 1908, &c. (Ques.) 4288 (iii).

"Industry" Dredge, Cor., Reps., &c., *re* Purchase, Removal, Repair, &c. (M. for copies*) 826 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6789 (iv).

Insurance Bill, Progress in Senate (remarks) 7069 (iv).

I.C.R., on Annual Statement (remarks) 2678 (ii).

—— Branch Lines Extension, on prop. Res (Mr. Emmerson) 2197 (ii).

—— Commission, Appointments since its creation, Places, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).

—— Employees, Dismissed or suspended for 1908, Names, Dates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3055 (ii).

—— Inquiry for ret., 4641 (iii).

I.C.R. Employees Strikes Dispute, Rep. of Commission (remarks) 289 (i).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Earnings and Working Expenses Monthly, &c. (Ques.) 162 (i).

—— Total Working Expenditure and Receipts, Amount of Capital Expenditure (Ques.) 5641 (iii).

Interior Clerks, Names, Salaries in Outside Service, Increase after June 1st, Resignations, &c. (Ques.) 532 (i).

—— Expenditure *re* Increases (Ques.) 1064 (i).
See "Supply—Civil Govt."

International Waterways Commission: *See* "Waterways".

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Supply, 3832 (ii).

—— Ques. of Order *re* "Manipulation of Trust Funds," 3849 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Japanese Treaty, ref. to in debate on Address, 46 (i).

Johnston, Capt., Repayments of Moneys *re* Str. "Hestia" (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 6889 (iv).

Kingston Military Buildings, on Ques. of Order, 2496 (ii).

"Lady Evelyn" Str., Purchase Price, Repairs, &c., (Ques.) 144 (i).

Lake Simcoe and Newmarket Canal, Cor. *re* Construction, &c. (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).

Letter Carrier Systems in Cities, Regulations *re* Apptmts. (Ques.) 5158 (iii).

Loans negotiated from 1st Jan., 1907, O.Cs. Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 685 (i).

——— Inquiry for Rets., 1561 (i); 4125 (iii).

Loan falling due on Nov. 1, 1908, Disposition of (Ques.) 147 (i).

Loans, Temporary, Details of $20,606,333 for Jan., 1909 (Ques.) 1408 (i).
See 'Govt. Loans.'

Major's Hill Park Hotel, Title *re* Land, &c. (Ques.) 147 (i).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3953 (ii).

Marconi Stations, Construction, Maintenance, Amounts paid (Ques.) 177 (i).

Marine Investigation by Judge Cassels, Expenditure, Legal Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 167 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchase of by Tender, &c. (Ques.) 168 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 3044 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2818 (ii).

Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4390 (iii).

——— Reading of Original, on Ques. of Order to Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 4260 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 4362 (iii).

——— Reading of Original Document (remarks) 4299 (iii).

——— Dredging Contract, ref. to in debate on Govt. Tenders, 227 (i).

——— Dredging Contract, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Emmerson) 276 (i).

Militia Expenditures by Public Works Dept. from 1896 to 1909 (Ques.) 2379 (ii).

Mines and Minerals, on M. (Mr. Congdon) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 6919 (iv).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1851 (i).

Minister of Inland Revenue, Information *re* Election (remarks) 13 (i).

'Montcalm' Str., Total Cost of Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 168 (i).

N. T. Ry. Employees, &c., Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 4801 (iii), 6919 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Natural Resources, Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6368 (iv).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G.B. (prop. Res.) 3484 (ii).

——— Notice of Motion, 482 (i), 3202 (ii).

Naval Defence of Sea Coast, Interpretation *re* Res. of Hse. (Ques.) 4289 (iii).
See 'Imperial.'

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5226 (iii).

N. B. Central Ry. Commission, Rep., Printing, &c. (remarks) 4236 (iii).

——— Statement *re* (remarks) 4296 (iii).

——— Report (M.) to lay on Table, 5487 (iii).

——— Rep., O.Cs., &c. (M.) to lay on Table, 5624 (iii).

——— Rep., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 5681 (iii).

——— Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) 5699 (iii).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3162 (ii).
See 'Supply—Canals.'

New York Lubricant Co., Payments to (Ques.) 188 (i).

Old Age Annuities Act, Number of Employees, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 141 (i).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1029 (i); in Com., 5566 (iii).

Patronage List, Abolition of, Comn. to Judge Cassels (remarks) 876 (i).

Penitentiaries and Prison Labour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 904 (i).

Political Partizanship: *See* 'Govt. Employees.'

——— Report, (M.) to lay on Table, 5487 (iii).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4247 (iii); in Com., 6314 (iv).

Post Office Apptmts., Incorrect Ret. (remarks) 1023 (i).

Preston, W. T. R., Transfer to Holland (remarks) 6000 (iv).

Prisoners Paroled or Pardoned, Cost of Ret., &c. (Ques.) 673 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of *re* 'Special Trains,' Ques. of Order (Mr. Conmee) 4291 (iii).

Protection of Coast Line and Sea-ports, &c., Notice of prop. Res., 482 (i).
See 'Naval.'

Prudential Life Ins. Co.: *See* 'Security.'

Public Works Dept., Salaries, O.C. *re* Increases (Ques.) 1074 (i).

Pugsley, Mr., and Mayes Affidavit: *See* 'Mayes,' 'N.B. Central.'

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Quebec Bridge Co., Payments to Stockholders, &c. (Ques.) 163 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 353 (i).
Quebec Tercentenary, Amounts subscribed, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1721 (i).
Ry. Act (electric power) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1122 (i).
Railway Act (general) Amt. B. 106 (Mr Graham) on M. for 2°, 6194 (iv).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 1°, 92 (i).
Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on motion for 3°, 522 (i).
Railway, Two-Cent Fares, Refunds by G.T. Ry., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com of Sup., 2912 (ii).
Restaurant Committee, H. of C., Interim Rep. (remarks) 402 (i).
——— on M. to adopt 2nd Rep. 401 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, 1718 (i), 2128, 2218, 2493, 2674, 3110 (ii).
Royal Canadian Mint, Total Cost, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1:6 (i).
——— Amount of Silver, &c. (M. for ret.*) 352 (i).
Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2802 (ii).
St. John Harbour Contract, Payments to G. S. Mayes *re* Dredging (Ques.) 1181 (i).
———Dredging Contracts, Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 1917 (i).
——— Date of Beginning of Work, Contracts with Companies, &c. (Ques.) 2:58 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Manufacture of Church Pews (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 901 (i).
Salvation Army Council Bill 142 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6068 (iv).
Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5644 (iii).
Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr Aylesworth) in Com., 1124 (iv).
Security Life Insurance Co. of Canada B. 188 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 6783 (iv).
Seed Grain Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 144 (i).
Seed Grain Vote, Distribution, Details of (M. for ret.*) 352 (i).
S.A. Volunteers Land Grants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6277 (iv).
——— Number issued, Sale of by Govt. Employees &c. (Ques.) 143 (i).
Statistical and Special Information Publications, Number issued by Depts., Costs, &c. (M. for ret.*) 157 (i).
Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) on Order for Com., 4592, 4595 (iii).
Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3983

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Supplies for Marine and Pub. Works Depts., Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 141 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture (cold storage for fruit) 6983 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (cement) 1536 (i).
Canals—Trent (construction) 3178 (ii); (Holland River) 1888 (i).
Canals—Welland (gate-lifter) 2036 (ii); (Port Colborne) 1903 (i); (Port Maitland) 2030; (repairs) 2034 (ii); (widening) 1903
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (experimental farm) 6982 (iv).
Civil Govt.—External Affairs (salaries) 7064 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 971 (i).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (electrical branch) 445; (salaries) 431, 444; (travelling expenses) 447; (weights and measures) 447 (i).
Civil Govt.—Interior (outside service) 6284; (salaries) 6248 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 440 (i).
Civil Govt.—Marine (contingencies) 3702; (salaries) 3688 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 3673 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 3666 (ii).
Civil Service Commission (printing) 7065 (iv).
Dom. Lands (advertising) 6285; (Hydrographic survey) 6284; (maps, &c.) 6289 (iv).
Excise (inspectors, salaries) 436; (stamps, &c.) 437; (tobacco stamps) 448; (travelling expenses, &c.) 437 (i).
Fisheries (commissions) 6957; (international commission) 6960; (transportation, &c.) 6956; (Young, W. S., compensation) 6982 (iv).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 7012; (agents in G.B.) 7014 (iv); (gen. vote) 5832 (iii).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (blankets, &c.) 976; (medical attendance) 976; (schools) 976 (i).
Inland Revenue (collection of duties) 448 (i).
Interior (astronomical surveys) 6263; (buffalo herds) 6991; (park reservations) 6991; (St. Mary's and Milk River diversions) 6268 (iv).
Legislation (members indemnity) 7066 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 6889; (St. John property) 6915; (salaries) 6889 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) conc., 7074
Marine (biological station) 6953; (dredging plant, &c.) 6885 (iv); (fisheries conference) 3696 (ii); (hydrographic surveys) 6917 (iv).
Marine—Public Works (piers on St. Lawrence) 6888; (St. Lawrence ship canal) 6878; (Sorel ship yard) 6885 (iv).
Metric System (lectures) 454 (i).
Militia (ordnance) 2308; (salaries) 2271, 2306 (ii).
Mines (assay office, B. C.) 7063; (ore tests) 7063 (iv).
Miscellaneous (conservation commission) 7064; (Hague Tribunal) 7057; (Parliamentary Companion) 7064 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
N. W. M. P. (compensations) 3664; (force) 3656 (ii).
Penitentiaries—Dorchester (electric light plant) 884; Generally (salaries) 886; (supplies) 888 (i).
Post Office (inspectors' salaries) 1650 (i).
Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (rents, &c) 3672 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Partridge Island water service) 3206 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1254 (i); (clerk of works) 3225; (electric lighting) 3226; (elevators) 3228; (grounds) 3225; (H. of C., additions) 3204 (ii); (new bldg.) 1250 (i); (Rideau Hall) 3233 (ii); (Royal Mint) 1272 (i), 3205; (telephones) 3229 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 1299 (i); (Quebec citadel) 3213; (Sherbrooke) 3223 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3224 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2511 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John tidal waters) 3240 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2338; (Little Current) 3234; (Sandy Cove) 3235; (Scotch Cove) 3234 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Naufrage pond) 2509; (Tignish) 2510 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 2512; (Batiscan) 3274; (Bonaventure) 3277; (Cap St. Ignace) 2523; (Chicoutimi) 2523; (Clarke City) 2527; (Laprairie) 3287; (Nicolet) 3246; (Riviere du Loup) 3284; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 3287; (St. Francis du Lac) 3286; (St. Helen's Island) 3245; (St. Michel Yamaska) 3262; (Saguenay dredging) 2802, 2887, 3285 (ii).
Railways—G.T.P. (Brunet, A.) 2042; (inspection) 2048; (Quebec bridge) 2050 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (board of commissioners) 6986 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 2931; (Chatham) 2946; (Drummondville) 2949; (facilities) 2948; (Halifax) 2935; (Moncton cut-off) 2921, 2922; (Moncton shops) 2946; (original construction) 2925; (Riviere du Loup) 2949; (St. Rosalie) 2948; (Sackville) 2935; (Sydney Mines) 2936; (water supply) 2947 (ii).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 2055; (litigation, &c.) 2055; (unforeseen items) 2054 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (litigation) 2056; (maintenance) 2044 (ii).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 452 (i).
Yukon Govt. (roads, &c.) 6273 (iv).
Conc., Reading of Items (remarks) 4018 (iii).

Thos. L. Smith, Patent Relief, B. 71 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 3°, 2578 (ii).

Toronto Old Fort, Reclamation of Land from Park, Blackwell Co., Restoration, &c. (Ques.) 3984 (ii).

—— Pets. *re* Transfer, &c. (remarks) 4122 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Toronto, Old Fort, Condition of, &c. (remarks) 6415 (iv).
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Inquiry for Ret., 6412 (iv).
See 'G.T.P.'
Trent Canal: *See* 'Newmarket.'
Two-cent Rate on Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Two Cent' &c.
Water-powers, Leases of Canals, Records of &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2037 (ii).
Waterways Treaty, N. B. Fisheries, Regulations *re* (remarks) 1245 (i).
Ways and Means (sugar) in Com., 5100 (iii).
Weights and Measures *re* Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3613 (ii).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2134 (ii).
Wharfs: *See* 'Govt. Harbours.'
Yukon Ordinances (beer tax) on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 5894 (iv).
——in Com. on Res., 7076 (iv).

FOWKE, Mr. F. L., *South Ontario.*
Canada Line SS. Service with Germany. Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 2589 (ii).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4533 (iii).
Oshawa Port, Customs Collector (remarks) 2673 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture (cold storage) 3191 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Whitby) 1535 (i)

FRASER, Mr. A. L., *Kings, P.E.I.*
Budget, The, 4980 (iii).
Elmira and Harmony Ry., P.E.I., Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 1243 (ii), 6787 (iv).
Fish Island Lightkeeper, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 6786 (iv).
Georgetown Marine Agent, Name, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 3194 (ii).
Greenfield, P.E.I., Post Office, Removal of, &c. (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
Harmony-Elmira Branch of P.E.I. Ry., Tenders *re* Construction (Ques). 1243 (i).
See 'Elmira.'
Ice-Breaker for Northumberland Straits, Name of Contractor, Price, &c. (Ques.) 674 (i).
Ice-Breaking Steamers, Reps. *re* Superannuation of Officers and Crews, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 1472 (i).
Lobsters Licenses in P.E.I., Number issued. Pets, &c. (Ques.) 1076 (i).
Lorne Valley, P.E.I., Tenders *re* Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 5776 (iii).
McDonald, Lauchlin, Resignation as Lightkeeper of East Point, P.E.I., Apptmt. of Successor, &c. (Ques.) 3194 (ii).

FRASER, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*

Naufrage Pond Protection Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2461 (ii).

Panmure Island Wharf, Purchase of Right of Way, &c. (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

Pictou and Magdalen Mail Service, Contract, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3047 (ii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication with the Mainland, on M. (Mr. Warburton) 6465 (iv).

'Stanley' and 'Minto' Strs., Names and Residences of Officers (Ques.) 674 (i).

Sturgeon Pier, P.E.I., Tenders, Contracts *re* raising, &c. (Ques). 1241 (i).

SUPPLY.

Arts: Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5949 (iv).

Fisheries (bait freezers) 6950; (fish curing) 6952 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—P. E. I. (Souris) 6534 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E. I. (bridges) 2508, (Graham's Pond) 2507 (Naufrage pond) 2508; (Port Vernon) 2511; (Sturgeon pier) 2510 (ii).

Railways—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 2959; (Harmony—Elmira branch) 2952; (Montague) 3420; (Souris) 3418 (ii).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

Cabano Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 122) 1°*, 3802 (ii); in Com., 4839 (iii).

Catholic Church Extension Society Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 1°*, 6083 (iv).

Label, Mr. Achille, Application for Pet. of Right *re* I. C. R. (Ques.) 3253 (ii).

Railway Mail Clerks, Furois, Dorais and Wathen, Dates of Examinations for Promotion, &c. (Ques.) 3253 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2371 (ii).

Tadousac and Riviere du Loup Winter Navigation (Ques.) 344 (i).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Vercheres.*

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) on Senate Amts. 5485 (iii).

Hart-Otis Car Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 92) 1°*, 2019 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 4799 (iii); in Com., 6567 (iv).

Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 738; 2° m., 1147 (i).

St. Maurice and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 2° m., 6083 (iv).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Dredges owned by Govt., Number, Construction, Price, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2596 (ii).

Fort Erie and Buffalo Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 69) 1°*, 1318 (i); in Com., 3403 (ii).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*

Preston, W. T. R., Complaints from Japan, *re* Work, &c. (Ques.) 480 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 393 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Michel, Yamaska) 3268 (ii).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6396 (iv).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., (M.) to conc., 1474 (i).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 510 (i).

G. T. P., Montreal Branch, Agreement, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).

——— Commission, Names of Employees, Residence, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 826 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal of Employees (Ques.) 874 (i).

——— Promises *re* Wharfage Dues, &c. (Ques.) 874 (i).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) M. to adj. debate, 1469 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal postal station) 1308 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Helen's Island) 3243 (ii).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 44) 1°*, 626; in Com., 1685, 1719, 1858, 1862 (i); 2058, 2129 (ii).

Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amount due Govt. *re* Booms, &c. (Ques.) 4222, 4891 (iii).

Chicoutimi Wharf, Expropriation of Land, Prices paid, &c. (Ques.) 4222 (iii).

Colonization and Repatriation Society, Lake St. John, Detailed Statements of Expenditures (M. for ret.*) 3991 (ii).

Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 865 (i).

Labour Hours for Workingmen, on M. (Mr Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5933 (iv).

Saguenay River Booms, Construction of by Govt. (Ques.) 4222 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 2904; (Saguenay dredging) 2878 (ii).

GLADU, Mr. J. E. O., *Yamaska.*

Budget, The, 4774 (iii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3925 (ii).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S., *Kootenay.*

Address, The, 111 (i).
B.C. Ry. Belt Lands, Settlers' Titles, &c. (Ques.) 1727 (i).
Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5472 (iii).
Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5216 (iii).
Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2850 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1943 (i).
'Farm Weeds' Book, Number distributed, Names, &c. (Ques.) 2757 (ii).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5276 (iii).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 1°*, 290 (i).
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. (amt.) 3411, 3605 (ii).
Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1847 (i).
Olin, Chas., Total Payments *re* Visits to Sweden (Ques.) 871 (i).
—— Rep. (M. for copy*) 881 (i).
S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations (remarks) 2229 (ii).
Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4540 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 594 (i); Post Office (salaries) 721 (i).
Civil Service Commission (salaries) 710 (i).
Post Office—Miscellaneous (ry. mail clerks) 3432 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents) 1617; Ottawa (Royal Mint) 1282 (i).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *East Kent.*

Fruit Marks Act, Regulations *re* Inspection, on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6815 (iv).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s (B. 119) 1°*, 3703 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 3187; (fruit transportation) 3187 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1368 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 3297; (Sydenham) 3324 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. Geo., *Nipissing.*

Abitibi and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 66) 1°*, 1318 (i).
Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1758 (i).

GORDON, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*

Dokis Indian Reserve, Payment for Berths, Lapses, &c. (Ques.) 542 (i).
Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665, 1706 (i).
G. T. P. Ry., Dismissal of Engineers, Names, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).
Lake Nipissing and Monetteville Canal, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1559 (i).
Lake Nipissing Floods, Claims of Settlers, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).
Latchford Dam on Montreal River, Contract *re* (Ques.) 543 (i).
—— Cor. with T. & N. O. Ry. Commission (read) in Com. of Sup., 3320 (ii).
Natural Resources, Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6381 (iv).
New Liskeard Wharf, Construction *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2553 (ii).
Nipissing Indian Reserve, Open for Settlement (Ques.) 684 (i).
North Bay Post Office Inspector, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 1558 (i).
Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 2538 (ii).
Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2795 (ii).
Sturgeon Falls and Sudbury Public Buildings, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).
SUPPLY—
Indians—Generally (relief) 1168 (i).
Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 894 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Bridgewater) 1285; (Guysborough) 1288; (Shelburne) 1292 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1362; (R. M. College) 1384 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (telephones) 1609 (i); 3232 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 1295 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Lake Nipissing) 3310; (Latchford dam) 3320; (Bonaventure) 3283; (Gaspé) 2553; (Lake St. Francis) 2555 (ii).
Railways—G.T.P. (Quebec Bridge) 2053 (ii).
Water Powers, Leases on Canals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2041 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P., (Minister of Railways and Canals), *Brockville.*

Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re* Rails, &c. (Ans.) 336 (i).
Aylen, Mr. J., Emplymt. by Transcontinental Ry. (Ans.) 5096 (iii).
Belleville Drill Hall, Acquisition of Land, Ownership of Officers Quarters, &c. (Ans.) 818 (i).
Bills of Lading, Jurisdiction by Ry. Commission (Ans.) 1179 (i).
Birdsalls Landing Wharf, Rice Lake, Cost of &c. (Ans.) 825 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*

Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry., Stockholders, Freight and Passenger Rates &c. (Ans.) 3473 (ii).

Buell, Mr., Legal Work on Ry. Commission *re* Express Companies, 3002 (ii).

Campbell, Bush, Emplymt. on Trent Canal (Ans.) 1066 (i).

Canada Eastern Ry., Original Price, Value, Expenditure, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 2149, 2580 (ii).

——— Corrected Answer, 3363 (ii).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 2061 (ii).

Canadian Medical Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Roche) in Com., 4843 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Subsidy (B. 186) 1°*, 6292; in Com., 6739 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 3409 (ii).

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 38 (Mr. Geoffrion) on Senate Amts., 5486 (iii).

C. P. R., Additional Stock, Distribution, &c., on M. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 421, 1326 (i).

——— on M. for Sup. (remarks) 784 (i).

——— Ref. to Courts (remarks) 883 (i).

——— Law Suit (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2920 (ii).

C. P. R. Gimli Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2965 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 3157 (ii).

See 'G. T. P. B. 25.'

Canadian Railways, Improved Service (remarks) on M. for Sup., 632 (i).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 11 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 986 (i).

Carillon and Grenville Canals, Number of Employees from July to Oct., 1907-8 (Ans.) 1396 (i).

Carillon Dam Water Power, Leace of, &c. (Ans.) 1557 (i).

Cataract Water-power Supply, Leases (explanation) in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).

Cattle Guards, Killing of Live Stock, &c. (Ans.) 680 (i).

——— Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1724 (i).

——— Failure of Companies to erect (Ans.) 1409 (i).

Cement Contract to W. G. Hartsanft Cement Co., Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 3985 (ii).

Civil Service Salaries Increases B. 187 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2° (remarks) 6343 (iv).

Coast Line and Seaports Protection, prop. Res. (remarks) 549 (i).

Cochrane Town Site and G. T. P., Interference *re* (Ans.) 2586 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*

Dickie, Alfred, Payments to *re* Damages by Fire (Ans.) 1075 (i).

Dominion Atlantic Ry., Examination by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).

Dredge on Lake Winnipeg, Expense *re* moving 'Mikado' from Sandbar (Ans.) 869 (i).

Election Expenses in North and South Ontario, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2588 (ii).

Elmira and Harmony Branch Ry., P. E. I., Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 1243 (i), 6787 (iv).

Falconer, Mr. R. S., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 332 (i).

Fenelon Falls Lockmaster, Payments to, Allowances, &c. (Ans.) 1068 (i).

Foret, Land leased to N. & A. Bourbonnais, Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 2591 (ii).

Fort Erie and Buffalo Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. German) in Com., 3404 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal and Welland Canal Enlargements (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).

Gillis, Angus, Compensation *re* Injuries on I. C. R. (Ans.) 6089 (iv).

Govt. Railways Act (damages) Amt. (B. 20) 1° m., 241; 2° m., 770; in Com., 771 (i).

G. T. P., Advertisements for Tenders *re* Ties, &c. (Ans.) 6091 (iv).

——— Amount of Guaranteed Bonds of N. T. R., Western Div., &c. (Ans.) 1339 (i).

——— Branch Lines, Plans *re* Orillia Branch (Ans.) 1077 (i).

——— Branch to Montreal, Agreement, Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 816 (i).

——— Contracts for North Bay Section, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 820 (i).

——— Cost per Mile (remarks) 2494 (ii).

——— Dismissal of Engineers, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).

——— Disputes with N.T.R. *re* Classification, &c. (Ans.) 2322 (ii).

——— Eastern Div., Expenditures *re* Loans (Ans.) 4634 (iii).

——— Employees, Total Number, Nationality, &c. (Ans.) 249 (i); 3042 (ii).

G.T.P. Lake Superior Branch Subsidy B. 30 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 1025; in Com., 1718 (i).

G.T.P. and C.P.R., Ft. William, B. 25 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 1718 (i).

G.T.P. Lake Superior Branch, Number of Miles completed (Ans.) 4287 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5110, 5117; in Com., 5291, 5309; on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to M. for 3°, 5617 (iii).

G.T.P., Mileage Construction of N.T. Ry., Average Cost per Mile (Ans.) 1184 (i).

G.T.P. and N.T.R. Classification, Reference *re* (Ans.) 4899 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*
G.T.P., N.B. Section, Estimated Cost (remarks) 2384 (ii).
——— Papers, on Inquiry for, 2773 (ii).
——— Prairie Section Contracts, Name of Contractors, &c. (Ans.) 3987 (ii).
——— Ry. Commissioners, Revised Stmnt. as to Cost (Ans.) 1056 (i).
——— Resignation of Mr. Morse, Action of Govt. *re* (Ans.) 345 (i).
——— Tenders, on Inquiry for Ret., 4801 (iii).
——— Total Expenditure to Feb., 1909, of Winnipeg-Moncton Section, &c. (Ans.) 3704 (ii).
——— Unpaid Wages, Claims of Stationmen, &c. (Ans.) 5629 (iii).
——— Western Div., Number of Miles completed, Payments by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1398 (i).
——— Winnipeg Terminal Site, Negotiations *re* Purchase (Ans.) 1071 (i).
G. T. Ry., Level Crossings, Cost of Protection, &c. (Ans.) 1914 (i).
Guysborough Public Works, Amount of Appropriation Expended (Ans.) 819 (i).
Halifax and Southwestern Ry. Subsidy, Negotiations *re* Construction (Ans.) 1561 (i).
Harmony-Elmira Branch of P.E.I. Ry., Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 1243 (i) 6787 (iv).
Harvey-Salisbury Railroad incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 776 (i).
Highways, Removal of Planks, &c. (remarks) 1022 (i).
Holland River Canal, Deputation *re* Construction (Ans.) 2153 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1915 (i).
——— Land Valuators, Remuneration, &c (Ans.) 2591 (ii).
——— Rep. *re* Flow of Water (Ans.) 473 (i).
——— Tender for Section 1, &c. (Ans.) 3251 (i).
See 'Trent,' &c.
Hudson Bay Ry., Total Expenditure, Number of Employees (Ans.) 1056 (i).
Hudson Bay Surveys, on M. (Mr. Meighen) for Ret., 685 (i).
Hungry Bay Dike, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 349 (i).
I.C.R., Applications *re* Running Privileges (Ans.) 351 (i).
——— Board of Management, Apptmt. of (remarks) 4803 (iii).
——— Branch Lines, Rep. *re* Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 351 (i).
——— Branch Lines, on M. for Rep. (Mr. Emmerson) 882 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Branch Lines Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2216 (ii).
——— Branch Lines Rep., Printing of (remarks) 875 (i).
——— Branch Lines Report, on Inquiry for, 664, 1718 (i).
——— Classification of Employees, Hours of Labour, &c. (Ans.) 1723 (i).
——— Double Tracking, Survey *re* at Amherst, &c. (Ans.) 529 (i).
——— East Bound Traffic, Percentage, &c. (Ans.) 529 (i).
——— Employees at Moncton, Number, &c. (Ans.) 331 (i).
——— Employees, Classification, Clerks Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 2157 (ii).
——— Frauds, Suspension of Officials (remarks) 2673 (ii).
——— Freight Clerks Betterments, Govtl. Intention (Ans.) 1561 (i).
——— Freight Clerks Disputes, Settlement of (Ans.) 247 (i).
——— Freight Clerks Dispute, Rep. of Commission (remarks) 289 (i).
——— Freight Clerks, Settlement *re* Arbitration (remarks) 2128 (ii), 6686 (iv).
——— Freight Clerks, Investigation *re* Labour Disputes (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3260 (ii).
——— Freight Clerks, Disputes, Letter of Dep. Min. of Rys. *re* Award of Board (Ans.) 4698; Cor., &c. (read) 4698 (iii).
——— Freight Employees, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 3568 (ii).
——— Freight Earnings in Cape Breton, Ticket Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 5632 (iii).
——— Motor Cars, Total Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 1720 (i).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Employees Provident Fund (B. 164) 1° m., 5248 (iii)
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Earnings and Working Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 162 (i)
——— Earnings and Expenditures for Oct. 1907 and year 1908 (Ans.) 243, 1415 (i).
——— Number of Employees each month for 1908 (Ans.) 1173 (i).
——— Receipts and Working Expenditures, Amount of Capital Expenditure (Ans.) 5641 (iii).
I.C.R., Proposal *re* Leasing or Sale, &c. (Ans.) 164 (i).
——— Printing and Stationery, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2374 (ii).
——— St. Ignace Station, Requests *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 3476 (ii).
——— Special Mail Trains, Instructions *re* Speed (Ans.) 872 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Truro Station, Erection of (Ans.) 824 (i).
——Truro Staff, Number employed, &c. (Ans.) 329 (i).
—— Truro Staff, Number employed for Sept., Oct., Nov. and Dec. (Ans.) 244 (i).
—— Wallberg Contract, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3475 (ii).
See 'Govt. Rys.'
Kingston Penitentiary, Dep. Warden's Residence, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 2589 (ii).
Lachine Canal Repairs, Cement Contracts (explanation) in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).
Lakefield Wharf, Amount of Expenditure, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 1063 (i).
Lake Nipissing Floods, Claims of Settlers, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).
Level Crossing Accidents Ret., on Inquiry for (remarks) 1117 (i).
Level Crossings on Rys., Number of Accidents, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 549, 1321 (i).
See 'Railways,' &c.
Loggie, W. S. Co., Payments to *re* Ry. Contracts (Ans.) 668 (i).
London and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3847 (ii).
McKenzie, Calvin, Emplymt. on I.C.R., &c. (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
Madoc-Eldorado Branch Ry., G.T. Bonus *re*, &c. (Ans.) 245 (i).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3845 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6078 (iv).
Mileage of Ry. Construction, from 1888 to 1908, &c. (remarks) 1076 (i).
Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 180 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 6629 (iv).
Mossy River Dredging, Expenditure of Appropriation, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 816 (i).
N.T. Ry (Red River bridge)—(B. 153) 1° m., 4798; in Com., 5235 (iii).
See 'Aylen.'
Nation River Drainage, Cor. O. Cs, &c., on M. (Mr. Broder) for Ret., 687 (i).
Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3114 (ii).
Newmarket Canal to Lake Wilcox, Construction, Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 5157 (iii).
See 'Holland,' &c.
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1045 (i); in Com., 5565 (iii), 5970 (iv).
Passengers Ticket Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. J. D. Reid) on M. for 2°, 552 (i).
Payne, J. Lambert, Duties, Salary, Hours of Work, &c. (Ans.) 1727 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*
Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract Price, Extras, &c. (Ans.) 818 (i).
Port Bruce Harbour, Amount of Expenditure (Ans.) 818 (i).
Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 2531 (ii).
Prudential Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr.) Macdonell) in Com., 5485 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Progress *re* Rebuilding. Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 165 (i).
—— Payments to Stockholders, &c. (Ans.) 163 (i).
—— Res. *re* Submarine Viaduct, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2321 (ii).
Railway Act (fires) Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 378 (i).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (prop. res.) 2323; in Com. on Res., 2384 (ii); 2°m., 6186; in Com., 6200, 6293; on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to M. for 3°, 6312; on Senate Amts., 7068 (iv).
Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 3°, 521 (i).
Ry. Act (telephones wires) Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Barr) on M. for 2°, 879 (i).
Railway Act (water powers, &c.) Amt. (B. 21) 1° m., 242; 2° m., 1117, in Com., 1118 (i).
Railway Aid in Alberta, Representations *re* (Ans.) 676 (i).
Railways in Alberta and Sask., Number of Miles in Operation (Ans.) 3049 (ii).
Railways and Canals (annual statement) on M. for Sup., 2675 (ii).
—— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1318 (i).
—— Deptl. Rep., on Inquiry for, 1250 (i).
—— Payments to Mr. J. A. Lussier, &c. (Ans.) 3990 (ii).
Ry. Capitalization of Stock, Regulations by Commission (remarks) 1187 (i).
Railway Commissioners, Pet. *re* Vacancy (Ans.) 529 (i).
Railway Commission Vacancy, Apptmt, of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2665 (ii).
Railway Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 289 (i).
Railway Crossings, Width of Openings, &c. (remarks) 3568 (ii).
Ry. Employees Provident Act Amt. (B. 164) in Com., 6740 (iv).
Ry. Lands Expropriation, Complaints *re* (remarks) 4802 (iii).
Railway Level Crossings, Accident near Kingston (remarks) 252 (i).
Railway Level Crossings, Cor. with Ry. Commissioners (remarks) 291 (i).
—— Legislation *re* (remarks) 1978 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*

Railway Level Crossings, Prevention of Accidents, on prop., Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1208 (i).

Railways in Saskatchewan, Number of Miles in Operation from 1896 to 1903 (Ans.) 3475 (ii).

Railway Subsidies Act Amt. (B. 174) 1° m., 5628 (iii); in Com., 6741 (iv).

Railways, Two-Cent Fares, Refunds by G. T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2917 (ii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 3111 (ii).

St. Johns Wharf, P.Q., Contract *re* Wharf Extension (Ans.) 2768, 2770 (ii).

St. Pierre River Drainage, Flooding, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) 4234 (iii).

Soulanges Canal, Expenditure *re* Repairs, Suspension of Mr. A. Sauve (Ans.) 1404 (i).

——— Number of Employees, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 869 (i).

Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 778 (i).

Steel Cars, Introduction of by I. C. R. (Ans.) 481 (i).

Stellarton Station, I. C. R., Area *re* Concrete Walks, &c. (Ans.) 5631 (iii).

Stony Lake Property, Damages *re* Floods (Ans.) 825 (i).

Stony Lake Wharfs, Nomber, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1064 (i).

Sturgeon Falls and Sudbury Public Buildings, Purchase of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3983 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Beauharnois (water power) 1910 (i).

Canals—Carillon and Grenville (Carillon dam) 3421; (macadamizing road) 2029; (St. Anne's lock) 2029; (repairing dam) 2029 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (St. John harbour) 1571; (surveys) 1910 (i).

Canals—Cornwall (repairs) 2029; (washout repairs) 2029 (ii).

Canals—Galops (bridges) 2029 (ii); (collector) 1574 (i).

Canals—Generally (staff and repairs) 2071 (ii).

Canals—Lachine (basin No. 2) 1910 (i); (slope walls) 3420 (ii); (cement testing) 792; (wharfs and basins) 786, 1563 (i).

Canals—Miscellaneous (surveys) 2055 (ii).

Canals—Rideau (bridges) 2030; (improvements) 3420 (ii).

Canals—St. Lawrence (district office) 1572 (i).

Canals—Sault Ste Marie (construction) 1909; (dredging) 1909 (i).

Canals—Soulanges (fireproof building) 1569; (slope trimmings) 1569 (i).

Canals—Trent (construction) 1577 (i), 2074, 3177; (dredging) 2030 (ii); (Holland river) 1578, 1887 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Welland (bridges) 2036 (ii); (electric plant) 1903 (i); (gate-lifter) 2036; (junction locks) 2036 (ii); (Port Colborne) 1903 (i); (Port Maitland) 2030; (repairs) 2034 (ii); (surveys) 1909; (widening) 1903 (i).

Civil Govt.—Railways (salaries) 462; Sec. of State (salaries) 460 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wolfe Island) 3313 (ii).

Railways—G. T. P. (Brunet, A.) 2042; (inspection) 2048; (Quebec bridge) 2050 (ii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 2960 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Aston track scale) 3415 (ii); (board of commissioners) 6986 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 2931; (Campbellton) 2951; (Chatham) 2946; (double tracking) 2753; (Drummondville) 2949; (Eastville) 2951 (ii); (extension) 6557 (iv); (facilities) 2947; (Gibson siding) 3418; (Halifax) 2935; (Loggieville) 2753; (machinery for shops) 2952; (Moncton cut-off) 2921; (Moncton shops) 2946; (original construction) 2925; (Point Tupper) 2951; (Rivière du Loup) 2949; (rolling stock) 2952; (Ste. Rosalie) 2948; (Sackville) 2934; (Sydney Mines) 2936; (Truro) 2754; (water supply) 2947; (Windsor) 3421; (working expenses) 3421 (ii), 6985 (iv).

Railways—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 2054; (litigations, &c.) 2055; (Quebec bridge) 3421; (unforeseen items) 2054 (ii).

Railways—N.T.R. (surveys, &c.) 6985 (iv).

Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 2959; (Harmony—Elmira branch) 2952; (Montague) 3420; (Souris) 3418 (ii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (litigation) 2056; (maintenance) 2044 (ii).

Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 454 (i).

Telegraph and Telephone Tariffs, Regulations by Ry. Board, &c. (Ans.) 2764 (ii).

Telephone Companies, O.C. *re* Control by Ry. Commission (Ans.) 1072 (i).

Telephone Lines crossing Railways, Applications, Refusals, &c. (Ans.) 335 (i).

Telephones, Provincial, Control of by Ry. Commission (Ans.) 1419 (i).

Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Smyth) in Com., 6063 (iv).

Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 2065 (ii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commission Officials, Ret. (remarks) 2494 (ii).

——— Rep. (presented) 289 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., La Tuque Yard, Site (remarks) 6292 (iv).

Trent Canal, Damages through Peterborough County (remarks) 5777 (iii).

——— Land Damages, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 4641 (iii).

Waterways Extension to Georgian Bay, &c. (Ans.) 474 (i).

See 'Holland,' 'Supply—Canals.'

GRAHAM, Hon. Geo. P.—*Con.*

Wallberg, Mr., Claims *re* Moneys due him (Ans) 3989 (ii).

Water Powers leased on Canals, &c., Records &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2038 (ii).
See 'Ry. B. 21,' 'Ont. & Mich.'

Welland Canal Employees, Number for Sept. and Oct. (Ans.) 470 (i).

——— Number of Employees, Total Salaries, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 815 (i).

——— Total Cost, Tonnage, &c. (Ans.) 2155 (ii).
See 'Georgian.'

Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 779 (i)

Williams, Thos., I.C.R. at Moncton, Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 331 (i).

Wire Fencing purchased during 1908, Tenders, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 245 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 1321 (i).

Vautelet, H. A., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 1412 (i).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 766 (i).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5473 (iii); in Com., 6012 (iv).

Committee, Standing Orders, on M. to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 2120 (ii).

Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving Prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) (amt.) 199 (i); Amt. agreed to (Y. 118; N. 76) 580 (i).

Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 465 (i); in Com., 2571 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5960 (iv).

Private Bills, Payments of Fees, 14th Rep. of Com. (M.) 4986 (iii).

Railways and Canals, Tel., &c., 14th Rep. of Com. (M.) 4986 (iii).

Ridout, John Grant Relief (B. 121) 1°*, 3802. (ii).

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) 2223 (ii).

Smith John Denison Relief (B. 157) 1°*, 4988 (iii).

Winnipeg Bank (B. 158) 1°*, 4988 (iii).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2132 (ii).

HAGGART, Mr. A., *Winnipeg.*

Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 76) in Com., 2578 (ii).

Cedar Rapids Mfg. & Power Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Boyer) in Com., 3405 (ii).

Coal and Timber Lands owned or leased by Private Individuals, Corporations, Revenue collected, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1420 (i).

HAGGART, Mr. A.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Winnipeg Terminal Site, Negotiations *re* Purchase (Ques.) 1070 (i).

Great West Permanent Loan Co.'s incorp. (B. 40) 1°*, 626 (i); in Com., 2569 (ii).

Imperial Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 76) 1°*, 1479 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6805 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt., Customs (Board of Customs) 584 (i).

Indians—Ont. (legal expenses) 994; Ont. and Que. (schools) 978 (i).

Indians—Sask. (farm implements) 1004 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 1548; (Winnipeg P. O.) 1550 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont (Burlington piers) 2967 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. John, *South Lanark.*

Annuities Act, Number of Applicants, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 3477 (ii).

C.P.R. Additional Stock, Distribution of, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 424, 1326 (i).

——— Ref. to Court (remarks) 883 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, on M. for Com. on Res., 299; in Com. on Res., 409 (i).

Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1748 (i).

External Affairs Dept., on prop. Res. (Mr. Murphy) 1999 (i).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4415 (iii).

Govt. Railways Act (compensation) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 775 (i).

Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 200 (i).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3579 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5141; in Com., 5256, 5495 (iii).

G.T.P. Lake Superior Branch Subsidy B. 30 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 1024 (i).

G.T.P., Original Quantities, &c. (remarks) 2772 (ii).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6116 (iv).

Insurance Act B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6693 (iv).

I.C.R. Branch Lines, Extension, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2196 (ii)

I.C.R. (reply) to Annual Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2709, 2720 (ii).

Mayes Affidavit, Reading of Original, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1036 (i).

HAGGART, Hon. John—*Con.*

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6323 (iv).

Ry. Act (electric power) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1118 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2330 (ii); in Com., 6216 (iv).

Railway Commission Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2637 (ii).

Railway Level Crossings, Prevention of Accidents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1229 (i).

St. Pierre River Drainage, &c., on M. (Mr Monk) 4235 (iii).

Supply, Conc., Reading of Items (remarks) 4048 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Chambly (St. Johns' harbour) 1571 (i).

Canals—Galops (bridges) 2029 (ii).

Canals—Lachine (cement) 794, 1567; (concrete wall) 1569; (wharfs and basin) 1565 (i).

Canals—St. Lawrence (district office) 1573 (i).

Canals—Soulanges (slope trimming) 1569 (i).

Canals—Trent (dredging) 2030 (ii).

Canals—Welland (Port Maitland) 2031; (repairs) 2034 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 644 (i).

Printing and Stationery (salaries) 805 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Partridge Island water service) 3208 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 1356 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1255; (Royal Mint) 1273 (i).

Public Works—Harbour and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Anne des Monts) 3287; (St. Michel, Yamaska) 3269 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (Brunet, A.) 2042; (inspection) 2048; (Quebec Bridge) 2050 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 2931; (Moncton cut-off) 2921 (ii).

Waterways Treaty, Despatch from Col. Sec. of State (remarks) on M. for Sup., 642 (i).

Waterways Commission Treaty, on M. (Mr. Magrath) to Com. of Sup., 6607 (iv).

Welland Canal, Lease to Cataract Power Co. &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).

HARRIS, Mr. Lloyd, *Brantford.*

Budget, The, 4653 (iii).

I.C.R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 2750 (ii).

Patterson, Mildred Gwendolyn Relief (B. 143) 1°*, 4411 (iii).

HARTY, Mr. Wm., *Kingston.*

SUPPLY.

Canals—Generally (staff, &c.) 2072 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wolfe Island canal) 3304 (ii)

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4454 (iii).

Budget, The, 4814 (iii).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 148 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4438 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on Order for Com., 3411 (ii).

——— on M. to dschg. Order (remarks) 4472 (iii).

——— on M. to place on Order Paper, 5093 (iii).

——— on M. for Com., (M.) to ref. back to Special Com., 5129, neg., 5414 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 6006 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 3410 (ii).

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Dubeau) on Senate Amts., 4594 (iii).

Coal conserved for the Home Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 3109 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1955 (i).

Fishery Regulations, Action of Ontario Govt. &c., on M. (Mr. Taylor) 6528 (iv).

Fisheries Regulations *re* International Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6977 (iv).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1655, 1696 (i).

French Treaty (remarks) 7071 (iv).

See 'Canada and France.'

Govt. Loans B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6711 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6183 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 2125 (ii).

Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6725 (iv).

Labour Hours for Working Men, on M. (Mr. Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5945 (iv).

Lake Ontario Fishing Industry, Regulations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 381 (i).

Loans: *See* 'Government.'

London and Lancashire Plate Glass Co.'s Bill (remarks) 4445 (iii).

London and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3846 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3946 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6076 (iv).

N.B. Central Ry. Commission's Report, on M. (Mr. Foster) to lay on Table, 5488 (iii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5560 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 241; in Com., 746 (i).

Private Bills, Extension of Hour for considering, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5774 (iii).

Ry. Employees Provident Act Amt. B. 164 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6741 (iv).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2798 (ii).

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2221 (ii).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4542 (iii).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3965 (ii).

Supply Bill, Amendments by Senate (remarks) 4120 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 699 (i); (live stock industry) 5849 (iii); (swine commission) 6985 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s (salaries) 383 (i).

Civil Govt.—Charges of Management, 399 (i).

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 387 (i).

Civil Govt.—Customs (Board of Customs) 581 (i).

Civil Govt.—Finance (salaries) 384 (i).

Civil Govt.—High Commissioner (contingencies) 386; (salaries) 385 (i).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 381 (i).

Immigration (agents) 7025 (iv).

Indians—Ont. (legal expenses) 993 (i).

Legislation (members indemnity) 7066 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (fisheries conference) 3694 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Bridgewater) 1286; (Glace Bay) 1288; (Shelburne) 1292 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1369; (Whitby) 1518 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture) 1605; (heating) 1601; (Major's Hill) 1601 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont (bridges, repairs) 2968; (Burlington piers) 2966 (ii).

Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 2065 (ii).

Ventilation and Fire Escapes of New Wing (remarks) 6781 (iv).

Ways and Means (sugar) in Com., 5099 (iii).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4201 (iii).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Macleod.*

Alberta and Saskatchewan Annual Allowance, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 2588 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. McIntyre) in Com., 3161 (ii).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 11 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 986 (i).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Coal Royalty, Total Amount paid to March 31st, 1908 (Ques.) 2588 (ii).

Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of (remarks) 5352 (iii).

Elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, Govt. Operation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 4035 (ii).

'Free Press,' Man., Payments to, Inquiry for Ret., 1978 (i).

Grazing Leases, Total Acres, Annual Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3703 (ii).

Homesteads, Volunteer Substitutes *re* Duties (Ques.) 1078 (i).

Hudson Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 43) in Com., 2067 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6181 (iv).

Immigration Inspectors, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1406 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 2160 (ii).

Immigration of Undesirables into Canada, Payments *re* (Ques.) 1406 (i).

Land Grants to Early Settlers in Man., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).

Peigan Indian Agency, Surrender of Land (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

Pincher Creek Post Office, Complaints *re* Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).

Railway Commission, Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2667 (ii).

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations (remarks) 2224 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (methylated spirits) 451 (i).

Interior (boundaries) 6266 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Lethbridge) 1551 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Victoria, immigration) 2084 (ii).

Public Works—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 1620 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Whitby) 1522 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Old Man River) 3336 (ii).

Timber Lands, Alberta, Revenue due and payable, &c. (Ques.) 3193 (ii).

Winnipeg 'Free Press,' Total Amounts paid by Govt., 1906-9 (M. for ret.*) 354 (i).

HODGINS, Mr. G. F., *Pontiac.*

Arnprior and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 1970 (i).

Cobalt Range Ry. Co.'s (B. 86) 1°*, 1813 (i).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 895 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*
Aerial Navigation, Experiments by Canadians (remarks) 2383 (ii).
American Immigration Agents, Duties *re*, &c. (remarks) 2243 (ii).
American Silver, Exportation of (remarks) 6780 (iv).
Beet Root Sugar Refineries, Duty *re* Preferential Tariff (Ques.) 3047 (ii).
Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4442 (iii).
Canned Meats, Contract called for by G. B. (Ques.) 1238 (i).
Fenelon Falls Lockmaster, Payments to, Allowances, Duties (Ques.) 1067 (i).
France and Canada SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4442, 5223 (iii).
Govt. Employees, Interference at Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6874 (iv).
Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4418 (iii).
G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3577 (ii); in Com., 5294 (iii); on prop. Res. (remarks) 4099 (iii).
—— on M. for 3° (remarks) 5522 (iii).
G. B. and Her Colonies: *See* 'Imperial Partnership.'
Homestead and Pre-emptions, in Man., &c., Number of Acres, &c. (Ques.) 1180 (i).
Hudson Bay Lands, Number of Acres homesteaded or pre-empted (M. for ret.*) 1421 (i).
Imperial Partnership of G.B. and her Colonies (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).
I.C.R. Branch Lines, Rep. of Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Emmerson) for Copy, 882
—— (remarks) *re* prop. Res., 2162 (ii).
Kingston Military Buildings, Excessive Expenditure (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2506 (ii).
Mayes Affidavit, Ques. of Order, 4262; on Ques. of Order, 4283 (iii).
—— on Reading Original (remarks) 4298 (iii).
—— Ques. of Order, 4326 (iii).
Militia Annual Training, Completion of Plans, &c. (Ques.) 682 (i).
Militia, Permanent Corps, &c., Winter Equipment, &c. (Ques.) 2376 (ii).
Mine Owners and Miners, Percentage of British Origin (remarks) 4121 (iii).
Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1845 (i).
Miniature Rifles, Targets, Supplies, &c., Extending to Colleges, &c. (Ques.) 681 (i).
Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3143, 3172 (ii).
See 'Supply—Canals.'

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
N.W.M. Police, Land Scrip, Refusal of Grants (Ques.) 1066 (i).
Oshawa Customs Collector, Name, &c., Acquisition by Govt. (Ques.) 2372 (ii).
—— incorrect answer (remarks) 2672 (ii).
—— Revenue, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1972 (i).
Oshawa Harbour, Apptmt. of Officials by Govt., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 3046 (ii).
Oshawa Harbour Purchase, Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 1918 (i).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4238 (iii).
Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 743 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Conmee) *re* 'Special Trains,' on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 4292 (iii).
Ry. Act (electric power) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1118 (i).
Railways and Canals (remarks) on Annual Stmnt., 2683 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Use of at Bisley (remarks) 5644 (iii).
Royal Military College Water Supply, Defects, &c. (Ques.) 682 (i).
Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2795 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Manufacture of Church Pews (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 901 (i).
Sanitary School of Technology, Govt. Aid *re* (remarks) 6061 (iv).
S.A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) 2226 (ii).
S.A. Veterans Land Grants, Conditions of Entry, &c. (Ques.) 1179 (i).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 778 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 727 (i).
Canals—Generally (staff, &c.) 2072 (ii).
Canals—Lachine (wharf and basins) 789 (i).
Canals—Trent (construction) 2074, 3177 (ii); (Holland River) 1902 (i).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 1904 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 651; Post Office (salaries) 722; Railways (salaries) 463 (i).
Civil Service Commission (salaries) 720 (i).
Immigration (agents) 7014; (G. B. agents) 7020; (St. Boniface hospital) 7034 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 6889 (iv).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship canal) 6877 (iv).
Militia (salaries) 2293 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff roads and bridges) 1171; (Banff water works) 1172 (i).
Penitentiaries—Dorchester (supplies) 918; Generally (supplies) 897 (i).
Pensions (N.W. rebellion) 812; (Mrs. Wilmot) 884 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Printing and Stationery (salaries) 806 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Chilliwack) 2091; (Prince Rupert quarantine) 2082; (Vancouver) 2082; (Victoria immigration) 2083 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 1596 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston Vet. hospital) 1534 (i); (Port Arthur) 2092 (ii); (R.M. College) 1533; (Whitby) 1526 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1269; (Major's Hill) 1603; (Royal Mint) 1271 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec citadel) 3212 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3225 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews rapids) 2106 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2511 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Cow Bay) 2471; (generally) 2118; (Middle River) 2478; (Sandy Cove) 2475; (South Lake, Lakevale) 2483; (Wallace bridge) 2484 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Tiffin) 2116; (Victoria) 2117 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Saguenay dredging) 2807 (ii).
Railways—G.T.P. (Quebec bridge) 2052; Miscellaneous (McGill school) 2071 (ii).

University Drill Corps, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 683 (i).
Ventilation and Fire Escapes of New H. of C. Wing (remarks) 6781 (iv).
Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 779 (i).
Whitby Harbour, Acquisition by Govt., Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 2372 (ii).
Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4160 (iii).

JAMESON, Mr. C., *Digby.*

Aids to Navigation on N.S. Coast, Applications *re* Personal Inspections, &c. (Ques.) 5640 (iii).
Budget, The, 4717 (iii).
Fairy Lake Indian Reserve, N.S., Conditions of Lease, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 2816 (ii).
Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 486 (i).
Fisheries Officers at Port Joly, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 4697 (iii).
Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6124 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6184 (iv).
Little River Wharf, Amount expended, Estimated Cost. (Ans.) 476 (i).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*

Sandy Cove Breakwater, Amounts owing for Labour, &c., Names, &c. (Ques.) 1728 (i).
—— Payments to Contractors (Ques.) 1419 (i).
Sissiboo River Bridge, Construction, &c., on M. for Sup., 6834 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 728 (i).
Civil Govt.—High Commission (contingencies) 386 (i).
Fisheries (commissions) 6957; (customs licenses) 6958; (fish breeding establishments) 6946; (international commission) 6961; (oyster culture) 6949; (protection cruiser) 6947; (transportation) 6956 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 6909 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries (hospitals) 6946; (hydrographic surveys) 6916 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 3438 (ii).
Marine—Public Works—(piers on St. Lawrence) 6888 (iv).
Pensions (Fenian raid) 812 (i).
Post Office (ry. mail clerks) 3433 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 1293 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 1300; (Montreal postal station) 1316; (Quebec) 1317 (i).
Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6534; (Mar. Provs.) 6553 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis Ice Piers) 2360; (Arisaig) 3233; (Baileys Brook) 3234; (Cheverie) 2456; (Church Point) 2457; (Clark's Harbour) 2462; (Digby) 2474; (Little River) 3234; (Minasville) 2479; (Sandy Cove) 2475, 3236; (South Lake, Lakevale) 3235; (Upper Prospect) 3235; (Yarmouth) 2484 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (extensions) 6557 (iv).

Westport Landing Pier (remarks) in Com of Sup., 2457 (ii).
—— Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 475 (i).
Weymouth P. O., Change of Name, &c. (M for cor.*) 3055 (ii).
Weymouth River Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2360 (ii).
Wood and Wood Pulp, Negotiations *re* Tariff Increase (Ques.) 1241 (i).
Yarmouth Harbour Buoys, Displacement of (remarks) on M. to adjn., 1114 (i).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Moosejaw.*

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2867 (ii).
Joliette and Lake Manuan Ry. Co.'s B. 126 (Mr. Dubeau) in Com., 4836 (iii).
Kootenay and Alberta Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 133) 1°*, 4286 (iii).
Prairie Fires, Relief *re* (remarks) 6411 (iv).
S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) 2227 (ii).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 5873 (iii).

Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 37) 1°*, 465 (i); in Com., 2564 (ii).

KYTE, Mr. G. W., *Richmond, N.S.*

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 497 (i).

I. C. R. Branch Lines, Extension, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2188 (ii).

Investigations in Deptl. Expenditures by Justice Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3746 (ii).

LACHANCE, Mr. A., *Quebec Centre.*

Desjardins, Capt., Emplymt. by Marine Dept., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4696 (iii).

Hoffman, Mr., Emplymt. by Marine Dept., &c. (Ques.) 4696 (iii).

Royal Guardians incorp. (B. 95) 1°*, 2120 (ii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*

Budget, The, 5079 (iii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 3153 (ii).

Coal and Timber Lands, Approx. Area, Names of Owners, Amount of Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 1185 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1978 (i).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2845 (ii).

Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William, Govt. Operation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 4011 (ii).

Ewart, J. S., Emplymt. *re* Newfoundland Fisheries (Ques.) 5629 (iii).

Foley, T. P., Emplymt. in Interior Dept. (Ques.) 2320 (ii).

Govt. Employees, Interference at Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6867 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 224 (i).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5330 (iii).

Humboldt Election Officials, Payments to (Ques.) 1731 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6171 (iv).

Land Grants to Early Settlers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6276 (iv).

Qu'Appelle Electoral District, Voters' Lists, &c. (M. for copies*) 1191 (i).

Railway Commission, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2659 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order, 2663 (ii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Railways, Number of Miles in Operation in Saskatchewan from 1896 to 1908 (Ques.) 3475 (ii).

S. A. Veteran Land Grants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).

Strachan, A. A., Land Patent, Homestead Duties, Cor. (M. for copy*) 3992 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5952 (iv); (live stock industry) 5834 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 6247 (iv).

Dom. Lands (surveys, plans, &c.) 6273 (iv).

Indians—Generally (grist and saw mills) 1016; (inspectors) 1167; Man., &c. (live stock) 1005; Sask. (farm implements) 1002 (i).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 6994 (iv).

Northwest Mounted Police (force) 1660 (ii).

Post Office (letter carriers) 1698 (i).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 2960 (ii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*

American Immigration Agents, Duties to Canadians on Border (remarks) 2242 (ii).

Civil Service Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6325 (iv).

Civil Service Salaries on M. (Mr. Fisher) for Com. on Res., 298 (i).

Fruit Marks Act, Regulations *re* Inspection, on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3390 (ii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5252 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6797 (iv).

Nails, Quantity imported, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 2156 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5231 (iii).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

Piers, &c., constructed by Day Labour, Procedure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2519 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6210 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 5880 (iii).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 1905 (i); (Port Maitland) 2032 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 593 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Whitby) 1520 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton cut-off) 2924 (ii).

Timber Limit Regulations, Suspension, &c. (Ques.) 342 (i).

Welland Canal, Number of Employees, Total Salaries, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 815

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for (Mr. Henderson) to ref. back to Special Com., 5437; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5447; in Com., 5481 (iii), 6039 (iv).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1869

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 91 (Mr. Geoffrion) on Senate Amts., 5486 (iii).

Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1758 (i).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com. (amt.) 568 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4695 (iii).

Extradition Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5236 (iii).

G.T.P., B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5185; in Com., 5272 (iii).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6099 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses to Societies, Names, Amounts (Ques.) 1406 (i).

International Waterways Commission, on M for Sup., 6630 (iv).

Level Ry. Crossings: *See* 'Ry. Bills.'

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3951 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6078 (iv).

Mayes-McAvity, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4277 (iii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary, on M. (J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 154 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6575 (iv).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5228 (iii).

Niagara Ice Jam, Action of Govt. *re* Assistance (remarks) 4703 (iii).

N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) 5689 (iii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1049 (i); in Com., 5304, 5369 (iii), 5967 (iv).

Passengers Ticket Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Reid) on M. for 2°, 554 (i).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4249 (iii).

Preston, Mr. W. T. R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6657 (iv).

Prudential Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 5484 (iii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 6195; in Com., 6293; on M. for 3° (amt.) 6302; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 100) 6310 (iv).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Railway Act (fires) Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 376 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 1°, 92 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 93; 2 °m., 374; 3 °m., 521 (i).

Railway Act (water-powers) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 242 (i).

Railway Level Crossings, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1218 (i).

Salisbury and Harvey Railroad Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1363 (i).

Salvation Army Council B. 142 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6069 (iv).

Senate, Abolition of (prop. res.) 1421 (i).

Smith, John Denison, Relief B. 157 (Mr. A K. Maclean) in Com., 6072 (iv).

Superior and Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3935 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Beauharnois (water-power) 1912 (i); Generally (staff, &c.) 2073 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 3677 (ii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7001 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (fisheries conference) 3688 (ii).

Militia (R.M.C. commandant) 6660; (supplies) 6668 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (patrol boats) 6682 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston. R.M.C.) 1507 (i).

Railways—G.T.P. (Quebec Bridge) 2051 (ii).

Railway—Miscellaneous (arbitration) 2054; (McGill school) 2071 (ii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (litigation) 2056, 2070; (maintenance) 2046 (ii).

Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Smyth) in Com., 6064 (iv).

Weights and Measures, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3685 (ii).

Welland Canal Employees, Number in Sept. and Oct., &c. (Ques.) 470 (i).

Yukon Act (judges) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5236 (iii).

LANCTOT, Mr. A,, *Richelieu.*

Investigation into Deptl. Expenditures by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3896 (ii).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*

Experimental Farming Stations, Establishment of (Ques.) 823 (i).

Experimental Farms, Location in Eastern Quebec, &c. (prop. res.) 1925 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G., (Prime Minister), *Quebec East.*

Address, The (M.) 12 (i).

Address, The, 33 (i).

—— (M.) to present, 139 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

All-Red Line, Negotiations *re* (Ans.) 148 (i).
—— on Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7070 (iv).
American Immigration Agents, Duties *re* Travellers (remarks) 2243 (ii).
Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 1320 (i).
Asiatic Exclusion from B.C., Telegram from Mr. Borden (read) in deb. on Address, 39 (i).
See 'Japanese,' 'Privilege.'
Bank of Montreal, Commissions *re* Debts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 399-400 (i).
Brazilian Electro Steel and Smelting Co.'s B. 10 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 1024 (i).
B.C. Increased Subsidy, Ref. to in debate on Address, 41 (i).
Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 3023 (ii), 5480 (iii), 5995, 6025 (iv).
—— on M. to place on Order Paper, 5094 (iii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5446 (iii).
Canned Meats, Contracts called for by G.B. (Ans.) 1238 (i).
Carleton and Comox-Atlin, Issue of Writ (remarks) 327, 401 (i).
Carter, Edward S., Emplymt. as Sessional Clerk (Ans.) 5095 (iii).
Cassels, Judge, Rep. *re* Marine Investigation, Discussion (remarks) 2219, 3003, 3249 (ii).
See 'Marine,' 'Investigations,' &c.
Central Ry. of N.B., Rep. of Commission *re* (remarks) 4125 (iii).
See 'N.B. Central.'
Cigarettes Legislation, &c. (Ans.) 246 (i).
Civil Service Act, Delay, &c. (remarks) 5895 (iv).
Civil Service Classification, Papers laid on Table, 325 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'
Civil Service Commissioners, on Inquiry for Rep., 874, 1023 (i), 2241, 3111 (ii), 4047 (iii).
Civil Service Salaries Increase B. 187 (Mr. Fisher) Salaries on M. for Com. on Res., 307; in Com. on Res., 1138 (i); on M. for 2°, 6338 (iv).
Coast Line and Seaports Protection, on Notice of prop. Res. (remarks) 549 (i).
See 'Imperial Defence,' &c.
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) to prepare List, 12 (i).
—— Rep. (presented) 325 (i).
—— (M.) to add Name, 664 (i).
Committees, Standing, Prop. Res. (Mr. Brodeur) Remarks, 1320 (i).
—— Change of Names (M.) 2217 (ii).
Comox-Atlin and Carleton By-elections, Discrepancy in Answers (remarks) 826, 874

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

Comox-Atlin, &c., Writs of Election (remarks) 327, 401 (i).
Conservation of our Resources: *See* 'Natural.'
Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 2°, 562 (i).
Daylight Saving Bill, on M. to place on Govt. Orders, 3203 (ii).
—— on M. (Lewis) to ref. to special Com., 3468 (ii).
Debt of Canada, Jan. 31st, 1909, Increase from 1908 (Ans.) 1079 (i).
Deptl. Payments *re* Marine Supplies (remarks) 2322 (ii).
Disallowance of Ont. Act, O.C. re (remarks) 4883 (iii).
Easter Adjournment (M.) 3705 (ii).
External Affairs Dept., on prop. Res. (Mr. Murphy) 1980 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Legislation *re* Bounty (Ans.) 3478 (ii).
Fishing Bounty Claims, Delay in sending Forms (remarks) 1187 (i).
Fisheries Convention with U.S., Reference to Hague Tribunal (remarks) 1395 (i).
Fisheries Jurisdictions and Provinces, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 2018 (ii).
Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ontario Govt. Legislation, on Ques. of Order, 6921 (iv).
Forest, Waterways, &c., on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6919 (iv).
France and Canada Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) prop. Res., 2017 (ii); in Com., 5223 (iii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Announcement *re* Signing (remarks) 140 (i).
—— Approval of Convention by France (Ans.) 149, 166 (i).
French Language on Govt. Works, Govtl. Intention *re* (Ans.) 249 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Pet. *re* Expenditure (remarks) 6415 (iv).
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays (Remarks) 3938 (ii), 4041 (iii).
—— (M.) to take in Wednesdays, 2017 (ii).
—— Saturday Sittings (M.) 5644 (iii).
See 'Morning,' &c.
Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4419 (iii).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5310; on M. for 3°, 5513 (iii).
G.T.P., Alleged Over-classification, Action taken by Govt. (Ans.) 178 (i).
—— Statmnt. of Mr. Wainwright *re* Inception (Ans.) 1561 (i).
G.T.R., Hotel Site, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 13 (i), 6412 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Grey, Earl, Extension of Time as Governor General (announcement) 5351 (iii).
Hecate Strait Status, Cor. with U.S. Govt. (remarks) 4882, 4990 (iii).
Hog Tariff from U.S. to Canada, Increase of (Ans.) 821 (i).
Homestead Pre-emptions, &c. (remarks) 1181 (i).
House of Commons Classification (M.) to conc., 6093 (iv).
See 'Civil Service,' &c.
Imperial Conference, Cor. laid on Table, 7069 (iv).
Imperial Defence, Action of Govt. *re* (remarks) 6942 (iv).
Imperial Defence, on M. for 3° of Supply Bill, 7082 (iv).
See 'Naval.'
Imperial Partnership with G. B. and Her Colonies, on Amt. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 6446 (iv).
Industrial Disputes Act, Discussion *re* (remarks) 4641 (iii).
Insurance Act Amt. (remarks) 1022 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 160 (i).
International Fisheries Commission, Names of Commissioners (Ans.) 1073 (i).
International Waterways Treaty with U.S., Change in Draft Treaty *re* Intersection of Islands (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1493 (i).
—— (explanation) 1562 (i).
—— Acceptance of U. S. Senate Amts. (remarks) 4472 (iii).
—— Conditional Ratification (remarks) 2336 (ii).
—— Date of Signing, Date of Receipt, &c. (Ans.) 1074 (i).
—— Delay in placing before Can. Parlt. (remarks) 175 (i).
—— Despatch from Colonial Sec. Earl of Crewe (read) 550 (ii).
—— Despatch from Colonial Sec. of State (remarks) on M. for Sup., 639 (i).
—— Discussion by Mr. Gibbons (remarks) 1563 (i).
—— Presentation of (remarks) 2494 (ii).
—— Publication of Newspapers (remarks) 1188 (i).
—— Ratification of by U. S., on M. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 1355 (i).
International Waterways Commission, on M. (Mr. Lancaster) to Com. of Sup., 6637 (iv).
—— N. B. Fisheries, Regulations *re* (remarks) 1245 (i).
—— Treaty, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7, 159, 292, 402 (i), 2019 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3848 (ii).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 3849 (ii).
See 'Cassels.'
Japanese Treaty with G. B., Date of Effect, Termination, &c. (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
King, Mr. Mackenzie, Total Amount paid *re* Visit to China (Ans.) 6407 (iv).
Labour Dept. (B. 165) in Com. on Res., 5350 (amt.) 5350 (iii); 2° m., 6712; in Com., 6717 (iv).
Labour Dept., Appmt. of a Minister (Ans.) 186 (i).
Lindsay Block, Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c. (Ans.) 681 (i).
Loans of Dec. 1907 and Oct. 1908, Information *re* (Ans.) 1075 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) conc., 7074 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Memorial (remarks) 2239 (ii).
—— Legislation *re* (Ans.) 530 (i), 3480 (ii).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3962 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6073 (iv).
Marconi Stations, Construction, Maintenance, &c., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchases of, Names of Individuals (Ans.) 3044 (ii).
See 'Deptl.' &c.
Marine Investigation, Prosecutions *re* (Ans.) 153 (i).
—— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 167 (i).
—— on Inquiry for Rep., 7 (i).
See 'Cassels.'
Mayes Affidavits, Reading of Original, on Ques. of Order to Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 4262 (iii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4386 (iii).
—— Dredging Contract, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Emmerson) 277 (i).
Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1848 (i).
Minister of Inland Revenue, Information *re* (remarks) 14 (i).
'Montcalm,' Str., Total Cost of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 168 (i).
Morning Sittings (M.) 5159 (iii).
See 'Govt. Business.'
Natural Resources of Can., Conservation of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 371 (i).
—— on Order for rsmnd. debate (remarks) 688 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Natural Resources of Canada, Special Com. (M.) 1556 (i).
—— on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6367 (iv).
Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3504; (amt.) 3512; Amt. to Amt., 3564 (ii).
—— Interpretation of Res. in Hse. (Ans.) 4289 (iii).
See 'Imperial,' &c.
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) on Amt. (Mr. Conmee) to M. for 3°, 6129 (iv).
N. B. Central Ry. Commission's Report, on M. (Mr. Foster) to lay on Table, 5488 (iii).
—— (objections) 5624 (iii).
N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, and Hon. Mr. Pugsley, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5646 (iii).
—— Rep., Printing, &c. (Ans.) 4236 (iii).
—— Statement *re* (remarks) 4296 (iii).
Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3169 (ii).
N. W. Mounted Police Barracks, Transfer of Grounds to Ry. Corporation, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).
N. W. M. P. Land Scrip, Refusal of Grants, &c. (Ans.) 1066 (i).
N. W. Rebellion, 1885, Grants to N. W. M. P., &c. (Ans.) 184 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°* *pro forma*, 9 (i).
Old Age Annuities Act, Number of Employees, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 142 (i).
Ontario and Manitoba Boundaries, Decision *re* (Ans.) 1075 (i).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1042 (i); in Com., 4535, 5304, 5364, 5567, 5964 (iii); on M. for 3°, 6003 (iv).
Oriental Immigration into B. C., Inaccuracy of Answer (remarks) 1249 (i).
—— Res. of Provl. Govt. *re* Royal Commission, Corrected Answer, 1976 (i).
See 'Asiatic.'
Penitentiaries and Prison Labour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 903 (i).
Post Office Savings Banks Deposits, Rates of Interest (Ans.) 1067 (i).
Potatoes sold in Bags, Statute *re* Measurements (Ans.) 352 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Complaints from Japan *re* Work, &c. (Ans.) 187, 480 (i).
—— Transfer to Holland (remarks) 5999 (iv)
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).
Private Bills, Amendments to Rules of House (M.) to conc., 6120 (iv).
—— Apptmt. of Special Com. *re* Revising of Rules (M.) 5351 (iii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Private Bills, Extension of Hour, &c. (M.) 5774 (iii).
—— Payment of Fees, on M. (Mr. Guthrie) 4987 (iii).
Private Bills, Refund of Fees, on M. (Mr. Ethier) to conc. in 8th Rep., 5889, 5997 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of, Asiatic Exclusion, Tel. of Mr. R. L. Borden, 664 (i).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Ont. & Mich. B. 34.'
Prudential Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 5485 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., Delay in Organizing (remarks) 663 (i).
—— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1189 (i).
Public Works, Hours of Labour B. 35 (Mr. Verville) on M. to dschg. from Order Paper, 4990 (iii).
Pugsley, Mr., and Mayes Affidavit: *See* 'N. B. Central.'
Pulp and Paper Duties, Negotiations with U. S. (remarks) 2384 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Report, French Translation, &c. (Ans.) 1722 (i).
Ry. Act (commissioners, &c.) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6296; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 6307 (iv).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 374; on M. for 3°, 527 (i).
Royal Guardians incorp. B. 95 (Mr. Rivet) on M. to consider, 7072 (iv).
Salvation Army Council B. 142 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6069 (iv).
Sanitary School of Technology, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 6061 (iv).
'Scotia,' SS., Subsidy Terms, &c. (Ans.) 4895 (iii).
Sec. of State, Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor (Ans.) 185 (i).
Speaker, Election of (M.) 2 (i).
Speaker, Dept., Apptmt. of (M.) 140 (i).
Specie Reserve, Date of last Inspection (Ans.) 869 (i).
Speech from Throne: *See* 'Address.'
Strathcona, Lord, Gift to Dom. *re* Training of School Children (M.) of Thanks (remarks) 3200 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Charges of Management, 399 (i).
Civil Govt.—Aud. General (salaries) 383; Civil Service Commission (salaries) 387; Finance (salaries) 384; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 398; High Commissioner (contingencies) 386; High Commissioner (salaries) 385; Privy Council (salaries) 398; Railways (consulting engineer) 386; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 385 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and G.B.) 6650; (Canada and Mexico) 6650; (Canada and Nfld.) 6651; (Canada and New Zealand) 6651; (Canada and

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

S. Africa) 6651; (contingent fund) 6655; (Gaspe) 6651; (Halifax and Canso) 6651; (Halifax and Nfld.) 6651; (Halifax and Spry Bay) 6652; (Magdalen Islands) 6652; (P.E.I. and C.B. and Nfld.) 6652; (Prince Rupert, B.C. and Jedway) 6652; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 6653; (St. John, Halifax and Yarmouth) 6654; (St. John and Minas Basin) 6654; (Victoria, &c., and Skagway) 6655 (iv).

N.W.M.P. (compensations) 3665; (maintenance of force) 3656 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 891 (i).

Pensions (Mrs. Wilmot) 883 (i).

Trade and Commerce (annuities administration) 6660; (Chinese administration) 6655; (commercial agencies) 6656 (iv).

Telegram *re* Exclusion of Asiatics from B.C. (read) in debate on Address, 39 (i).

Telephone Rates in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr Lennox) 1811 (i).

Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 3001 (ii).

——— Part II., Rep. (presented) 3936 (ii).

Trade Commissioner at Shanghai, Vacancy. Apptmt. (Ans.) 2320 (ii).

Tuck, ex-Chief Justice, Rep. *re* Offer of a Knighthood (Ans.) 154 (i).

Veterans of 1866, Land Grants to (Ans.) 668 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods (remarks) *re* placing on Govt. Orders, 6186 (iv).

Wood and Wood Pulp, Negotiations *re* Tariff Increase (Ans.) 1241 (i).

Yukon Ordinances (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7076 (iv).

——— (beer tax) on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 5894 (iv).

LAVERGNE, Mr. L., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*

Quebec and Oriental Ry. Co.'s (B. 138) 1°*, 4286 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Batiscan) 3274 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General) *Gaspe.*

Address, The, 80 (i).

Agricultural Industry, Number of Farmers, &c. (Ans.) 151 (i).

Alien Labour Act, Proposed Amts. (Ans.) 167 (i).

Black Lake Postmaster, Complaints, Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 4896 (iii).

Brighton and Campbellford Mail Route, Increase in Contract Price (remarks) 3155 (ii).

Brophy's Post Office, Name of Postmaster, Changes *re* (Ans.) 1186 (i).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—Con.

Burks Falls and Trout Lake Mail Routes, Contractors, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3196 (ii).

Canadian Economic Lubricant Co., Payments to (Ans.) 188 (i).

Cariboo Mail Service, Payments *re* (Ans.) 1731 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3426 (ii).

Carson, Mr. Geo., Emplymt. by P. O. Dept., Absences, &c. (Ans.) 4697 (iii).

Cassell's Report: *See* 'Investigations.'

Central Park, B.C., Mail Delivery, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 2590 (ii).

Chilliwack Post Office Site, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 1414 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 137) 1°*, 4253 (iii); in Com., 6324 (iv).

See 'Post Office,' &c.

Civil Service Salaries, in Com. on Res., 963 (i).

Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of (remarks) 4120, 5352 (iii).

Co-operative Societies, on M. for Sup. (remarks) 2331 (ii).

Dartmouth Post Office, Insufficient Accommodation (remarks) 3253 (ii).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2843 (ii).

Dorland and U. E. Loyalists Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 334 (i).

Envelopes, Complaints *re* Mutilation of through Mails (Ans.) 349 (i).

Etobicoke Postmaster, Apptmt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 671 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6754 (iv).

Experimental Farms and Agricultural Stations, Establishment of since Jan., 1908 (Ans.) 157 (i).

———Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1969 (i).

'Falcon' and 'Fearless' Strs., Purchase and Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 187 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1653 (i).

Franking Privilege *re* Campaign Literature, Names of Ministers (Ans.) 2585 (ii).

Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Names, Stage Routes, &c. (Ans.) 2585 (ii).

Gaspé-Perce Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 2596 (ii).

Glace Bay Mails, Contract *re* Collection (Ans.) 5775 (iii).

Glace Bay Post Office Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 5636 (iii).

Govt. Employees, Interference with Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6872 (iv).

Gowganda Postal Facilities (remarks) 1395, 1704 (i).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Siberian Labourers (Ans.) 4898 (iii).
—— Answer to former Question (remarks) 4989 (iii).
Greenfield, P.E.I., Post Office, Removal of, &c., (Ans.) 5776 (iii).
Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Pauqte) for Cor., 837 (i).
Imperial Partnership with G.B. and Her Colonies, on Amt. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
Industrial Disputes Act, Statistics *re* Number of Strikes (Ans.) 155 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. Bill, Progress in Senate (remarks) 7069 (iv).
I.C.R. Employees Strikes Dispute, Rep. of Commission (remarks) 290 (i).
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3917 (ii).
King, Mr. Mackenzie: *See* 'Supply—Labour,' &c.
Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6726 (iv).
Labour Hours for Working Men, 8-hour day, &c., on M. (Mr. Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5938 (iv).
'Lady Evelyn' Str., Purchase Price, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 144 (i).
Letter Carriers in Cities, Appmts. (Ans.) 5158 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Lévis Postmastership, Apptmt. of Successor to Mr. A. Lafrancois (Ans.) 4636 (iii).
Londonderry, &c., Mail Contracts, Name, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 825 (i).
Lorne Valley, P.E.I., Tenders *re* Mail Contract (Ans.) 5776 (iii).
Mackey's Station Post Office, Complaints *re* Management (Ans.) 545 (i).
Macleod Post Office, Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).
McKenzie, Mr. D., Resignation as Postmaster of Three Brooks, Apptmt. of a Successor (Ans.) 4640 (iii).
Mail Boxes purchased and entered free of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 548 (i).
Mail Service in Hyde Park Post Office, in Middlesex country, &c. (Ans.) 3251 (ii).
Mail and Stage Routes, Number of Miles, &c (Ans.) 481, 814 (i).
Malagash, N.S., Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5639 (iii).
Manufacturing Industries, Number of Employees (Ans.) 152 (i).
Meat and Canned Foods Act, Applications *re* Exemptions, Instructions, &c. (Ans.) 156 (i)

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

New York Lubricant Co., Payments to (Ans.) 188 (i).
North Bay Post Office Inspector, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1558 (i).
N.S. Mail Services, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1731 (i).
Owen Sound Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).
Piers, Wharfs, Construction by Day Labour, Procedure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2515 (ii).
Pictou to Magdalen Island Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3047 (ii).
Political Partizanship: *See* 'Govt. Employees.'
Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 12 (i).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. (B. 136) prop. Res., 3802 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4236 (iii); in Com., 6313 (iv).
See 'Civil Service.'
Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. (B. 19) 1° m., 241; in Com., 738 (i).
Post Office Apptmts., Incorrect Returns (remarks) 1023 (i).
Post Office Deposits and Interest Credits in Pass Books (Ans.) 4896 (iii).
Post Offices and Dom. Govt. Savings Banks, Distinction *re* (Ans.) 4897 (iii).
Post Office Orders and Postal Notes, Total Number issued payable in G.B. (Ans.) 1242 (i).
Post Office Payments to Mail Carriers, &c. *re* Newmarket and Aurora (Ans.) 1560 (i).
Post Offices in Peel County, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3046 (ii).
Post Office Revenues at Kingston, Brantford, Sherbrooke and Quebec, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 5633 (iii).
Queens and Sunbury, Mail Service established in Oct. 1908 (Ans.) 2375 (ii).
Railway Mail Cars, Unsuitability, &c. (Ans.) 3653 (ii).
Ry. Mail Clerks, Furois, Dorais and Wathen, Date of Examination, &c. (Ans.) 3253 (ii).
Railway Mail Clerks, Increase of Salaries (Ans.) 4223 (iii).
—— Number killed or injured, &c. (Ans.) 3476 (ii).
Railway Mail Service Increases, &c. (Ans.) 336 (i).
Roblin and Forest Mills Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 334 (i).
Rural Mail Boxes, Number delivered in Dufferin County (Ans.) 341 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2784 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment of in Grey County (Ans.) 672 (i).
——— in East Northumberland, &c. (Ans.) 3480 (ii).
——— Location of Routes, Non Delivery, &c. (Ans.) 347 (i).
——— Number of Routes, &c. (Ans.) 6409 (iv).
——— in Prince Edward County, Contract *re* (Ans.) 1077 (i).
——— Purchase of Boxes, Duty, &c. (Ans.) 179 (i).
——— System, &c. (Ans.) 148 (i).
——— Total Expenditure on Routes (Ans.) 677 (i).)
See 'Supply.'

St. John Postmaster, Superannuation, Appointment of Successor, &c. (Ans.) 871 (i).

St. Justine Station Mail Delivery, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

Ste. Philomène Mail Contract, Yearly Cost &c. (Ans.) 2770 (ii).

St. Polycarpe Post Office, Complaints *re* Officials, Change of Site, &c. (Ans.) 4894 (iii).

Sillsville and The Pines Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 333 (i).

Souris Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. J. Dolmage, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 1916 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6851 (iv).
See 'Govt. Employees.'

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 652; (salaries) 651; Post Office (contingencies) 725; (salaries) 613, 720 (i).

Labour Dept. (industrial disputes) 655 (i); (printing, &c.) 3433; Miscellaneous (opium conference) 3433 (ii).

Post Office (country postmasters) 1700; (inspectors' salaries) 1649 (i), 3431 (ii); (letter carriers) 1697; (mail carriers) 1653; (miscellaneous) 1716 (i); (miscellaneous stamps) 3432 (ii); (rural delivery) 1714 (i), 3423 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Doucet's Ianding) 2544; (Douglastown) 2547; (Father Point) 2548; (Gaspé) 2550; (Rimouski) 2558 (ii).

Sydney Free Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1708 (i).

Thedford, Arkona and Fort Frank Rural Mail Delivery, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 477 (i).

Tercentenary Postage Stamps, Total Amount *re* Sale (Ans.) 3654 (ii).

Winnipeg P.O. and Ry. Station Mail Contract, Tenders, Changes, &c. (Ans.) 870 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) 4452 (iii).

Agricultural Industry, Number of Farmers, &c. (Ques.) 151 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Alien Labour Act, Proposed Amts. (Ques.) 166 (i).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 760 (i).

Associated Press Despatches, Amount contributed, Supervision, &c. (Ques.) 331 (i).

Aylen, Mr. J., Emplymt. by Transcontinental Ry. (Ques.) 5096 (iii).

Bills of Lading Bill, Disussion re (remarks) 6918 (iv).

Bonaventure Public Works, Amount expended prior to 1900, &c. (M. for ret.*) 173, 353 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1320 (i), 2218, 3004 (ii).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4437 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3004 (ii), 5480 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Henderson) to ref. back to Special Com., 5437; (amt.) 5444; neg. (Y. 52; N. 103) 5478 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order, 5460 (iii).

Canadian, Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1719, 1868 (i), 2062 (ii).

Civil Service Salaries, on M. for Com. on Res., 300 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6393, 6756 (iv).

Disraeli Wharf, Number of Vessels calling, &c. (Ques.) 2761, 2816 (ii).

Dredging Contract of McAvity and Mayes, Recovery of Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 166 (i).
See 'Mayes.'

Dry Docks, Construction under Subsidies Act, Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 478 (i).
——— Annual Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 246 (i).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s Bill (remarks' on M. for Com. on Private Bills, 1362 (i).

Equity Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp B. 161 Aylesworth) in Com., 6626 (iv).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6749 (iv).

External Affairs Dept. B. 90 (Mr. Murphy) in Com., 4470 (iii).

Extradition Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5239 (iii).

Falconer, Mr. K., Total Payments to *re* Marine Bookkeeping, &c. (Ques.) 1729 (i).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ontario Govt. Legislation (M.) to Com. of Sup., 6920 (iv).

Franklin Montgomery Grav Patent Relief B. 132 (Mr. Rankin) in Com., 4883, 5028 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4427 (iii).

Govt. Loans B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6710 (iv).

Govt. Railways Act (compensation) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 774 (i).

G. T. P. Ry., Alleged Over-classification, Action by Govt. *re* (Ques.) 178 (i).

——— Disputes with N. T. R. *re* Classification, &c. (Ques.) 2321 (ii).

G. T. P., Lake Superior Branch Lines Subsidy B. 30 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 666 1025; in Com., 1365 (i).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5118; in Com., 5192, 5291, 5317 (iii).

——— on M. for 3° (remarks) 5527 (iii).

G. T. P. Ry. Co., and National Transcontinental Ry., Classification, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3055 (ii).

——— Reference *re* (Ques.) 4899 (iii).

G. T. P., Eastern Div., Itemized Schedules of Engineer's Estimates (M. for ret.*) 1923 (i).

——— Quantities of Work executed, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1923 (i).

——— inquiry for ret., 2773 (ii), 4801, 4990 (iii), 6060 (iv).

——— Mr. Wainwright's Stmnt. *re* Inception (Ques.) 1560 (i).

G. T. Ry. Level Crossings, Cost of Protection, &c. (Ques.) 1913 (i).

Harvey-Salisbury Railroad incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 2°, 775 (i).

Holland River Canal, Land Valuators, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 2591 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 3055 (ii).

——— at Newmarket, Tenders for Section 1, &c. (Ques.) 3253 (ii).

See 'Newmarket.'

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6098 (iv).

Immigrants, British to Canada, direct from Native Country, Number, &c. (Ques.) 1919 (i).

Immigrants, British Subjects prevented entering Can., &c. (Ques.) 478 (i).

Immigrants prevented from landing in Can., Nationality, &c. (Ques.) 478 (i).

Immigration Regulations, O.C., Application of, &c. (Ques.) 250 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6705 (iv).

Johnston, Capt., Repayment of Moneys from Str. 'Hestia' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6890 (iv).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com., 3472 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Level Crossing Accident Ret., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 1116 (i).

——— Number of Accidents, Inquiry for Ret., 548 (i).

See 'Rys.,' &c.

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) on Sen. Amts., 6075 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Book-Keeping, Result of Change in Method (Ques.) 1919 (i).

See 'Falconer.'

Mayes Affidavit, Reading of, on Ques. of Order to Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 4263 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 4315 (iii).

Mayes Dredging Contract at St. John, Conditions, Recovery of Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1174 (i).

——— Recovery of Moneys (Ques.) 153 (i).

Manufacturing Industries, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 152 (i).

Marine Investigation, Prosecutions *re* Judge Cassel's Rep. (Ques.) 152 (i).

Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 180 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 6629 (iv).

Montreal Woollen Mills, Closing *re* Tariff Laws (Ques.) 2591 (ii).

Natural Resources Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6366 (iv).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5228 (iii).

N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., (remarks) 5686 (iii).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3130 (ii).

See 'Supply—Canals.'

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4472, 4521, 5296, 5366, 5559 (iii), 5958; on M. for 3°, 6000 (iv).

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 741 (i).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 2530 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Conmee) *re* 'Special Trains,' 4292 (iii).

Prudential Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 5185 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Res. *re* Sub-Marine Viaduct, Construction of (Ques.) 2321 (ii).

Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 3°, 524 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2386 (ii); on M. for 2°, 6187; in Com., 6200 (iv).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 6123 (iv).

Railway Act (water-powers) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 242 (i).

Railway Level Crossings, Cor. with Ry. Commission (remarks) 291 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Railway Level Crossings, Legislation *re* (remarks) 1977 (i).

—— Number of Accidents, Time, Cause, &c. (M. for ret.*) 158 (i).

Railway Crossings, Methods adopted by Ry. Board, *re* Protection, Expenditures, &c. (M. for ret.*) 827 (i).

—— Preventions *re* Accidents (prop. res.) 1192 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 1320 (i), 6412 (iv).

Roof Garden, New Wing, H. of C. (remarks) 7074 (iv).

Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 63 (Mr. Ames) on Senate Amts., 6788 (iv).

Royal Casualty and Surety Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. H. H. McLean) in Com., 2575, 2717 (ii).

Royal Life Insurance Co.'s B. 177 (Mr. Sutherland) on M. for 1°, 5885 (iii); on M. for 2°, 6082 (iv).

Salvation Army Council B. 142 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6068 (iv).

Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1134 (i).

Souris Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6854 (iv).

S.A. Bounty Act, Regulation *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2219 (ii).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4541 (iii).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3845 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 1564 (i).

Canals—Trent (construction) 2074 (ii); (Holland River) 1897 (i).

Canals—Welland (repairs) 2034 (ii).

Fisheries (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 3451; (International Fisheries Commission) 3446 (ii).

House of Commons (salaries) 6775 (iv).

Indians—Man. (St. Peters, removal) 3462 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 6890 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (investigation) 3450 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 6671; (patrol boats) 6682 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents, &c.) 2075 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 1598 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (electric lighting) 1600; (elevators) 1599; (Major's Hill) 1602; (Rideau Hall) 1604 (i); (telephones) 3230 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 1592 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N S. (generally) 2118; (Yarmouth) 2486 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Tiffin) 2116; (Victoria) 2117 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 2512; (St. (Poupore, W. J., claims) 3361 (ii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 6543 (iv).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Poupore, W. J., claims) 3361 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton cut-off) 2925 (ii).

Railways—N.T.R. (surveys, &c.) 6986 (iv).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 6657 (iv).

Telephones in Can., Control of Rates, &c. (prop. res.) 1761 (i).

Telegraph and Telephone Tariffs, Regulations from Ry. Board, &c. (Ques.) 2764 (ii).

Telephone and Telegraph Special Com., of 1905, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 153 (i).

Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B 42 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 2063 (ii).

Transcontinental Ry., Inquiry for Ret., 6060 (iv).

See 'G.T.P.'

Tuck, Ex-Chief Justice, Rep. *re* Offer of a Knighthood (Ques.) 154 (i).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2132, 2136 (ii).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, 4126 (iii).

Woollen Mills, Number, Quantity of Can. Wool used, &c. (Ques.) 150 (i).

Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada for 1907, Duty, &c. (Ques.) 149 (i).

Vancouver Bank B. 52 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 2147 (ii).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *West Huron.*

Address, The, 128 (i).

Assaults and Offences (B. 88) 1°m., 1971 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, in Com. on Res., 410 (i).

Criminal Code (motors) Amt. (B. 60) 1°m., 952 (i).

Criminal Code (wife beaters) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 1°, 93; on M. for 2°, 561 (i).

Daylight Saving (B. 108) 1° m., 2491; 2° m., 3468; (M.) for Special Com., 3468 (ii).

—— Request to place on Govt. Orders, 3203 (ii).

Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 738 (i).

Load Line on Ships (B. 45) 1° m., 663 (i).

Ry. Act (sanitary conditions) Amt. (B. 111) 1° m., 3362 (ii).

Vessels, Govt. Inspection (B. 73) 1° m., 1319 (i).

Weapons, Offensive (B. 83) 1° m., 1716 (i).

Wireless Telegraphy on Ships (B. 74) 1° m., 1393 (i).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B*
Budget, The, 4974 (iii).
Experimental Farms, Location, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1945 (i).
Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 505 (i).
Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5909 (iv).
Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 282 (i).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 5588 (iii).
I. C. R., Branch Lines Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2214 (ii).
——— on Annual Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2746 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Railways—I. C. R. (Sackville) 2935 (ii).

LORTIE, Mr. J. A., *Soulanges.*
Foret, Land, Lease to N. & A. Bourbonnais, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 2591 (ii).
St. Polycarpe Post Office, Complaints *re* Officials, Change of Site, &c. (Ques.) 4894 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Amount expended for Repairs, Suspension of A. Sauve, &c. (Ques.) 1404 (i).
Soulanges County Wharfs, Repairs, Valuations, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3055 (ii).
Soulanges Island, Change of Name (Ques.) 2757 (ii).
Wharfs at St. Zotique, Amounts of Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1400 (i).

LOW, Mr. T. A., *South Renfrew.*
Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M (Mr. Lennox) 4218 (iii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*
Budget, The, 4991 (iii).
——— Remarks, 4746 (iii).
Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5460 (iii).
Canadian, Liverpool and Western Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1867 (i).
C. P. R., Issue of New Stock, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1324 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6401 (iv).
'Duty of the Hour' Pamphlet, Distribution of in Pictou (remarks) 26 (i).
Franklin Montgomery Gray Patent Relief B. 132 (Mr. Rankin) in Com., 4885 (iii).
G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 5556, 5575 (iii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6153 (iv).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6802, 6812 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Johnston, Capt., Repayment of Moneys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).
Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1855 (i).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5971 (iv).
P. E. I. Winter Communication with the Mainland, on M. (Mr. Warburton) 6462 (iv).
Prudential Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 5484 (iii).
Railway Act (fires) Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 377 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2341; (Cow Bay) 2469 (ii).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *South Toronto.*
American Barlock Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 123) 1°*, 4041 (iii).
American Fishing Vessels, Seizures, Courts of Trial Procedure, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).
Ammonal Explosives (1908) Patent Relief (B. 93) 1°*, 2120; 2° m., 2579 (ii).
Bank Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 1732 (i).
Canadian Red Cross Society's incorp. (B. 160) 1°*, 4988 (iii).
Coinage at Canadian Mint, Date of, Circulation, Profit, &c. (Ques.) 1401 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 16) 1° m., 160 (i).
Dredging Contracts in Ont. and Que. for 1907-8, Renewals, &c. (Ques.) 3049 (ii).
Electric Power exported at Niagara Falls, Names of Licensees, Taxation, &c. (Ques.) 345 (i).
Equity Fire Insurance Co. of Canada, incorp. (B. 161) 1°*, 4988 (iii); in Com., 6625 (iv).
France and Canada Commercial Treaty, Present Condition (Ques.) 4896 (iii).
Franklin Montgomery Gray Patent Relief B. 132 (Mr. Rankin) in Com., 5028 (iii).
Garrison Common, Transfer of Property to Exhibition Association, Delays, &c. (Ques.) 182 (i).
Govt. Deposits in Banks, Discrimination *re* &c. (Ques.) 245 (i).
Immigrant Agents in Canada, Locating Settlers, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2160 (ii).
Immigrants, Arrival for present year, Names, Addresses of Agents, in Canada, &c. (Ques.) 1404 (i).
Industrial Disputes Act Amt. (B. 113) 1° m., 3565 (ii).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Industrial Disputes, Discussion *re* (remarks) 4641 (iii).

—— Statistics *re* Strike, &c. (Ques.) 154 (i).

Insurance Commission, Omission of Evidence of British Actuaries, &c. (Ques.) 243 (i).

I.C.R. Station Freight Clerks Disputes, Settlement of (Ques.) 246 (i).

London and Lancashire Plate Glass Indemnity Co. of Canada (B. 27) 1°*, 290 (i); in Com., 2146 (ii).

Manitoba and Ontario Boundaries, Decision *re* (Ques.) 1074 (i).

Muir Memorial Fund, Request for Aid (Ques.) 5095 (iii).

N.W. Rebellion, 1885 Veterans, Grant to N. W. M. P. (Ques.) 184 (i).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5355, 5396 (iii), 5965 (iv).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4239, 4246 (iii); in Com., 6313 (iv).

Post Office Deposits and Interest Credits in Pass Books (Ques.) 4896 (iii).

Post Office Orders and Postal Notes, Total Number issued, payable in G.B. (Ques.) 1242 (i).

Potatoes sold in Bags, Measurements *re* (Ques.) 351 (i).

Prudential Trust Co., Limited incorp. (B. 91) 1°*, 2019 (ii); in Com., 5484 (iii).

Salvation Army Council B. 142 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6069 (iv).

Statutes for 1908, Delay in Publishing, &c. (Ques.) 183 (i).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3966 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Post Office (letter carriers) 1698 (i).

Pubic Works—Buidings—Ont. (Toronto barracks) 1505; (Toronto drill hall) 1504; (Toronto observatory) 1505 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Royal Mint) 3205 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto) 3317 (ii).

Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Smyth) in Com., Ques. of Order, 5575 (iii).

Toronto Barracks, Delay *re* Erection on Humber River Site (Ques.) 183 (i).

See 'Garrison.'

Toronto Harbour Works, Delay *re* Payments to Men (Ques.) 544 (i).

Toronto, New Post Office, Delay in Construction (Ques.) 336 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings, &c.) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2388 (ii); in Com., 6211, 6297 (iv).

Railway Mail Service, Increases, &c. (Ques.) 336 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Waterways and Boundaries Treaty and Welland Canal Enlargement (Ques.) 6292 (iv).

Waterways Treaty Commission, on M. (Mr. Magrath) to Com. of Sup., 6614 (iv).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K., *Lunenburg.*

Canadian, Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 2062 (ii).

Committees, Special, Ref. to of Deptl. Reps. (remarks) 2028 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6761 (iv).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6746 (iv).

Fisheries Convention, Reference to The Hague (remarks) 1395 (i).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 493 (i).

Geodetic Survey Bureau, Establishment of (M. for cor.) 3056 (ii).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4422 (iii).

Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 576 (i).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crothers) 574 (i).

House of Commons Elevators, Repairing and Running (remarks) 2337 (ii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3808 (ii).

Johnston, Capt., Repayment of Moneys from Str. 'Hestia' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6890 (iv).

Natural Resources of Can., Conservation of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 369 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 723 (i)

Fisheries (commissions) 6958; (customs licenses) 6960 (iv); (international fisheries commission) 3449; Miscellaneous (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 3460 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 6890; (lightkeepers salaries) 6981 (iv).

Marine—Dredging (plant, &c.) 6886 (iv).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 890 (i).

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Bridgewater) 1284; Ont. (Whitby) 1540; Ottawa (peat testing) 1502 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2346; (generally) 2118 (ii).

Telephone Companies, O.C. *re* Control by Ry. Commission (Ques.) 1072 (i).

Telephone Rates in Canada, Control of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1772 (i).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*

Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 2064 (ii).

Waterways Treaty, N.B. Fisheries, Regulations *re* (remarks) 1245 (i).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *South York, Ont.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 753 (i).

C.P.Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 3039, 3155 (ii).

C.P.R., Additional Stock, Distribution, &c., on M. for Sup., 416 (i).

——— O.C. *re* (M. for copy*) 685 (i).

——— O.Cs., &c. (read) 780 (i).

——— Ref. to Courts, &c. (remarks) 882 (i).

——— Remarks, on M. for Sup., 1321 (i).

Canadian Railways, Improved Service, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 626 (i).

Dominion Atlantic Ry., Examination by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2928 (ii).

Fisheries Development, Appmnt. of Select Com., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 491 (i).

G.T.P. Lake Superior Branch Lines Ry. Co.'s B. 30 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 1366 (i).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3612 (ii); in Com.., 5277, 5326 (iii).

Gowganda Mail Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1703 (i).

Harvey-Salisbury Railroad incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 2°, 777 (i).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6103 (iv).

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 740 (i).

Ry. Act (hours of labour) Amt. B. 72 (Mr. R. Smith) on M. for 1°, 1318 (i).

Railways Two-Cent Fare, Refund of Money by G. T. Ry., Letter *re* (read) 2911 (ii).

Smith, John Denison Relief B. 157 (Mr. Maclean) in Com., 6071 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Sec. of State (salaries) 461 (i).
Excise (methylated spirits) 450 (i).
Inland Revenue (electric power export) 455 (i).
Labour Dept. (industrial disputes) 658 (i).
Metric System (lectures) 454 (i).
Post Office (letter carriers) 1703 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Montreal river) 2975 (ii).

Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Smyth) in Com., 6065 (iv).

McALLISTER, Mr. D. H., *Kings and Albert, N.B.*

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1713 (i).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 280 (i).

McALLISTER, Mr. D. H.—*Con.*

I.C.R. Branch Lines Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2208 (ii).

Public Health Bureau, Establishment of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1101 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John surveys) 1642 (i).

Wells, Judge, Apptmt. in Westmoreland County, Absence with and without Leave, &c. (Ques.) 4897 (iii).

McCALL, Mr. A., *Norfolk.*

G.T.P. Loans B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5168 (iii).

St. Williams Landing Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3332 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 1284 (i).

Welland Canal, Total Cost, Tonnage, &c. (Ques.) 2154 (ii).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Banff Fish Hatchery, Establishment of, Representations *re*, &c. (Ques.) 871 (i).

Calgary Electoral District, Dep. Returning Officers, Scrutineers, &c. (M. for ret.*) 685 (i).

——— Voters' Lists, Copy (M. for copy*) 685 (i).

Coal Strike in the West, Settlement by Dept. of Labour (remarks) 5351 (iii).

Irrigation, Investigation *re* Water Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).

Natural Resources Commission B. 159 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6381 (iv).

Natural Resources, Lands, &c., Details of Moneys received, &c. (M. for ret.*) 685 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Payments to since Cancellation of Contract (Ques.) 1071 (i).

North Saskatchewan River Surveys, Average Cost per Mile (Ques.) 870 (i).

'Opportunities in Canada,' Name of Publisher (Ques.) 2158 (ii).

——— Number of Copies distributed, &c. (Ques.) 676 (i).

Railway Aid in Alberta, Representations *re* (Ques.) 676 (i).

Railways in Alberta and Sask., Number of Miles in Operation (Ques.) 3049 (ii).

R. N. W. Mounted Police Barrack Grounds, Transfer to Ry. Corporation, &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Alberta (M. for cor*) 3056 (ii).

School Lands, Alberta, Total Area, Fund, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 7072 (iv).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands—(timber protection) 6286 (iv).

Villa Lots in Section 14, Twp. 21, Applications *re* Transfer, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 685 (i).

McCOIG, Mr. A. B., *West Kent.*

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1952 (i).

Hogs, Dressed, Inspection of, &c. (Ques.) 2758 (ii).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *West Northumberland, O.*

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries—Stony Mountain (supplies) 920 (i).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatoon.*

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 11) 1°*, 159 (i).

Commerce Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 189) 1°*, 6403 (iv).

Committee, Standing Orders, 1st Rep. (presented) 2119 (ii).

Fidelity Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 190) 1°*, 6403 (iv).

Prudential Life Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 188) 1°*, 6403 (iv).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Land Grant, Location, &c. (Ques.) 468 (i).

Royal Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 177) 1° m., 5885 (iii).

Wake, John Relief (B. 178) 1°*, 5886 (iii); 2° m., 6081 (iv).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 29) 1°*, 290 (i); in Com., 2130 (ii).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4207 (iii).

McGIVERIN, Mr. H. B., *Ottawa.*

Civil Service Salaries, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Com. on Res., 319 (i).

——— Classification Schedules, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2451 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 396 (i).

McINTYRE, Mr. W., *Strathcona.*

Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 23) 1°*, 290 (i).

Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1318 (i).

Athabaska Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1318 (i).

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) 1°*, 1648 (i).

C.P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) in Com., 3039, 3151 (ii).

C.P.R. Issue of New Stock, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1350 (i).

McINTYRE, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 290 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Com. on Private Bills, 1362 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6167 (iv).

Moravian Church Board of Elders incorp. (B. 167) 1°*, 5623 (iii).

Railway Crossings, Width of Opening, &c. &c. (remarks) 3568 (ii).

St. Mary's Ry. Co., Change of Name (B. 46) 1°*, 738 (i).

Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 465; 2° m., 778 (i).

Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 37) 2° m., 778 (i).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4156 (iii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D., *Cape Breton, North.*

Budget, The, 5021 (iii).

——— Remarks, 4745 (iii).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 46 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4444 (iii).

Coal, Conserving for the Home Market (prop. Res.) 3087 (ii).

Expropriation of Ry. Lands, &c., Complaints *re* (remarks) 4802 (iii).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 500 (i).

Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4275 (iii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).

'Northumberland' Dredge, Men on Voters' Lists (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2403 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1047 (i).

Payne, J. Lambert, Duties, Salary, Office Hours, &c. (Ques.) 1726 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6212 (iv).

Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1134 (i).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3974 (ii).

SUPPLY

Ocean and River Service (wrecking plant) 6681 (iv).

Public Works—Harbour and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2362 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (facilities) 2948; (Sydney Mines) 2938 (ii).

McLEAN, Mr. H. H., *Sunbury and Queens.*

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5911 (iv).

McLEAN, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6808 (iv).

Royal Casualty and Surety Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 51) 1°*, 738 (i); in Com., 2575 (ii).

SUPPLY

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John tributaries) 1635 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *South Huron.*

Budget, The, 4901 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 6011 (iv).

McMILLAN, Mr. J. A., *Glengarry.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (telephones) 1607 (i).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W., *Cape Breton South.*

Boat Harbour, Skinner's Cove, Yearly Expenditure, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 2817 (ii).

Brophy's Post Office, Name of Postmaster, Changes *re* (Ques.) 1186 (i).

Budget, The, 4936 (iii).

Cape Breton South, Election Returning Officer, Payments *re* Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5636 (iii).

Cassell's Report: *See* 'Investigations.'

Cedar Rapids Mfg. & Power Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Boyer) in Com., 3406 (ii).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 2°, 534 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6400, 6758 (iv).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6750 (iv).

Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com., on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 503 (i).

Fishery Inspector at Cape Breton, Apptmt. of Successor to A. C. Bertram (Ques.) 5631 (iii).

Fishery Wardens in Victoria County, N.S., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 5637 (iii).

Flint Island Fog Alarm, Contract *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5636 (iii).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).

Glace Bay Mails, Contract *re* Collection, &c. (Ques.) 5635, 5775 (iii).

Glace Bay Range Lightkeeper, Applicants, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 5636 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3636 (ii).

I.C.R. Earnings for Freight Shipments, Ticket Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 5632 (iii).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Inverness Harbour, Items of Expenditure of 1908-9, Vote, &c. (Ques.) 6404 (iv).

Investigations in Depts. by Mr. Justice Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3736 (ii).

Labour Hours for Working Men, Restriction, &c., on M. (Mr. Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5939 (iv).

Lobster Packers, Investigation *re* Difficulties with Fishermen (remarks) 6062 (ii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1873 (i).

Plaster Mines Lighthouse, Dismissal of Hector McRae, &c. (Ques.) 6784 (iv).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6323 (iv).

Ry. Employees Provident Act Amt. B. 164 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6741 (iv).

Secret or Illicit Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1484 (i).

'Stanley' Str., &c., Total Expenditure from 1894 to 1908 (M. for ret.*) 1922 (i).

SUPPLY.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 6898; (buoy steamer) 6914; (maintenance) 6902 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (meteorological service) 6915 (iv).

Penitentiaries—St. Vincent de Paul (supplies) 915 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay 1288; (New Glasgow) 1290; (Westville) 1292 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2344; (Baddeck) 2453; (Cow Bay) 2463 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Meaford) 2984 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Sydney Mines) 2936 (ii).

Sydney, Free Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1706 (i).

Tatamagouche River Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2365 (ii).

'Zaidee' and 'Gladiator' Govt. Strs., Privileges *re* Towing, &c., (Ques.) 5631 (iii).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A., *Medicine Hat.*

Aylwin, F. P., Grant of Land *re* Irrigation Purposes, Cor. Reps., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1190 (i).

Blood Indian Reserve, Sale of Land (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3025 (ii).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 11 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 987 (i).

Experimental Farms, Location, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1943 (i).

Geodetic Survey Bureau, Establishment, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 3075 (ii).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*

Hand Hills, Alberta Post Office, Application *re* (M. for copy*) 2162 (ii).
Niagara River Falls, Amount of Overflow (Ques.) 1074 (i).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1037 (i); in Com., 5380 (iii).
Railway Charters, Lapsed Powers, Date of Charters, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1190 (i).
SUPPLY.
Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 599 (i).
Indians—Generally (schools) 1015; Man, &c. (live stock) 1006 (i).
N. W. M. P. (force) 3664 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Lethbridge) 1551 (i).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 2964 (ii).
Waterways Commission, Treaty *re* Milk River and St. Mary's River: on M. for Sup., 6583 (iv).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2145 (ii).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *East Elgin.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4455 (iii).
Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 170) 1°*, 5623 (iii).
Canning Factories Inspectors, Numbers, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 822 (i).
Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5901 (iv).
Port Bruce Harbour, Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 818 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3331 (ii).
Port Stanley Pier, Latest Date of Payments to Men (Ques.) 342 (i).
Postmasters Salaries in East Elgin (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3429 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5952 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 602 (i).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 7026 (iv).
Post Office (rural mails) 3429 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers, &c.) 1619; (power) 1617 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Whitby) 1530 (i).
Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6535 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington piers) 2967; (McGregor's Creek) 2975; (Port Stanley) 2977 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (litigation) 2069; (maintenance) 2045 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*

SUPPLY—
Canals—Lachine (cement) 803 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal postal station) 1303 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M., *Regina.*

Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William Govt. Operation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 4026; (amt.) 4034 (ii).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3629 (ii).
Railway Commission, Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer from N. W., on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2656; (amt.) 2659; Agreed to (Y. 94; N. 54) 2669 (ii).
S.A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) 2228 (ii).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A., *Portage la Prairie.*

Assiniboine River Works, Cost per yard for Sept. and Oct. (Ques.) 1239 (i).
—— Pets., &c. *re* Straightening of, &c. (Ques.) 472 (i).
Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3004 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5455 (iii).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3° (amt.) 5616 (iii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Surveys, (M. for ret.) 685 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry., Total Expenditure, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1055 (i).
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3798, 3803 (ii).
Makaroff Postmaster, Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).
Mayes Affidavit and Mr. Pugsley, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary Admission of Detectives, &c. (Ques.) 1182 (i).
N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) 5699 (iii).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5389 (iii).
Ry. Commission Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2652 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (board of customs) 586; (contingencies) 590 (i).
Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 837; Stony Mountain (supplies) 919 (i).
Post Office (country postmasters) 1700; (Ry. clerks) 1700 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 1596; (lighting) 1616 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 1544; (Winnipeg P.O.) 1551 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 1369(i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (telephones) 1609 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 1294 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 1595 (i).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*

Allegash River, Diversion of Waters, Reps. &c. (M. for copy) 3082 (ii).

Cabano Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 122 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4839 (ii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s (B 171) 1°*, 5623 (iii).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S., *North Grey.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 751 (i).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Legislation *re* Bounty (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).

Govt. Employees, Interference at Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6868 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 213 (i).

G. T. P., Lake Superior Branch, Number of Miles completed, Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 4286 (iii).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 4075; in Com., 5265, 5322, 5491; on M. for 3° (amt) 5604 (iii).

G. T. P., Negotiations *re* Proposed Loan, prior to Oct. 1908 (Ques.) 4290 (iii).

G. T. Stock, Outstanding, Rate of Interest, Total Liabilities, &c. (Ques.) 3651 (ii).

Mileage of Ry. Construction, from 1888 to 1908, Authorized by Charters (Ques.) 1076 (i).

Militia Expenditures, Items in Estimates, &c. (Ques.) 4634 (iii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop Res. (Mr. Foster) 3528 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4481, 5376 (iii), 5971 (iv).

Owen Sound Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

Owen Sound Post Office, Original and Present Cost, Change of Plans, &c. (Ques.) 247 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment of in Grey County (Ques.) 671 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 791; Soulanges (slope trimmings) 1570 (i).

Dom. Lands (surveys) 3463 (ii).

Fisheries (International Fisheries commission) 3446 (ii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 3465 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 896 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating) 1613 (i).

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Halifax) 1289 (i).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture) 1605; (heating, &c.) 1601; (Rideau Hall heating) 1611; (Royal Mint) 1280 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (Wingfield) 3347 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Meaford) 2983, 3313; (Owen Sound) 3315 (ii).

Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 778 (i).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *South Grey.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 4041 (iii).

Budget, The, 4845 (iii).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 284 (i).

——— rsmd. adjnd. debate, 571 (i).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s (B. 140) 1°*, 4411 (iii).

Hudson Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 124) 1°*, 4041 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6695; in Com., 6800 (iv).

Insurance Bill, Addresses, Reps., &c., made to Committee of 1907-8 (M.) to lay on Table, 2489 (ii).

——— (M.) to ref. to Special Com. Banking and Commerce, 2490 (ii).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com., 3414 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5568 (iii).

Prudential Trust Co.'s incorp B. 91 (Mr Macdonell) in Com., 5484 (iii).

Railway Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, 6306 (iv).

Royal Casualty and Surety Co.'s Bill (Mr. McLean) in Com., 2718 (ii).

Salvation Army Council (B. 142) in Com., 6068 (iv).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 1448 (i).

Smith, John Denison Relief B. 157 (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com., 6073 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Generally (staff, &c.) 2073 (ii).

Excise (methylated spirits) 449 (i).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies), 894, 908 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods Bill (remarks) *re* discussion, 6774 (iv).

——— B. 105, 2° m., 6774; in Com., 6774 (iv).

Wood Alcohol, Quantity purchased, Price, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1396 (i).

MOLLOY, Mr. J. P., *Provencher.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 768 (i).

Big Grass Marsh Swamp Lands, Transfer of, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3056 (ii).

Budget, The, 5059 (iii).

Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s (B. 141) 1°*, 4411; in Com., 5483 (iii).

Railway Commission, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2647 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Boivin, Ernest, Emplymt. by Govt., Cheque to A. Desbiens (Ques.) 2759 (ii).

Bonin, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3990 (ii).

Canada and France Ocean SS. B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5219 (iii).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1861 (ii), 2062 (ii).

Capital Supply Co., and Govt. Patronage, Names of Promotors, &c. (Ques.) 683 (i).

Co-Operative Societies (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2323 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 48 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 6383 (iv).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2841 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1967 (i).

Fagin, Thos., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2154 (ii).

Germany and Canadian Treaty, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 4125 (iii).

Godin, Dr., Payments to *re* Land Damages (Ques.) 3990 (ii).

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2017 (ii).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6124 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving, on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 196 (i).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5147; in Com., 5191 (iii).

Hopper Scows, Construction of (Ques.) 1185 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 2010 (i), 5217 (iii); in Com., 6155 (iv).

——— on M. to resume adjnd. debate (remarks) 4413 (iii).

Immigration Deportations, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 1975 (i).

Immigration to U. S. and Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 840 (i).

Imperial Defence Conference (remarks) on M. for 3° of Supply Bill, 7084 (iv).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Insurance Bill, Discussion *re* (remarks) 6290 (iv).

Land Grants to early Settlers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6275 (iv).

Levis Postmastership, Apptmt. of Successor to Mr. A. Lafrancois (Ques.) 4636 (iii).

Lindsay Block, Ottawa, Negotiations *re* Purchase (Ques.) 681 (i).

Lussier, J. A., Payment to by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 3990 (ii).

——— Returning Officer at St. Johns-Iberville, Payments to (Ques.) 2766 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Inquiry for Evidence, 662 (i).

Martel, Hormidas, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3990 (ii).

Montreal Free Port, Recommendation of Royal Commission (remarks) 4802 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 4799; in Com., 5234 (iii).

Natural Resources Conservation Commission on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6363 (iv).

Navigable Waters Protection Act. Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5226 (iii).

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract Price, Extras, &c. (Ques.) 818 (i).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4245 (iii); in Com., 6314 (iv).

Proportional Representation in House of Commons, &c. (prop. res.) 2598 (ii).

Railway Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6297; on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to M. for 3°, 6313 (iv).

Railway Level Crossings, Prevention of Accidents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1227 (i).

Red River Settlers, Land Grants, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6279 (iv).

'Richelieu,' Dredge, Removal of Captain, &c. (Ques.) 1185 (i).

Richelieu River Improvements Office (Ques.) 1185 (i).

Royal Canadian Dragoons at St. Johns, P.Q., Contracts *re* Supplies (Ques.) 2767 (ii).

Royal Casualty and Surety Co.'s Bill (Mr. McLean) in Com., 2720 (ii).

Rutherford, Dr. J. S., Resignation, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1720 (i).

St. Johns Harbour, P.Q., Contract for Wharf Extension, &c. (Ques.) 2768, 2770 (ii).

——— Improvements in Richelieu River, Estimates, &c. (Ques.) 2817 (ii).

St. Johns Military Buildings, Lease, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 672 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

St. Maurice and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 2°, 6083 (iv).

Ste. Philomene Mail Contract, Annual Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2770 (ii).

St. Pierre River Drainage, Floods, &c. (M.) to adjn. Hse., 4229 (iii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Contract with J. G. Heroux *re* Timber, Inspection *re* (Ques.) 6404 (iv).

—— Manufacture of Church Pews (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 900 (i).

—— Manufacture of Furniture, &c. (Ques.) 673 (i).

Salvation Army Council B. 142 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6068 (iv).

Smith, John Denison, Relief B. 157 (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com., 6071 (iv).

Statutes, French Translation, Designation of Titles (remarks) 2023 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 691; (exhibitions) 727; (Year Book) 701 (i).

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 790 (i).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 6247 (iv); Labour Dept., (Labour Gazette) 654; Post Office (salaries) 724 (i).

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 705 (i).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7003; (G. B. agents) 7019 (iv).

Interior (astronomical surveys) 6264 (iv).

Labour Dept. (industrial disputes) 655 (i).

Militia (salaries) 2278 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 900 St. Vincent de Paul (furniture making) 900 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal postal station) 1303 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2347 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (docks, &c.) 2896; (Saguenay dredging) 2887 (ii).

Tariff Changes *re* Tin, &c. (remarks) 4126 (iii).

Transportation Problem (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2888 (ii).

MURPHY, Hon. C. (Secretary of State), *Russell.*

Agriculture Dept., Outside Service, Amounts voted (Ans.) 1409 (i).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep., on Inquiry for, 1250 (i).

Debates, Official, Cost of Printing, &c. (Ans.) 1720 (i).

—— French Translation, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1722 (i).

Dom. Elections, Payments to Officials, &c. (Ans.) 1067 (i).

Cape Breton South, Payments *re* Elections, Expenses to Ret. Officers (Ans.) 5636 (iii).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*

Capital Supply Co. and Govt. Patronage, Names of Promoters (Ans.) 684 (i).

Census and Statistics Bulletins, Translation of (Ans.) 1404 (i).

Civil Service Apptmts. since July, 1908, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 142 (i).

Civil Service Apptmts. since Sept., 1908 (Ans.) 143 (i).

Civil Service, Names and Positions of those receiving no Increases (Ans.) 1558 (i).

—— Payments in 1896 and 1909-10 at Ottawa (Ans.) 2149 (ii).

—— Re-organization, Temporary Clerks, &c. (Ans.) 142 (i).

——Salaries, in Com. on Res., 1135 (i).

—— Salaries Ret. (remarks) 1395 (i).

Comox-Atlin Elections, Issue of Writ for 11th Parlt., Instructions to Returning Officer, &c. (Ans.) 682 (i).

External Affairs Deptl. (B. 90) prop. Res., 1813, 1978; 1°* of of B., 2008 (i); in Com., 4436, 4470 (iii).

Foran, Mr. Wm., Apptmt. of Successor (remarks) 3363 (ii).

Foreign Correspondence, Number of Letters, &c. (Ans.) 3987 (ii).

'Free Press,' Man., Payments to, on Inquiry for Ret., 1978 (i).

Humboldt Election Officials, Payments to (Ans.) 1731 (i).

Logberg Printing Co., Suppl. Ret. (presented) 4041 (iii).

—— on Inquiry for Ret., 2674 (ii).

Lussier, J. A., Returning Officer at St. Johns-Iberville &c. (Ans.) 2767 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Delay in Printing, &c. (remarks) 633 (i).

Marine Investigation, Evidence, &c., on Inquiry for, 402, 549 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 93; 2° m., 378 (i).

Oriental Immigration into B. C., Res. *re* Royal Commission (Ans.) 1242 (i).

Polling Booths in Ont., Payments *re* Rents (Ans.) 3251 (ii).

Secretary of State, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 14 (i).

Statutes for 1908, Delay in Publishing, &c. (Ans.) 184 (i).

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—External Affairs (salaries) 7064 (iv); Sec. of State (contingencies) 461; (salaries) 458 (i).

Civil Service Commission (printing) 7065 (iv); (salaries) 705 (i).

Printing and Stationery (salaries) 804 (i).

Timber Limit Regulations, Suspension, &c. (Ans.) 343 (i).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*

Towers in Dufferin County, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 341 (i).

Vancouver Election Officials, Delay in Payments to (Ans.) 1418 (i).

Voters' Lists, Parry Sound, Cost of Revision (Ans.) 669 (i).

—— Thunder Bay, &c., Cost of (Ans.) 340 (i).

NANTEL, Mr. W. B., *Terrebonne.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 765 (i).

Budget, The, 4780 (iii).

Canadian, Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1693, 1859 (i), 2062, 2129 (ii).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 2°, 566 (i).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 5152, 5159 (iii).

Immigration to U. S. and Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 852 (i).

Judges Salaries, Error in Statutes of 1905 (remarks) 6474 (iv).

Railway Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6296 (iv).

Ry. Act (farm crossings) Amt. (B. 54) 1° m, 813 (i).

Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 3°, 526 (i).

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 647 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cap. St. Ignace) 2522 (ii).

NEELY, Mr. D. B., *Humboldt.*

Budget, The, 4951 (iii).

C.P.Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 3151, 3161 (ii)

Elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, Govt. Operation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 4017 (ii).

Insulting Language towards members, Ques. of Priv., 3942 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3844, 3942 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6073 (iv).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 62) 1°*, 1116 (i); in Com., 2530, 2537 (ii).

Railway Commission, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2649 (ii).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W., *North Oxford.*

Budget, The, 4804 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., on Ques. of Order (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3020 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5477 (iii); in Com., 6048 (iv).

NESBITT. Mr. E. W.—*Con.*

Equity Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6328 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 225 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6806 (iv).

McQucid, Laura, Relief (B. 181) 1°*, 5997 (iv).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3958 (ii).

Mayes Affidavit, Ques. of Order, 4279, 4375 (iii).

Railway Commission Apptmt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) Ques. of Order, 2639 (ii).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 1437 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods (B. 105) 1°*, 2670 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3026 (ii).

Civil Service Salaries, Classification *re* Schedules, &c., on M. for Sup., 2449 (ii).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 2°, 561 (i).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3579, 3614 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5120; in Com., 5269 (iii).

Madoc-Eldorado Branch Ry., G.T.R. Bonus *re*, &c. (Ques.) 245 (i).

Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4369 (iii).

—— Reading of Original, on Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 4269 (iii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup, 1842 (i)

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1040 (i).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. (B. 39) 1° m., 465 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6202 (iv).

Ross Rifles, Number accepted and rejected by Militia Dept. (Ques.) 245 (i).

—— Total Payments *re* (Ques.) 329 (i).

Ross Rifle Factory, Number of Employees, Inspection *re* Standards, &c. (Ques.) 1411 (i).

Vautelet, H. A., Emplymt. as Architect, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 1412 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK (Minister of the Interior) *Edmonton.*

Aylesworth, Geo. Anson, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 249 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

Bell, Charles F., Conditions *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 2323 (ii).

Berube, Rev. E. P., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 3986 (ii).

Birtle Agency, Purchase of Live Stock (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 1168 (i).

Birtle Hospital, Attendance of Dr. Wright (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease, &c. (Ans.) 6785 (iv).

—— Sale of Land (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1008 (i).

Brandon City, Exchange of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 2322 (ii).

Brewster, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Immigration (Ans.) 1483 (i).

B. C. Railway Belt Lands, Settlers, Titles, &c. (Ans.) 1727 (i).

Burrows, T. A., Timber Permit in Twp. 30 and 31, &c. (Ans.) 2592 (ii).

Catholic Immigration, Instructions to Agents (remarks) 2672 (ii).

Caughnawaga Indian Reserve, Grants for Church Purposes (Ans.) 1410 (i).

Caughnawaga-Iroquois Indians' Reserve, Return of Fines for Stealings, &c. (Ans.) 1410 (i).

Coal and Timber Lands, Approx. Area, Owners Names, &c. (Ans.) 1185 (i).

Coal Royalties, Total Amount payable in 1908 (Ans.) 2588 (ii).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Payments for Berths, Lapses, &c. (Ans.) 542 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 94; in Com., 379 (i); on Senate Amts., 2911 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act, French Translation, &c. (Ans.) 532 (i).

Fairy Lake Indian Reserve, N. S., Lease, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 2816 (ii).

File Hill Indian Agency, Resignation of Mr. Godfrey, Charges against Inspector, &c. (Ans.) 3045 (ii).

Fishery Licenses issued to Wikwinikong Indians, Representations *re* (Ans.) 6407 (iv).

Foley, T. P., Emplymt. in Interior Dept. (Ans.) 2321 (ii).

Fort Malden, Representations *re* Sale, &c. (Ans.) 6087 (iv).

Geodetic Survey Bureau, Establishment of, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for Cor., 3068 (ii).

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale of Advertisements, &c. (Ans.) 3991 (ii).

'Glimpses of Northwestern Canada,' Copies circulated, Payments *re*, &c. (Ans.) 4641 (iii).

G. T. P., Lands sold for Stations, &c. (Ans.) 143 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

G.T.P., Terminal Town Sites Ret. (remarks) 2494 (ii).

Grazing Leases Total Area, Annual Rental, &c. (Ans.) 3703 (ii).

Griffith, Mr. Wm., Apptmt. as Immigration Agent, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1415 (i).

Hickman, W. A., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 3054 (ii).

Higgs, Deportation by Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 147 (i).

Homesteads and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold, Moneys received, &c. (Ans.) 482 (i).

Homesteads and Pre-emptions in Man., &c. Number of Acres, &c. (Ans.) 1180 (i).

Homesteads west of Lake Winnipeg, Rep. *re* unfitness for Settlement (Ans.) 3252 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. (B. 17) 1°*, 240 (i); 2° m., 2009 (i); on M. for resmng. adjd. debate, 4413; 2°, 5218 (iii); in Com., 6129 (iv).

Immigration Agents, Apptmts. in France since 1908, Names, &c. (Ans.) 678 (i).

Immigration Agents in France, Number, Reps. Resignation of J. E. Cyr (Ans.) 1414 (i).

Immigration Agents, Bonus Commissions, &c. (Ans.) 1407 (i).

—— Names, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1405 (i).

Immigration Agents resident in Canada (Ans.) 3989 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, Restrictions, &c. (Ans.) 3705 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses to Societies, Names, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 1406 (i).

Immigration Bounties for 1907-8, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 678 (i).

Immigrants, British, prevented from landing in Canada, &c. (Ans.) 478 (i).

Immigration Deportations, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 1975 (i).

Immigrants Destitute in Toronto (remarks) 2335 (ii).

Immigrants from G. B. to Canada direct (Ans.) 1919 (i).

Immigrants for 1907-8 from U. S., G. B., France and Belgium, Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 679 (i).

Immigration Inspectors, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1406 (i).

Immigrants, Number arriving in Canada for present year, Names and Addresses of Canadian Agents, &c. (Ans.) 1404 (i).

Immigrants prevented landing in Canada, Nationality, &c. (Ans.) 479 (i).

Immigration Printing and Advertising, Amount exended in 1908-9 (Ans.) 2381 (ii).

Immigration Regulations, O.C. *re*, Application of (Ans.) 250 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

Immigrants rejected and deported, Number, &c. (Ans.) 677 (i).

Immigration of Undersirables into Canada, Payments *re* (Ans.) 1406 (i).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 14 (i).

Indians Timber Lands, Sale of, List read in Com. of Sup., 1165 (i).

Interior Deptl. Clerks, Increases *re* Salaries, List of Names, &c. (Ans.) 532 (i).

——— Outside Service, Expenditure *re* Increases (Ans.) 1065 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1021 (i).

——— on inquiry for, 876 (i).

——— Officials Dismissals, Charges, &c. (Ans.) 2382 (ii).

Irrigation, Investigation *re* Water Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6283 (iv).

Irrigation Proposition for Lands by Percy Aylwin (Ans.) 2380 (ii).

Judge, H. A., Emplymt. by Govt. as Detective, &c. (Ans.) 1400 (i).

Kitsilano Indian Reserve, Transfer to City, &c. (Ans.) 1973 (i).

'La Region du Lac Saint Jean, Guides des Colons,' Distribution in Quebec (Ans.) 678 (i).

Lake St. John Ry. Colonization Subsidy Grant, &c. (Ans.) 678 (i).

Land Grants to early Settlers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6276 (iv).

Lands in Man. and N. W. undisposed of by Govt. (Ans.) 2374 (ii).

Land Patents for Sections 16, 20 and 22, &c., Payments of Taxes, &c. (Ans.) 4901 (iii).

Latitude and Longitude of Canadian Cities, &c. (Ans.) 2378 (ii).

Milk River, Mackie Lease, &c. (Ans.) 6405 (iv).

Miller, Mr. N. B., Immigration Agent, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7000 (iv).

Nipissing Indian Reserve, Open for Settlement (Ans.) 684 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Payments to since cancellation of Contract (Ans.) 1072 (i).

North Saskatchewan River Surveys, Average Cost per Mile (Ans.) 870 (i).

Olin, Chas., Total Payments *re* visit to Sweden (Ans.) 871 (i).

'Opportunities in Canada,' Name of Publisher (Ans.) 2158 (ii).

——— Number of Copies distributed (Ans.) 676 (i).

Orientals in B. C., Number, &c. (Ans.) 1920 (i).

Prairie Fires, Relief *re* (remarks) 6411 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Land Grant, Location, &c. (Ans.) 469 (i).

Railway Subsidies Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 5629 (iii).

Rama Indian Trust Funds, Amount held by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 544 (i).

Rama Twp., Expenditure on Roads and Bridges (Ans.) 677 (i).

Rand, Dr. F. A., Payments *re* Indians (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 1168 (i).

Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Compensation to Squatters, &c. (Ans.) 531 (i).

Rutherford Islands, Dispute *re* Ownership, &c. (Ans.) 6408 (iv).

St. Nicholas Indian Island, Disposal of by Govt. (Ans.) 1410 (i).

St. Peters Indian Reserve, Surrender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1019, 1139 (i).

School Lands, Alberta, Total Area, Funds, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 7072 (iv).

Seed Grain Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 144 (i).

Seed Oats purchased for Albert and Sask., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1420 (i).

Seed Wheat, Purchase for Sask. and Alberta, Price, Grade, Loss, &c. (Ans.) 1419 (i).

S. A. Veteran Land Grants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).

——— Homestead issued, &c. (Ans.) 2818 (ii).

——— Scrip, Sale of to Govt. Employees (Ans.) 143 (i).

S. A. Land Grants, Number located, Appointments of Substitutes, &c. (Ans.) 6404 (iv).

——— Conditions of Entry, &c. (Ans.) 1179 (i).

——— Regulations re (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2221 (ii).

——— Regulations as to Residence, &c (Ans.) 541 (i).

Spanish River Indians, License for cutting Timber (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 1170 (i).

Squatters on Dauphin Lands, Burning of Buildings, &c. (Ans.) 3045 (ii).

Squatters Claims *re* Dauphin Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6287 (iv.)

Steamers on Lake Winnipeg for Indian Dept., Lease, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1403 (i).

Sturgeon Breeding in Lac du Bonnet, Sale of Fish, &c. (Ans.) 531 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 971 (i); Interior (salaries) 6247 (iv).

Dom. Lands (advertising) 6285; (hydrographic survey) 6284; (maps, &c.) 6289 (iv); (surveys) 3463 (ii), 6273; (timber protection) 6286 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7000; (deportations) 7021; (G.B. agents) 7015; (St. Boniface hospital) 7035 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (cleansing orchards) 1160; (destitute) 1139; (schools) 1142; (surveys commission) 1144 (i).

Indians—Generally (destitute, &c.) 1010; (general expenses) 1016; (grist and saw mills) 1016; (inspectors travelling expenses) 1161; (relief) 1167; (schools) 1015; (surveys) 1016; (timber inspectors) 1161; (triennial clothing) 1015 (i).

Indians—Man., &c. (annuities) 1002; (live stock) 1005 (i); (St. Peters, removal) 3462 (ii); (seeds, &c.) 1004 (i).

Indians—N.B. (medical attendance) 999 (i), 3462 (ii).

Indians—N.S. (medical attendance) 998 (i), 3462 (ii); (seed grain) 998 (i).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (agricultural grants) 993; (annuities) 998; (blankets) 976; (legal expenses) 993; (medical attendance) 976; (surveys) 989; (schools) 976, 989 (i).

Indians—P.E.I. (Lennox wharf) 1000; (medical attendance) 1000 (i).

Indians—Que. (medical relief) 3461 (ii).

Indians—Sask. (farm implements) 1002 (i).

Indians—Yukon (schools) 1160 (i).

Interior (astronomical surveys) 6263; (buffalo herds) 6991; Miscellaneous (park reservations) 6991 ; (St. Mary's and Milk River diversions) 6269 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Banff, roads and bridges) 1171; (Banff, water works) 1171; (litigation) 1172 (i); (maps) 3466; (seed grain) 3464 (ii).

N.W. Ter. Govt. (salaries) 1171 (i).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 2962 (ii).

Yukon Govt. (administration salaries) 6272; (roads, &c.) 6273 (iv).

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Purchase by Govt. Sales, &c. (Ans.) 477 (i).

Timber Lands, Alberta. Amount due and Payable (Ans.) 3194 (ii).

Turtle Mountain Squatters, Removal, Compensation, &c. (Ans.) 1417 (i).

Vaughan, Mr., Surveys, Incomplete Return (remarks) 2128 (ii).

Volunteer Substitutes for Homestead Duties (Ans.) 1078 (i).

Watson, R. J., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2158 (ii).

Yukon Ordinances (prop. res.) in Com., 7075 (iv).

——— Beer Tax (prop. res.) 5892 (iv).

Zinc in Albermarle County, Govt. Bonus *re* (Ans.) 1078 (i).

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *Toronto, West.*

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3146 (ii).

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 746 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (cement testing) 791 (i).

OSLER, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Customs (Board of Customs) 589 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Amherst) 1283; Ont. (Toronto barracks) 1506; Ont. (Whitby) 1529; Ottawa (new bldg.) 1251; (Royal Mint) 1281 (i).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *East Northumberland, Ont.*

Campbellford and Brighton Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

——— (remarks) 3655 (ii).

Govt. Policy *re* Govt. Buildings (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2507 (ii).

G.T.P., Cost of N. B. Section, Estimated Cost, &c. (remarks) 2383 (ii).

——— Cost per Mile (remarks) 2494 (ii).

Ry. Act (electric power) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1121 (i).

Rural Mail in East Northumberland, &c. (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 5879 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Brighton) 3314 (ii).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4153 (iii).

PAPINEAU, Mr. L. J., *Beauharnois.*

SUPPLY.

Canals—Beauharnois (water power) 1911 (i).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Agriculture Dept., French Translation of Documents (Ques.) 2762 (ii).

Berube, Rev. E. P., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ques.) 3986 (ii).

Exhibitions, Subsidized by Dom. Govt., Amounts, Officials, &c. (Ques.) 544 (i).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1940 (i).

——— Establishment of since Jan. 1908, &c. (Ques.) 156 (i).

French Language on Govt. Works, Signatures *re*, Govtl. Intention (Ques.) 249 (i).

——— Telephone Cos., &c., Cor. with Govt. (M. for copies*) 1421 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6129 (iv).

Immigration Agents, Apptmts. in France since 1908, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 678 (i).

Immigration Agents resident in Canada (Ques.) 3989 (ii).

Immigration Bounties for 1907-8, Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 678 (i).

Immigrants for 1907-8, Number from U. S., G. B., France and Belgium, Amount of Expenditure (Ques.) 678 (i).

PAQUET, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Immigrants rejected and deported, Number, &c. (Ques.) 677 (i).

Immigration to U. S. and Repatriation, Cor. with Dept. of Interior and Colonization Societies (M. for copy) 827 (i).

Labour Dept., Apptmt. of Minister, &c. (Ques.) 186 (i).

Lake St. John Ry., Colonization Subsidy Grant, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 678 (i).

'La Region du Lac Saint Jean, Guides des Colons,' Distribution of Pamphlet (Ques.) 678 (i).

Latitude and Longitude of Canadian Cities, Record of (Ques.) 2378 (ii).

Lévis Graving Dock, Insufficient Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 186 (i).

'Montcalm' Icebreaker, Number of Crew, Daily Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 167 (i).

——— Name of Engineer, *re* Investigations (Ques.) 548 (i).

——— Res. of Chamber of Commerce, Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 328 (i).

Sessional Messengers appointed or dismissed since 1880 (M. for ret.*) 521 (i).

Statutes, French Translation, Designation of Titles (remarks) 2020 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 688; (year-book) 703 (i).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *West Lambton.*

Brazilian Electro-Steel and Smelting Co. Limited (B. 10) 1°*, 159; in Com., 1023 (i).

Canada Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 56)—(M.) to place on Order Paper, 5093 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 75) 1°*, 1479 (i); in Com., 3409 (ii).

Cedar Rapids Mfg. & Power Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Boyer) in Com., 3406 (ii).

Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 12) 1°*, 159 (i).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5901 (iv).

Govt. Railways Act (compensation) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 773 (i).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3599 (ii).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 160 (i).

Huron and Ontario Ry Co.'s (B. 14) 1°*, 160 (i).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com., 3414 (ii).

Mexican Land and Irrigation Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 160 (i).

National Accident and Guarantee Co. of Canada (B. 103) 1°*, 2318 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6209 (iv).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F.—*Con.*

Railway Level Crossings, Prevention of Accidents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1231 (i).

PARENT, Mr. G., *Montmorency.*

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3879 (ii).

PATERSON, Hon. Wm., (Minister of Customs), *Brant.*

Associated Press Despatches, Amount collected, Supervision, &c. (Ans.) 332 (i).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Vols I. and II. (presented) 12 (i).

——— Vol. II (presented) 1474 (i).

Bacon Curing Industry, Number of Hogs condemned, &c. (Ans.) 342 (i).

Books entering Canada under British Preferential Tariff, &c. (Ans.) 2587 (ii).

Budget, The (remarks) 4598, 4915 (iii).

Canadian Imports, Percentage entering Can. in 1908 (Ans.) 1728 (i).

Canadian Ships docking for Repairs, Res. *re* (Ans.) 3053 (ii).

Chinaware, Customs Duty, &c. (Ans.) 4636 (iii).

Civil Service Salaries, in Com. on Res., 964 (i).

Coasting Trade, O.C. *re* Change of Date (Ans.) 3052 (ii).

Costello Thos., Rep. of Woollen Industry, &c. (Ans.) 1176 (i).

Customs Collector at Bathurst, Leave of Absence (Ans.) 5157 (iii).

Customs Seizures, on Inquiry for Ret., 2773 (ii).

Debt, Net, Present Amount, Increase, &c. (Ans.) 148, 342 (i).

Dominion Loans, Amount Redeemable, &c. (Ans.) 545 (i).

Dominion 4 per cent Loan, Amount of Sinking Fund (Ans.) 545 (i).

See 'Loans', 'Govt. Loans.'

Electric Power exported at Niagara Falls, Names of Licensees, Taxes imposed, &c. (Ans.) 346 (i).

Estimates for 1909-1910 (presented) 327 (i).

Fish caught in Summer, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 2128 (ii).

Foot and Mouth Disease, Present Condition, Embargo, &c. (Ans.) 334 (i).

Fruit Imports into B.C. from U.S., Quantities, Values, &c. (Ans.) 3250 (ii).

Funded Debt, Redeemable, Sinking Fund, &c. (Ans.) 342 (i).

Govt. Deposits in Banks, Discrimination *re* (Ans.) 246 (i).

Govt. Loans or Advances since Dec. 1908, Purposes, &c. (Ans.) 163 (i).

PATERSON, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
G.T.P. Total Expenditure *re* Construction of N.T.R. (Ans.) 1182 (i).
Hay, &c., from U. S., Entries at Kingston (Ans.) 1177 (i).
Hickory and Ash Handles, Number imported for 1908 (Ans.) 1210 (i).
Hull Customs Collections, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1418 (i).
Imports and Exports for 1908 (Ans.) 4288 (iii).
Insurance Commission, Omission of British Actuaries' Evidence (Ans.) 243 (i).
Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6719 (iv).
Loans of Dec., 1907, Sums available for Works (Ans.) 669 (i).
Loan falling Due on 1st Nov. 1908, Disposal of (Ans.) 147 (i).
See 'Dom. Lands.'
Mail Boxes purchased and entered into Canada free of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 547 (i).
Market Garden Produce, Total Imports from 1901-8, Duty collected, &c. (Ans.) 5096 (iii).
Meagher, Mathias, Apptmt. to Customs Staff at Debec, N.B., Salary (Ans.) 3655 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates (presented) 327 (i).
Nails, Quantity imported, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 2156 (ii).
National Trans. Ry., Loans *re* Construction of Eastern Div., Rates of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 679 (i).
Oshawa Harbour, Apptmts. by Gov., Payments, &c. (Ans.) 3046 (ii).
Oshawa Customs Collector, Name, &c. (Ans.) 1973 (i), 2373 (ii).
—— Remarks, 2673 (ii).
Passover Bread, Higher Duties, Request *re* (Ans.) 3986 (ii).
Pork, Bacon, &c., Entries at Kingston, &c. (Ans.) 1177 (i).
Port Credit, Customs Revenue, Superannuation of Collector (Ans.) 3049 (ii).
Preston, W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt., Transfer, &c. (Ans.) 3991 (ii).
Pulp and Paper produced in Canada, Quantity exported, &c. (Ans.) 3048 (ii).
Quebracho Extract, Quantity imported, Pet. *re* Duty, &c. (Ans.) 1179 (i).
Revenue for December, Details of 'Miscellaneous' (Ans.) 149 (i).
Rifles, Swiss and Foreign imported into Canada, Regulations *re* (Ans.) 2382 (ii).
Royal Canadian Mint, Total Cost, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 147 (i).
—— Number of Coins manufactured, Purchase of Silver, &c. (Ans.) 244 (i).

PATERSON, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Sault Ste. Marie Farm and Garden Imports, Value, &c. (Ans.) 339 (i).
Savings Deposit and Loans, 3 per cents, Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 680 (i).
Securities of Corporations, Amount deposited with Govt., &c. (Ans.) 247 (i).
Shipping Drawbacks, Amounts paid from 1898 to 1908 (Ans.) 167 (i).
Ships repaired in Foreign Countries, Duty *re* (Ans.) 2763 (ii).
Steel Importations from March 31st, 1908, to Jan. 31st, 1909, on M. (Mr. Boyce) 355 (i).
Supply (M.) for Com., 140 (i).
SUPPLY—
Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking) 455 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 5865 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 390, 705 (i).
Civil Govt.—Customs (Board of Customs) 581; (contingencies) 590 (i).
Civil Govt.—Finance (salaries) 384 (i).
Civil Govt.—Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 399 (i).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (electrical branch) 445 ; (salaries) 428, 444; (travelling expenses) 447; (weights and measures) 447 (i).
Civil Govt.—Public Works (contingencies) 3672 (ii).
Customs—(preventive service) 611; (printing and stationery) 609; (travelling expenses) 608 (i).
Excise (inspectors, &c., salaries) 436; (methylated spirits) 448; (tobacco stamps) 457, 447 (i).
Inland Revenue (customs collections) 448; (electric power exports) 455 (i).
Metric System (lectures) 454 (i).
Miscellaneous (patent medicines) 458 (i).
Pensions (N.W. rebellion) 812 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachute) 1302 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2368 (ii).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 452; (intercolonial Bureau) 455 (i).
Telephone and Telegraph Special Com. of 1905, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 153 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Part I., (presented) 176 (i).
Trade Relations with Germany, Total Exports, &c. (Ans.) 482 (i).
Ways and Means, (M.) for Com., 140 (i).
Wood Alcohol, Quantity purchased, Price, &c. (Ans.) 1397 (i).
Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4145 (iii).
Woollen Mills, Number, Canadian Wool used, &c. (Ans.) 150 (i).
Wool, Raw, Imported into Canada for 1907, Duty, &c. (Ans.) 150 (i).
Yukon Ordinances (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7080 (iv).

PATERSON, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

'Zaidee' and 'Gladiator' Govt. Strs., Privileges *re* Towing, c. (Ans.) 5631 (iii).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*

Animals, Health of, Inspection, &c., Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 821 (i).

Budget, The, 4642 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 2572 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Aid B. 186 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6740 (iv).

Carillon and Grenville Canals, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1396 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1734 (i).

Cedar Rapids Manufacturing Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Boyer) in Com., 3404, 3472 (ii).

Civil Service: *See* 'House of Commons.'

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1657 (i).

Govt. Employees, Interference at Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6877 (iv).

Govt. Loans B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6710 (iv).

Govt. Loans, Amounts and Date prior to 1913, Due, &c. (Ques.) 3654 (ii).

——— Loans of 1874, 4 per cent, Date of first Notice (Ques.) 3654 (ii).

——— Loans falling due prior to 1913 (Ques.) 3704 (ii).

Govt. Piers and Harbours Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4429 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 4091; in Com., 5237, 5331; on M. for 3°, 5614 (amt.) 5616 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Total Expenditure to Feb., 1909 *re* Building and Equipment from Winnipeg to Moncton, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3704 (ii).

G.T.R. Co., Prior Lien on Assets, Opinion of Law Officers of Crown (Ques.) 4228 (iii).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6117 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6699; in Com., 6705 (iv).

Insurance Bill, Inquiry *re* Legislation, 971, 1022 (i).

Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6729 (iv).

Lachute Mills Post Office, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 158 (i).

Loans: *See* 'Govt. Loans.'

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1038 (i); in Com., 5306 (iii).

Ottawa Assurance Co.'s (B. 139) 1°*, 4286 (iii).

Ottawa Buildings leased by Govt., Rental, Superficial Area, Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 1556 (i).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Passover Bread, Higher Rate of Duty, Request *re* (Ques.) 3986 (ii).

Political Partizanship: *See* 'Govt. Employees.'

Royal Casualty and Surety Co.'s Bill (Mr. McLean) in Com., 2717 (ii).

Specie Reserve, Date of Last Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 869 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 646; Indian Affairs (salaries) 973 (i).

Indians—Man. (St. Peters, removal) 3432 (ii).

Miscellaneous (unprovided items) 3466 (ii).

Post Office (miscellaneous, stamps) 3432 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lavatories) 1392; (peat testing) 1389; (steel fittings) 1391 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachute) 1301 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Campbellton) 2951; P. E. I. (Harmony-Elmira) 2958; (Souris) 3419 (ii).

Tercentenary Postage Stamps, Total Amount *re* Sale (Ques.) 3654 (ii).

Thos. L. Smith, Patent Relief B. 71 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 3°, 2950 (ii).

Timber Inspector, Salary, 973 (i).

Tuberculosis Congress, International, Delegates *re* (Ques.) 1186 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods Bill, Discussion *re* (remarks) 6846 (iv).

——— Remarks *re* placing on Govt. Orders, 6186 (iv).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W., *Annapolis.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers——N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2342 (ii).

PORTER, Mr. E. GUSS, *West Hastings.*

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 756 (i).

Belleville and Corbyville Collectors of Inland Revenue, Retirements, Apptmts, &c. Ques. 4893 (iii).

Belleville Drill Hall, Land Site, Officers' Quarters, &c. (Ques.) 673, 817 (i).
See 'Hastings.'

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on M. (Mr. Henderson) to ref. back to Special Com., 5440 (iii).

Civil Service Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6327 (iv).

Extradition Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5242 (iii).

Govt. Piers and Harbours Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4428 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5254 (iii).

PORTER, Mr. E. Guss—*Con.*

Hastings Rifle Battalion, Quarters in Belleville Drill Hall (Ques.) 1076 (i).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5227 (iii).

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 743 (i).

Ry. Act (electric power) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1120 (i).

Railway Mail Clerks killed or injured, Number (Ques.) 3476 (ii).

Railways Two-Cent Fare, Refund by G. T. Ry. Co. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2920 (ii).

Rural Mail Delivery in Prince Edward County, Establishment of (Ques.) 1077 (i).

Secret or Illicit Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1124, 1482 (i).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Public Works Health Act) 811 (i).

Canals—Trent (construction) 1577; (Holland River) 1580 (i).

Interior (astronomical surveys) 6266 (iv).

Pensions (Fenian raid) 813 (i).

Public Works — Buildings—Ottawa (telephones) 1608 (i).

Yukon Govt. (administration salaries) 6272 (iv).

Trent Canal Fish Slides (remarks) 2672 (ii).

PRICE, Mr. Wm., *West Quebec.*

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Dubeau) on Senate Amts., 4594 (iii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3877 (ii).

Johnston, Capt., Repayment of Moneys from Str. 'Hestia' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).

SUPPLY.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 6880; (salaries) 6889 (iv).

Marine—Dredging (plant) 6886 (iv).

Marine—Public Works (piers on St. Lawrence) 6888; (St. Lawrence ship canal) 6877; (Sorel yard property) 6885 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Victoria immigration) 2085 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents) 2453 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, R. M. C.) 1383, 1511 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (generally) 2118; (South Lake, Lakevale) 2183 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. Francis) 2554; (Lévis) 2094; (repairs) 2554; (St. Anne des Monts) 2906; (St. Charles) 2095; (Saguenay dredging) 2809; (Sorel) 2909 (ii).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*

Security Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 188) in Com., 6781 (iv).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 77) 1°*, 1479 (i); in Com., 4538 (iii).

PROWSE, Mr. L. E., *Queens, P.E.I.*

SUPPLY.

Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 2960 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Public Works) *St. John City and County.*

Allegash River, Diversion of Waters, on M. (Mr. Michaud) for Cor., 3084 (ii).

Assiniboine River, Straightening of (Ans.) 472 (i).

——— Cost per yard for Sept. and Oct. (Ans.) 1239 (i).

Belleville Drill Hall, Officers Quarters *re* (Ans.) 1076 (i).

Boat Harbour, Pictou Co., N.S., Total Expenditure, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 2817 (ii).

Boat Harbour, Skinner's Cove, Yearly Expenditure, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 2817 (ii).

Boivin, Ernest, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).

Bonaventure Public Works, Expenditure prior to 1900 on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 174 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 1320 (i), 2218, 3004 (ii).

Canadian Economic Lubricant Co., Payments to since 1906 (Ans.) 177 (i).

Cariboo Breakwater, N.S., Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2153 (ii).

Cassels' Report: *See* 'Investigations.'

Cedar Rapids Mfg. & Power Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Boyer) in Com., 3404 (amt.) 3409; in Com., 3472; (amt.) 3605 (ii).

Charlottetown Post Office, Sidewalk Construction, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 4228 (iii).

Chesley Post Office, Amount of Vote, &c. (Ans.) 543 (i).

——— Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1360 (i).

Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Sale of Booms (Ans.) 4222, 4891 (iii).

Chicoutimi Wharf, Expropriation of Land, &c. (Ans.) 4222 (iii).

Chilliwack Public Building, Negotiations *re* Site (Ans.) 1073 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, Classification *re* Schedules, &c., on M. for Sup., 2443 (ii).

——— Increases since April, 1908, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1069 (i).

See 'Public Works,' 'Supply,' &c.

Cobourg Harbour Expenditure, Amount of Expenditure for 1908 (Ans.) 3988 (ii).

Courtney Bay, Contracts *re* Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

See 'St. John,' &c.

Disraeli Wharf, Number of Vessels calling, &c. (Ans.) 2816 (ii).

Dredging Contracts in Ont. and Quebec, for 1907-1908, Renewals, &c. (Ans.) 3050 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Dredging Contract, Recovery of Moneys from McAvity and Mayes, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).

See 'Mayes,' &c.

Dredges, purchased by Public Works Dept., Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 146 (i).

Dry Docks, Construction under Subsidies Act, Negotiations *re* (Ans.) 478 (i).

Dry Docks Subsidies Act, Annual Expenditure (Ans.) 246 (i).

East Huron Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3477 (ii).

Eatonville Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4638 (iii).

Estimates, Passing of (remarks) 3204 (ii).

Flint Island Fog Alarm, Contract *re*, Wages, &c. (Ans.) 5637 (iii).

Fraser River, Flooding at Delta, Rep. of Mr. Coste, &c. (Ans.) 2587 (ii).

Georgian Bay Ship Canal Rep. (presented) 14 (i).

Girard, Mr. L. P., Emplymt. on Saguenay Dredging Works (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 2811 (ii).

Govt. owned Dredge working in N.S., Arrangements *re* Contract (Ans.) 2320 (ii).

Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving, on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 192, 232, 256 (i).

—— O.C. laid on Table, 171 (i).

See 'Investigations,' &c.

Grand Bend Dock, Approaches, &c. (Ans.) 2586 (ii).

G.T.R. Hotel on Major's Hill Park, Title *re* Land, &c. (Ans.) 147 (i).

Greenwood and Grand Forks Post Office Sites, Options *re* (Ans.) 814 (i).

Grenville-Hawkesbury Bridge, Aid to (Ans.) 1558 (i).

Halifax Customs House, Total Cost, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 815 (i).

Halifax Post Office, Contract for Reconstruction, &c. (Ans.) 814 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Piers, &c., Procedure *re* Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2513 (ii).

Harding, Mr.: *See* 'Investigations,' &c.

Hopper Scows, Construction of (Ans.) 1185

Honora Dock, Manitoulin, Construction, Dimensions, Exependiture, &c. (Ans.) 6408 (iv).

House of Commons, Allotment of New Rooms Instructions *re* (Ans.) 141, 466 (i).

—— Explanations *re* Answer, 170, 177 (i).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6098 (iv).

House of Commons Elevators, 2338 (ii).

—— New Wing, Amount expended for Deptl. Labour (Ans.) 2149 (ii).

See 'Roof Garden.'

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Icelander River Dredging, Cost of (Ans.) 347 (i).

Indian Point Dredging, Tenders *re*, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 1397 (i), 2763 (ii).

Inverness Harbour Improvements, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 4637 (ii).

—— Items of Expenditure *re* Vote of 1908-1909 (Ans.) 6404 (iv).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3899 (ii).

Jesus River Dredging, Amount expropriated, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1069 (i).

Kingston Military Buildings, Correction of Figures (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2539 (ii).

—— Excessive Expenditure (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2501 (ii).

—— Ques. of Order, 2498 (ii).

—— Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 546 (i).

See 'R. M. C.' &c.,

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com., 3606 (ii).

Lacas, Emile, Absence from Dept. for 1906-7-8, Pay, &c. (Ans.) 4635 (iii).

Lakefield Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3332 (ii).

Lake Manitoba, Rep. *re* Lowering of Water, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 2593 (ii).

Lake Nipissing and Monetteville Canal, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1559 (i).

Lake Simcoe Waters, on Inquiry for Ret., 2773 (ii).

Latchford Dam on Montreal River, Contract *re* (Ans.) 543 (i).

—— Cor. with T. N. & O. Ry. Commission (remarks) 3320 (ii).

Levis Graving Dock, Insufficient Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 186 (i).

Lismore Wharf, Construction of, Unpaid Accounts, &c. (Ans.) 1079 (i).

Little Current, Dredging Depth, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 7073 (iv).

Little River Wharf, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 476 (i).

Loggie, W. S. Co., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 480 (i).

London and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3846 (ii).

Magnetawan River Improvements, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 476 (i).

Manitoulin Island, Telephone or Telegraph System, Representations *re* (Ans.) 6407 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Public Works Depts., Purchase of Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 141 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Maritime Dredging Co., Tender *re* St. John Harbour (Ans.) 6787 (iv).

Markham Post Office, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6406 (iv).

Mayes Affidavit, Reading of Original, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4255, 4313; on Ques. of Order, 4257 (iii).

——— (explanation) 4297 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Daniel) 4315 (iii).

Mayes-McAvity Dredging Contract (remarks) in debate on Govt. Tenders, &c., 205, 232, 256 (i).

——— Conditions, Recovery of Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1174 (i).

See 'Investigation,' 'St. John.'

Michipicoten River Wharf, Expenditure, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 338 (i).

Military Buildings, on M. (Mr. Edwards) for Original Tenders, 1922 (i).

Militia Expenditures by Public Works Dept. from 1896 to 1909 (Ans.) 2380 (ii).

Mission River Piers, Advertisement for Tenders (remarks) 6920 (iv).

Napanee River Dredging, Surveys, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 333 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2094 (ii).

National Art Gallery, Purchase of Pictures, &c. (Ans.) 6087 (iv).

Nation River Drainage, Rep. of Engineer *re* (Ans.) 1178 (i)

N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners Report, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., 5683 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 5658, 5680 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5647 (iii).

——— Ques. of Priv., &c., 6058 (iv).

——— Rep., Printing, &c. (remarks) 4236 (iii).

New Liskeard Wharf, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2553 (ii).

Newspaper Advertising: *See* 'Whitby.'

New Westminster Dry Dock, Application *re* Govt. Aid (Ans.) 3048 (ii).

Niagara Falls, Amount of Overflow (Ans.) 1074 (i).

Nipigon River Dredging, Appropriations voted in 1908, Payments *re* (Ans.) 3653 (ii). 4223 (iii).

——— Estimated Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 5635 (iii).

'Northumberland,' Dredge, Number of Crew, Names, Emplymt., &c. (Ans.) 2815 (ii).

——— Names on Voters' Lists, on M. for Sup., 2403 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5970 (iv).

Oromocto Wharf, Total Cost, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 2319 (ii).

Oshawa Harbour, Acquisition by Govt. (Ans.) 1919 (i), 2373 (ii).

——— Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 3046 (ii).

Otonabee River Dredging, Name of Contractor, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3044 (ii).

——— Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 4221 (iii).

Ottawa Buildings leased by Govt., Rentals, Superficial Area, Taxes, &c. (Ans.) 1558 (i).

——— Payment of Taxes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1610 (i).

Owen Sound Post Office, Original and present Cost, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 248 (i).

Panmure Island Wharf, Purchase of Right-of-way, &c. (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

Peat Fuel Testings, Memorandum of Dr. Haanel read in Com. of Sup., 1493 (i).

Peterborough West, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ans.) 4637 (iii).

Pneumatic Tubes, Montreal, Quantity and Value of Purchase (Ans.) 1068 (i)

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Repairs to (Ans.) 1557 (i).

Port Arthur Harbour and Mission River Dredging, Contractors, Inspectors, &c. (Ans.) 5775 (iii).

Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3329 (ii).

Port Hood Breakwater, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4892 (iii).

Port Stanley Pier, Latest Date of Payments to Men (Ans.) 342 (i).

——— (remarks) 4048 (iii).

Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 464 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries, O.C. *re* Increases (Ans.) 1074 (i).

——— Expenditure re Byng Inlet, &c. (Ans.) 1178 (i).

Public Works in Middlesex, Expenditure for twenty years (Ans.) 4228 (iii).

Public Works Expenditures, Promises during Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1357 (i).

——— Expenditure for South Wellington, last 20 years (Ans.) 3655 (ii).

Public Works Supplies, Notice to Agents *re* Purchases, laid on Table, 3650 (ii).

Queens and Sunbury Wharfs Construction, Estimated Cost (Ans.) 2320 (ii).

Quesnel Telegraph Station Supplies, Contract *re* (Ans.) 1919 (i).

Restaurant Com., 2nd Rep. of Com. (M.) 290. 401 (i).

——— Interim Com. (remarks) 402 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Returns, on Inquiry for, 2493, 2674, 3110 (ii).

'Richelieu,' Dredge, Removal of Captain (Ans.) 1185 (i).

Richelieu River, Improvement Office (Ans.) 1186 (i).

Root Garden, New Wing, H. of C. (remarks) 7074 (iv).

R. M. C. Cottages, Cost, Specifications, &c. (Ans.) 1733 (i), 2319 (ii).

Royal Military College Stables, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1732, 1733 (i).

See 'Kingston,' 'Veterinary,' &c.

Royal Mint, Fencing, O. C. *re* (read) in Com. of Sup.), 1356 (i).

St. Andrew's Lock, Bridge Approaches (Ans.) 2159 (ii).

—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3900 (ii).

St. Andrews Rapids Locks, Construction, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 531 (i).

St. Anne de Bellevue Locks, Pet. *re* Dredging (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

St. John, N.B., Dredging, Apptmt. of Supt., &c. (Ans.) 5632 (iii).

—— Date of Beginning of Work, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 2158 (ii).

—— Payments to G. S. Mayes (Ans.) 1181 (i).

—— Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 1918 (i).

—— on Inquiry for Ret., 3255 (ii).

See 'Courtney.'

St. Johns, P.Q., Richelieu River Improvements, Estimates, &c. (Ans.) 2817 (ii).

St. Joseph's Island Wharfs, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 337 (i), 2586 (ii).

St. Lawrence Channel, Amount expended, Continuation of Work (Ans.) 2151 (ii).

St. Williams Landing Pier (remarks) in Com of Sup., 3332 (ii).

Saguenay River Boom, Construction of by Govt. (Ans.) 4222 (iii).

Sandy Cove Breakwater, Amounts owing, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1419, 1728 (i).

Sea Bull Wharf, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 338 (i).

Selkirk Post Office, Estimated Cost, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 348, 530 (i).

Shell River Bridge, Original Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 529 (i).

Sherbroke Drill Hall, Contract *re*, &c. (Ans.) 3478 (ii).

Simcoe and Couchiching Lakes, Expenditure *re* Lowering Waters (Ans.) 543 (i).

Snag Boat at Selkirk, Total Cost (Ans.) 474 (i).

S. A. Patriotic Fund, Names of Beneficiaries (Ans.) 2157 (ii).

Spry Bay Govt. Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4895 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Sturgeon Pier, Tenders, Contract *re* Raising (Ans.) 1241 (i).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 78) in Com., 3964 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 1569 (i).

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 394; Public Works (contingencies) 3672 (ii); (salaries) 613 (i), 3665 (ii).

Fisheries (international fisheries commission) 3442; Miscellaneous (Cushing & Co.'s claims) 3451 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Lethbridge) 1551 (i), (Strathcona) 3224 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Chilliwack) 2090; (Nanaimo) 3224; (Prince Rupert quarantine) 2081; (Vancouver) 2082; (Vernon) 2075; (Victoria immigration) 2082 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 1620; (engineers, &c.) 1619; (heating) 1613 (i), 3233 (ii); (lighting) 1616; (power) 1617; (rents) 1617 (i), 2075, 2452, 3673 (ii); (water) 1619 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 1596; (experimental farms) 1598 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 1543; (Winnipeg P.O.) 1549 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Grosse Isle) 3211; (Partridge Island, water service) 3206 (ii); (St. John drill hall) 1293 (i); (St. John hospital fitting) 3210 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Amherst) 1282; (Bridgewater) 1283; (Glace Bay) 1287; (Guysborough) 1288; (Halifax) 1288; (New Glasgow) 1290; (Pictou) 1291; (Shelburne) 1291; (Westville) 1292 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 1356; (Cornwall) 1359; (Glencoe) 1361, 1366 (i); (Kingston artillery park) 3223 (ii); (Kingston R. M. C.) 1381, 1507, 1532 (i); (Kingston R.M.C.) in conc., 4049 (iii); (Kingston vet. hospital) 1534; (Leamington) 1386; (Markham) 1386; (Simcoe) 1392; (Toronto, barracks) 1505; (Toronto, drill hall) 1504; (Toronto, observatory) 1505; (Whitby) 1393, 1519, (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1253; (astronomical observatory) 617 (i), (clerk of works) 3225 (ii); (electric lighting) 1600 (i), 3226 (ii); (elevators) 1600 (i), 3228 (ii); (fittings) 1391; (furniture) 1605; (grounds) 1600 (i), 3225 (ii); (heating, &c.) 1601 (i); (House of Commons alterations) 3204 (ii); lavatories) 1392; (Major's Hill) 1601; (museum) 1275 (i), 3215 (ii); (new bldg.) 1250; (peat fuel testings) 1389, 1494; (Rideau Hall) 1604 (i), 3233 (ii); (Rideau Hall grounds) 1611; (Rideau Hall, heating) 1612; (Royal Mint) 1271 (i), 3205 (ii); (telephones) 1605 (i), 3229 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 1292 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 1293 (i); (detention hospital) 3221 (ii); (Joliette) 1294; (Knowlton) 1301; (Lachute) 1301 (i); (Montreal, examining

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

warehouse) 3211 (ii); (Montreal P.O., enlargement) 1317; (Montreal, postal station) 1303 (i); Quebec citadel) 3211 (ii); (Quebec) 1317; (St. Johns) 1317; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 1317 (i), 3222 (ii); (Three Rivers) 1318 (i).

Public Works — Buildings—Sask. (Prince Albert) 1555 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 1592 (i); (Dawson) 3224 (ii); (rents, &c.) 1620 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Dom. (generally) 6534 (iv); (vessels, repairs) 3338 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging—Maritime Provs. 6553 (iv); (plant) 3339 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (Wingfield) 3347 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging—P. E. I. (Souris) 6555 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alta (Old Man River) 3337 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Okanagan) 6544; (Quesnelle) 6544 (iv); (Victoria) 2102; (Lac du Bonnet) 2985; (Lake Dauphin) 2997; (Portage la Prairie) 3001, 3333; (repairs, &c.) 2985; (Roblin bridge) 2996; (St. Andrews rapids) 2097; (Winnipeg Beach) 2986 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Beaver Harbour) 1622; (Buctouche 1623; (Campbellton) 1625; (Campobello) 1646; (Cape Bald) 1625; (Cape Tormentine) 1625; (Cummings Cove) 1625 (i); (Dorchester) 3237 (ii); (Dover) 1625; (Harvey bank) 1626; (Heron island) 1626; (Kouchibougouac) 1626; (Lameque) 1626; (Leonardsville) 1626; (Mill's Point) 1626; (Moncton) 1627; (North Head) 1629; (Pink Rock) 1629; (Pointe du Chene) 1629; (Quaco) 1629; (Richibucto) 1629 (i), 3237 (ii); (Richibucto) conc., 4049 (iii); (St. Andrews) 1645 (i); (St. John) 2109 (ii); (St. John harbour) 1645; (St. John surveys) 1641 (i); (St. John, tidal waters) 3238 (ii); (St. John, tributaries) 1633; (Seal Cove) 1645; (Shippegan) 1645; (Whitehead wharf) 1646 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2338; (Arisaig) 3233; (Avonport pier) 2453; (Baddeck) 2453; (Bailey's Brook) 3234; (Bay St. Lawrence) 2455; (Big Bras d'Or) 2455; (Blue Rocks) 2455; (Breton Cove) 2456; (bridges) 2474; (Cheverie) 2456; (Church Point) 2457; (Clark's harbour) 2462; (Cow Bay) 2463; (Digby) 2473; (Glace Bay) 3234; (Grand Etang) 3234; (Little Narrows) 2477; (Little River) 3234; (Middle River) 2477; (Minasville) 2479; (Port Hastings) 2479 (ii); (Port Hood) 6543 (iv); (Portuguese Cove) 2480, 3234 (ii); (repairs, &c.) 6543 (iv); (Sandy Cove) 2475, 3235; (Scotch Cove) 3234; (South Lake, Lakevale) 2480, 3235; (Spry Bay) 2474; (Tangier) 2484; (Upper Prospect) 3235; (Wallace bridge) 2484; (Yarmouth) 2484 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blanche River) 2966; (Blind River) 3292; (bridges, repairs) 2968; (Brighton) 3314; (Burlington channel) 2966; (Cobourg) 2967; (Collingwood) 3294; (Goderich piers) 2968; (Gravenhurst) 2981; (Lake Nipissing) 3308; (Latchford dam) 3320; (Little Current) 2973, 3302; (McGregor's Creek) 2975; (Magnetawan) 2982; (Meaford) 2984, 3313; (Montreal river) 2975 (ii); (Newcastle) 6544 (iv); (Owen Sound) 3315; (Petewawa) 3308; (Port Arthur, &c.) 2092; (Port Stanley) 2977; (Richard's Landing) 2978; (Rondeau) 2979; (St. Lawrence channel, Kingston) 2979; (Sault Ste. Marie) 2980, 3317; (Silver Centre) 3317; (Southampton) 2980, 3317; (Spanish River, 3324; (Sydenham) 3324; (Tiffin) 2115; (Toronto) 2980, 3317; (Victoria) 2117; (Wolfe Island canal) 3304 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (bridges) 2507; (creosoted timber) 2511; (Graham's Pond) 2507; (Naufrage pond) 2512, 2508; (Sturgeon pier) 2510; (Tignish) 2510; (Vernon) 2511 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse à l'Ilot) 2513; (Anse à la Barbe) 2512; (Batiscan) 3274; (Bonaventure) 2559; (Bonaventure River) 3277; (Cap St. Ignace) 2522; (Chicoutimi) 2523; (Clarke City) 2526, 2540, 2887; (Doucet's Landing) 2543; (Douglastown) 2546; (Garthby) 2549; (Gaspé) 2550; (general repairs) 3243; (Lake St. Francis) 2554; (Lake St. John) 2556; (Laprairie ice piers) 2899 (ii); (Laprairie) 3287; (Lévis) 2094; (Magdalen Islands) 2557; (Mistook) 2557; (Nicolet) 3246; (repairs, &c.) 2554; (Richelieu) 2559; (Rimouski) 2558; (Rivière du Loup) 3284; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 2902; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 2906, 3287; (St. Charles river) 2095; (St. Francis du Lac) 3285; (St. Francis river) 2898; (St. Fulgence) 2906; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 2906; (St. Maurice) 2900; (St. Michel d'Yamaska) 3247, 3262; (St. Nicholas) 2908; (Saguenay) 3284; (Saguenay dredging) 2802, 2878; (Sorel) 2909, 3289; (Yamaska) 2900, 3291 (ii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Julien, Wm. compensation) 3349 (ii); (monuments) 6543 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Kamloops) 3348 (ii).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Yukon (Ashcroft) 3349; (Ashcroft Dawson) 3349 (ii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Poupore, W. J., claims) 3361 (ii).

Sussex St. Govtl. Buildings, Architect's Plans, &c., Ownership, &c. (Ans.) 4638 (iii).

Tatamagouche Bay Wharf, Expenditure for Oct. and Nov., &c. (Ans.) 185 (i).

Tenby Bay Wharf, Warehouse, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 340 (i).

Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Smyth) in Com., 6064 (iv).

Toronto Harbour Works, Delay *re* Payments to Men, &c. (Ans.) 544 (i).

Toronto, New Post Office, Delay in Construction (Ans.) 336 (i).

Transportation Problem (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2891 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Uxbridge Post Office, Option on Sites, &c. (Ans.) 181, 1731 (i), 6091 (iv).

Tenders: See 'Govt.,' &c.

Veterinary Hospital at Kingston, Dimensions, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 2150 (ii).

Victoria Harbour, B.C. Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2105 (ii).

Wallace Bridge Wharf, Contracts *re* Construction (Ans.) 1916 (i).

Welland, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ans.) 3990 (ii).

Westport Landing Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2458 (ii).

—— Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 476 (i).

Westville Post Office, Area of Concrete Walks (Ans.) 6086 (iv)

—— Contract Price, Inspectors, &c. (Ans.) 2755 (ii).

Weymouth River Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2362 (ii).

Wharfs, B.C., on Inquiry for Ret., 3004 (ii).

Wharfs on Inland Waters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3331 (ii).

Wharfs between Longue-Pointe and Pointe-aux-Trembles (Ans.) 1069 (i).

Wharfs in N.S., N.B., and B.C., Amount expended since 1906 (Ans.) 348 (i).

Wharfs in Queens and Sunbury, Tenders called for in Oct., Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans). 2375 (ii).

Wharfs at St. Zotique, Amounts expended (Ans.) 1401 (i).

Whitby Harbour, Acquisition by Govt. Negotiations *re* (Ans.) 2372 (ii).

Whitby, &c., Public Buildings, Advertisements *re*, List of Papers (read) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).

Windsor, N.S., Post Office, Tenders *re* renovating (Ans.) 4289 (iii).

Wingham Post Office Clock, &c. (Ans.) 4637 (iii).

Winnipeg Beach Pier, Removal of Obstructions in Manitou Rapids (Ans.) 335 (i).

Wolfe Island Canal, Maintenance by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 3043 (ii).

RANKIN, Mr. J. P., *North Perth.*

Franklin Montgomery Gray, Patent Relief (B. 132) 1°*, 4221; in Com., 4883, 5028 (iii).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*

Agricultural Fertiliers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 1°, 2910 (ii).

Belleville Drill Hall (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 674 (i).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on M. (Mr. Henderson) to ref. back to Special Com., 5442 (iii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

C.P.R. Stock Issue (remarks) on M. for Sup., 786 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, in Com. on Res., 407 (i).

Commercial Feed Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 1°, 3937 (ii); in Com., 5211 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4633 (iii).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i).

Govt. Employees, Interference at Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6870 (iv).

Govt. Railways Act (compensation) B. 20 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 780 (i).

Govt. Tenders, Opening and Receiving (prop. Res.) 188 (i).

—— Notice of, 170.

House of Commons Elevator, Repairing and Running (remarks) 2337 (ii).

Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.'s B. 48 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 2°, 1147 (i).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4494, 4530 (iii).

Passenger Ticket Act Amt. (B. 2) 1°*, 91; 2° m., 550 (i).

Preston, W. T. R., Protest from Japan *re* Statements, &c. (Ques.) 186 (i)

—— Transfer to Holland (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6657 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6200; in Com., 6293 (iv).

Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 778 (i).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4538 (iii).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3968 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food, (fraudulent marking) 456 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 689; (census, &c.) 696; (exhibitions) 729 (i); (live stock industry) 5834 (iii), (Patent Record) 696; (Public Works Health Act) 810 (i).

Canals—Beauharnois (water-power), 1910 (i).

Canals—Chambly (St. John's harbour) 1571; (surveys) 1910 (i).

Canals—Lachine (basin No. 2) 1910; (cement) 1567; (wharfs and basins) 786;

Canals—St. Lawrence (district office) 1572; (Galops collector) 1574 (i).

Canals—Soulanges (slope trimmings) 1569 (i).

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 1578 (i).

Canal—Welland (electric plant) 1903; (Port Colborne) 1903 (i).

Civil Govt.—Customs (board of customs) 585; (contingencies) 602 (i).

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (salaries) 445 (i).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 613, 720 (i).
Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 3671
Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (salaries) 461 (i).
Civil Govt.—Sec. of State (contingencies) 461; (salaries) 459 (i).
Civil Service Commission (salaries) 392, 705 (i).
Customs—Miscellaneous (printing and stationery) 609; Outside Service (salaries 608 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamer) 6910 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (contingent fund) 6655 (iv).
Marine—Public Works—(St. Lawrence ship canal) 6878 (iv).
Militia (gratuities) 2313 (ii); (supplies) 6662 (iv); (warlike stores) 2317 (ii).
Miscellaneous (patent medicines) 458 (i).
Northwest Mounted Police (force) 3660 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 6670; (ice-breaker, Northumberland Straits) 6673; (life saving rewards) 6675; (patrol boats) 6682; (wrecking plant) 6681; (wrecks investigations) 6679 (iv).
Penitentiaries—(supplies) 899; St. Vincent de Paul (supplies) 915 (i).
Printing and Stationery (salaries) 804 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating) 1614; (rents) 1618 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Whitby) 1521 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 618 (i); (museum) 3215 (ii); (new bldgs.) 1252; (telephones) 1605 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (detention hospital) 3221; (Quebec citadel) 3213 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon, (rents &c.) 1620 (i).
Public Works—Dredging—Dom. (vessels) 3338 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 3333 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Yarmouth) 2485 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Spanish River) 3329; (Toronto) 3320; (Wolfe Island) 3305 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Clarke City) 2528, 2541; (Nicolet) 3246; (Saguenay dredging) 2810; (St. Helen's Island) 3245; (St. Michel d'Yamaska) 3247 (ii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese administration) 6655; (commercial agencies) 6657 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 452; (Intercolonial Bureau) 455 (i).

Tompkins Hannah Ella, Relief (B. 135) 1°*, 4411 (iii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N., *Cumberland.*

Boat Harbour, Pictou Co., N.S., Total Expenditure, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 2318 (ii).
Eatonville Wharf, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 4638 (iii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*

Falconer, Mr. R. S., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 332 (i).
Fort Cumberland Land, Govt. Ownership, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 3481 (ii).
Guysborough County Public Works, Expenditure of Votes, &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).
Indians, Medical Attendance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1169 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6797 (iv).
I. C. R., Claims for Damages by persons in N. S., Settlement, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3054 (ii).
—— Claims for Damages, Settlement of between June and Dec. 1908 (Ques.) 2157 (ii)
—— Double Tracking, Survey *re* at Amherst, &c. (Ques.) 529 (i).
Lismore Wharf, Construction, Unpaid Accounts, &c. (Ques.) 1079 (i).
McKenzie, Calvin, Employt. on I.C.R., Pay, &c. (Ques.) 2152 (ii).
Malagash, N.S., Mail Contract, Expiry of, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 5639 (iii).
'Minto' and 'Stanley' Strs., Officers off duty on 12th to 17th Feb. 1909, &c. (Ques.) 1975 (i).
Nappan Experimental Farm, Names of Employees, Rate of Pay, &c. (Ques.) 5640 (iii).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Men on Voters' Lists (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2403 (ii).
—— Number of Crew, Names, Emplymt., &c. (Ques.) 2815 (ii).
Pictou County Fishery Overseers, Prosecutions in Salmon Illegal Fishing (Ques.) 5632 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 652 (i).
Indians—N.S. (medical attendance) 998 (i).
Labour Dept. (industrial disputes) 658 (i).
Penitentiaries—Dorchester (electric lighting) 884 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 2115 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 2454; (Big Bras d'Or) 2455; (Breton Cove) 2456; (bridges) 2474; (Cumberland) 2118; (Joggins Mines) 2477; (Little Narrows) 2477; (Portuguese Cove) 2480; (Wallace bridge) 2484 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (double tracking) 2753; (Loggieville) 2753 (ii).
Wallace Bridge Wharf, Contracts *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1916 (i).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1867 (i).
Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3791 (ii).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A.—*Con.*

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 154 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6574 (iv).

Montreal Municipal Rights, Par. in 'La Presse' (remarks) 1648 (i).

Royal Guardians (B. 95) M. to consider, 7071 (iv).

Washington R. McCloy, Patent Relief (B 169) 1°*, 5623 (iii).

ROBB, Mr. J. A., *Huntingdon.*

Bills of Lading, Jurisdiction by Ry. Commission (Ques.) 1179 (i).

Foot and Mouth Disease, Present Condition Embargo, &c. (Ques.) 334 (i).

Govt. Employees, Interference at Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6870 (iv).

Hungry Bay Dyke, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 349 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6811 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Militia (salaries) 2305 (ii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Birtle Hospital, Attendance of Dr. Wright *re* Indians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

Canadian Medical Association incorp. (B. 134) 1°*, 4221; in Com., 4840 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

——— Memorial *re* (read) 2235 (ii).

———Settlement re Delimitation, &c. (Ques.) 530 (i).

Man. Judicial District, Apptmt. of Judge (Ques.) 341 (i).

Makaroff Postmaster, Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1703 (i).

Manitoba Post Office Transfers since Nov. 1908, Names of former Postmasters, &c. (Ques.) 1414 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1922 (i).

Pope Post Office, Pet. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1713 (i).

Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Compensation to Squatters, &c. (Ques.) 530 (i).

Shell River Bridge, Original Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 529 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 697 (i).

Civil Govt.—Finance (salaries) 385 (i).

Indians—Generally (destitute, &c.) 1010; (general expenses) 1016; (schools) 1015 (i).

Indians—Man. (annuities) 1002; (live stock) 1005; (seed grain) 1004; (surveys) 1015 (i).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (schools) 979 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 3422 (ii).

Miscellaneous (litigation) 1172 (i); (seed grain) 3465 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 1546; (Winnipeg P.O.) 1549 (i).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Prince Albert) 1555 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 3001; (repairs) 2985; (Roblin bridge) 2995; (St. Andrews rapids) 2108 (ii).

Telephone Rates in Canada, Control of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1761 (i).

ROSS, Mr. J. A., *Rimouski.*

La Compagnie du chemin de fer International de Rimouski incorp. (B. 50) 1°*, 738 (i).

ROY, Mr. C., *Montmagny.*

Can. Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 6020 (iv).

Cap St. Ignace, I.C.R. Tank, Cor. *re* Construction (M. for copies*) 3992 (ii).

Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 859 (i).

I.C.R., St. Ignace Station, Requests *re* Construction (Ques.) 3476 (ii).

——— Construction, &c. (M. for pets.*) 3992 (ii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3890 (ii).

Laberge, Alphonse, Lease with Govt. (M. for copies) 3992 (ii).

ROY, Mr. E., *Dorchester.*

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 2860 (ii).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 222 (i).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3547 (ii)

RUSSELL, Mr. J., *East Toronto.*

Immigrants, Destitute, Par. in Toronto 'Telegram' (remarks) 2335 (ii).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 4240 (iii); in Com., 6316 (iv).

RUTAN, Mr. W. W., *Prince Albert.*

C.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 3039; (amt.) 3040, 3151 (ii).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2848 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3950 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6079 (iv).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*

American Immigration Agents, Duties, &c. (remarks) 2243 (ii).

Budget, The (remarks) 4968 (iii).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

Civil Service Salaries, in Com. on Res., 410 (i).

Coal Oil Explosions, Evidence, Reps. *re* Explosions in Man. (M. for copies*) 1421 (i).

——— Investigation as to Deaths, &c. (Ques.) 1056 (i).

Elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, Govt. Operation (prop. res.) 3993 (ii).

Govt. Railways Act (compensation) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 775 (i).

Highways, Removal of Planks, Instructions from Ry. Commissioners (remarks) 1022 (i).

King, Mr. Mackenzie, Total Amount paid to *re* Absence in China, &c. (Ques.) 6406 (iv).

Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6737 (iv).

Railway Act (fires) Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 377 (i).

Railway Commission Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2630 (ii).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2801 (ii).

Souris Postmaster, Dismissal of, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6847 (iv).

——— Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1915 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 727 (i).

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 390, 708 (i).

Immigration (deportations) 7022 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Amherst) 1282; (Bridgewater) 1285; (Shelburne) 1291 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (museum) 1278; (Royal Mint) 1274 (i).

Turtle Mountain Squatters, Removal, Compensation, &c. (Ques.) 1417 (i).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2134 (ii).

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *South Oxford.*

Fruit Marks Act, Regulations *re* Inspection, on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).

Ry. Commission Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2661 (ii).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 626 (i).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4211 (iii).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O., *Wentworth.*

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1694 (i).

Fruit Marks Act, Regulations *re* Inspection, on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O.—*Con.*

Geodetic Survey Bureau Establishment, on M. (Mr. Maclean) for Cor., 3070 (ii).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 278 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 3190 (ii); (Year Book) 705 (i).

Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 3681 (ii).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4171 (iii).

SEGUIN, Mr. P. A., *L'Assomption.*

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3931 (ii).

Patent Medicines Act, Apptmt. of Analysts, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 3476 (ii).

SEXSMITH, Mr. J. A., *East Peterborough.*

Adulteration Act Amt. (B. 100) 1° m., 2217 (ii).

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4448 (iii).

Birdsall, Landing Wharf, Rice Lake, Cost of, Contract *re* (Ques.) 825 (i).

Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5208 (iii).

Lakefield Wharf, Amount of Expenditure, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 1063 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3332 (ii).

Otonabee River Floods, Payments to Property Owners re Damages (M. for ret.*) 1190 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6228 (iv).

Stellarton Station, I. C. R., Area of Concrete Walks, &c. (Ques.) 5630 (iii).

Stony Lake Property, Damage *re* Floods (Ques.) 825 (i).

Stony Lake Property Owners, Payments *re* Damages by Floods (M. for ret.*) 1190 (i).

——— Wharfs, Number, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1064 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 3190 (ii); (experimental farm) 5950 (iv); (experimental farm, electric ry.) 3193 (ii); (International Institute) 5883; (live stock industry) 5878 (iii).

Canals—Trent (construction) 3183 (ii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7032 (iv).

Post Office (rural mails) 3124 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal Land Damages, Amounts paid *re*, &c. (Ques.) 4641 (iii).

Watson, R. J., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2158 (ii).

Westville Post Office, Area of Concrete Walks &c. (Ques.) 6085 (iv).

SHARPE, Mr. S., *North Ontario.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4458, 5203 (iii).

Armouries supplied by Officers, Policy of Govt., &c. (Ques.) 824 (i).

Bank Act (unclaimed balances) Amt. (B. 155) 1° m., 4801 (iii).

Buell, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. before Ry. Commission (Ques.) 3252 (ii).

——— (remarks) 3062 (ii).

Buildings, Public, erected. Names of Villages, Cost of Maintenance, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3055 (ii).

Campbell, Bush., Emplymt. on Trent Canal (Ques.) 1066 (i).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4442 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 2573 (ii). 6053 (iv).

——— in Com., 3018; Ques. of Order, 3019 (ii).

——— on M. to ref. back to Com., on Standing Orders, 3041 (ii).

——— on Order for Com. (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Banking, &c., 4164 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Henderson) to ref. back to Com., 5443 (iii).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 2058 (ii).

Cattle Guards at Ry. Crossings, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1724 (i).

Cattle Guards at Ry. Crossings, Complaints to erect, &c. (Ques.) 680, 1409 (i).

Cement Contract to W. G. Hartsanft Cement Co., Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 3985 (ii).

Chartered Banks, Unpaid Balances for five years, &c. (Ques.) 2592 (ii).

See 'Bank Act.'

Civil Service Act, Apntmt. of Officials in 1908, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 827 (i).

Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5207 (iii).

Foot and Mouth Disease, Precautionary Measures *re* Prevention, Apptmt. of Officials, &c. (M. for ret.*) 521 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Minimum Tariff on Farm Products (Ques.) 5158 (iii).

Govt. Loans, Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2161 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1724 (i).

Govt. Savings Banks, Deposits for Oct. 1889, 1896-7-8, Number of Officials, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1924 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1723 (i).

G.T.P., Tenders for Ties *re* N.T. Ry., Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 6091 (iv)

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Holland River Canal, Deputation *re* Construction, Rep. of Engineers, &c. (Ques.) 2153 (ii).

Indians, Medical Relief (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1169 (i).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3774 (ii).

Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching, Lowering of Waters, Expenditures, &c. (M. for ret.*) 685 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2773 (ii).

See 'Simcoe.'

Loans by Govt., Expenses *re* (Ques.) 1921 (i).

Loan Returns, Expenditures, &c. (remarks) 4124 (iii).

See 'Govt. Loans.'

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Supplies, Purchases since Investigation (Ques.) 472 (ii).

Marine Supplies, Amounts paid *re* by Departments of Govt. to Companies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2597 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 3044 (ii).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).

North and South Ontario Election Expenses, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 2587 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5383 (iii), 5968 (iv).

Plank, Mr. M. W., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3252 (ii).

Post Office and Dom. Govt. Savings Banks, Distinction *re* (Ques.) 4897 (iii).

Post Office Savings Banks, Rate of Interest on Deposits, &c. (Ques.) 1067 (i).

Rama Indians, Trust Funds, Amount held by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 543 (i).

——— Expenditures on Roads and Bridges (Ques.) 677 (i).

Savings Deposits and Loans, 3 per cent, &c., Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 679 (i).

Simcoe and Couchiching Lakes, Expenditure *re* Lowering Waters (Ques.) 543 (i).

See 'Lakes.'

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) 2234 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 700; (exhibitions) 733 (i).

Canals—Lachine (cement) 801 (i).

Canals—Trent (construction) 1577 (i); 2074, 3179 (ii); (Holland River) 1578, 1587, 1887 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 647 (i).

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 706 (i).

Civil Govt.—Customs (Board of Customs) 587; (contingencies) 593 (i).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 721 (i).
Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 616 (i).
Indians—Generally (inspectors) 1162; Ont. (legal expenses) 996 (i).
Labour Dept. (industrial disputes) 655 (i).
Miscellaneous (litigation) 1172 (i).
Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 892 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (New Glasgow) 1291; (Westville) 1292 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Cornwall) 1359; (Glencoe) 1361, 1366; (Kingston Vet. Hospital) 1534; (Whitby) 1522 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 618; (Royal Mint) 1280 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 1294 (i)
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Lake Nipissing) 3309; (Sault Ste. Marie) 3317; (Silver Centre) 3317; (Sydenham) 3324 (ii).
Railways— G. T. P. (Quebec Bridge) 2052 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton cut-off) 2925 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (litigation) 2057, 2068 (ii).

Uxbridge Post Office, Options *re* Sites, &c. (Ques.) 181, 1731 (i), 6091 (iv).

Wallberg's Claims *re* moneys due him, Fiat &c. (Ques.) 3989 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H., *Lisgar.*

Budget, The, 4794 (iii).
—— Ques. of Order, 4958 (iii).
—— Remarks, 5062 (iii).
English Oats, Number of Bushels, Purchase Prices paid (M. for ret.*) 1734 (i).
Fisheries in Pembina River, Regulations or Agreements with U.S., Cor., O.Cs., &c. (M. for copies*) 548 (i).
Gretna Quarantine Buildings, Total Cost, Price of Land, &c. (Ques.) 824 (i).
Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 62 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 2535 (ii).
Seed Oats purchased for Alberta and Sask., Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1420 (i).
Seed Wheat, Number of Bushels purchased, Price paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1734 (i).
—— (Ques.) 1419 (i).
South African Land Grants, Changes *re* Regulations as to residence, &c. (Ques.) 541 (i).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Surrender of Land (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5956 (iv).
Civil Service Commission (salaries) 710 (i).
Penitentiaries—Stony Mountain (supplies) 923 (i).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg P. O.) 1550 (i).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 2965 (ii).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

Corporations' Securities, Total Amounts deposited with Govt. (Ques.) 247 (i).
Forests, Waterways and Water-Powers, 3rd rep. (M.) to conc., 6919 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Number of Employees, Nationality, &c. (Ques.) 249 (i), 3042 (ii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., Documents printed and distributed, Number of (M. for ret.*) 1191 (i).
Canadian Imports, Percentage entering Can. in 1908, &c. (Ques.) 1728 (i).
Fisheries Development, Apptmt. of Sel. Com. (prop. res.) 483 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6172 (iv).
I.C.R., Branch Lines, Extension, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2193 (i).
—— East Bound Traffic, Percentage, &c. (Ques.) 528 (i).
Lobster Packing Licenses granted in N.S. for 1908, Name and Address, &c. (Ques.) 328 (i).
N.S. Weekly Mail Service, Number of (Ques.) 1731 (i).
Shipping Drawbacks, Amounts paid from 1898 to 1908 (Ques.) 167 (i).

SMITH, Mr. A. W., *North Middlesex.*

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4153, 4194 (iii).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Address, The, 94 (i).
—— Ques. of Order, 134 (i).
Budget, The, 4727 (iii).
Burrard, Westminster Boundary Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1116 (i).
Cooperative Societies, on M. for Sup., 2333 (ii).
Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) to M. for Sup., 2855 (ii).
Deptl. Payments to Companies *re* Marine and Other Supplies (Ques.) 2822 (ii).
Fishery Cruisers, Number owned by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2769 (ii).
Fisheries Cruiser for Pacific Coast, Tenders, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 2155 (ii).
New Westminster Penitentiary, Warden from 1876 to 1888, Escape of Prisoners, &c. (Ques.) 2769 (ii).
New Westminster Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Orientals in B. C. on Jan. 1, 1909, Number naturalized, &c. (Ques.) 1920 (i).

Ry. Act (hours of labour) Amt. (B. 72) 1°m., 1318 (i).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 868 (i).

Victoria and Barkley Sound Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 59) 1°*, 868 (i); on Senate Amts., 4445 (iii).

SMYTH, Mr. Wm. R., *East Algoma.*

Fishery Licenses issued to Wikwinikong Indians, Representations *re* (Ques.) 6107 (iv)

Franking Privilege, Abuse of by Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4128 (iii).

Honora Dock, Manitoulin, Construction, Dimensions, Expenditures, &c. (Ques.) 6408 (iv).

——Yearly Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 7072 (iv).

Howell, H. M., Payments to, Itemized Statement (M. for copy*) 3992 (ii).

Little Current Dredging, Depth, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 7072 (iv).

Manitoulin Island Telephone or Telegraph System, Representations *re* (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 4531 (iii).

Rutherford Bay, Ownership of Islands, Settlement of, &c. (Ques.) 6408 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Indians—Ont. and Que. (schools) 985; (surveys) 990 (i).

Penitentiaries—Kingston (supplies) 887 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blind River) 3293; (Little Current) 2973; (Montreal river) 2975; (Richard's Landing) 2978; (Spanish River) 3325 (ii).

Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 104) 1°*, 2318 (ii); in Com., 5483, 5574 (iii), 6062 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. Charles Marcil) *Bonaventure.*

Address, The, Order, Ques. of (ruling) 134 (i).

Belleville Drill Hall (remarks) *re* answer to Question, 674 (i).

Bills, Assent to by Dep. Gov. (Mess. from Senate) 4119 (iii).

—— Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 4122 (iii).

Bills, Procedure in absence of Promoters (remarks) 4145 (iii).

Budget, The, Members remarks checked, 4874 (iii).

—— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Cowan) Ques. of Order, 4756 (iii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Budget, The, Ques. of Order (Mr. Campbell) 4957 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) on M. to ref. back to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 3041 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. S. Sharpe) to ref. back to Banking Com., 4164 (iii).

—— on M. (Mr. Henderson) to refer back to Special Com., 5429 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 5458 (iii).

Carleton County Electoral Div., Certificate of Election (notification) 1553 (i).

—— Issue of Warrant (notification) 159 (i).

Comox-Atlin, Member Elect., Certificate of (notification) 1234 (i).

—— Resignation of Mr. W. Sloan (notification) 14 (i).

Co-Operative Societies, Members remarks checked, 2326 (ii).

Deferred Elections, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ames) 2868 (ii).

Disraeli Wharf, Irregularity of Question, 2761 (ii).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ont. Govt. Legislation, Ques. of Order, 6921 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. R. L. Borden) 280 (i).

—— Ques. of Order (Mr. Staples) 285 (i).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crothers) ruling, 573 (i).

G. T. P., Sub-contracts on B. C. Section, Violation of Labour Contracts, Members remarks checked, 3940 (ii).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6109 (iv).

—— Classification (presented) 2493 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., Irrelevancy of debate, 6168 (iv).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, &c. on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 3849; (ruling) 3855 (ii).

Kingston Military Buildings Expenditure, Ques. of Order, 2496 (ii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 2506

Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 12 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries, Depletion of, Members Remarks checked, 6944 (iv).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) on Senate Amts., 6080 (iv).

Manitoba Post Office Transfer Questions (remarks) 1414 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brodeur) Ques. of Order, 4044 (iii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

McAvity-Mayes Dredging Contract, Stmnt. of Minister must be accepted (ruling) 273 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Emmerson)—(ruling) 276 (i).

Mayes Dredging Contract, Correction in Answer (amt.) 1175 (i).

——— Remarks, 153 (i).

Mayes Affidavit, Reading of, Ques. of Order, 4254, 4259; (ruling) 4259, 4297 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Daniel) 4315 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 'imputing motives,' (ruling) 4408 (iii).

Members, New, Notification of, Comox-Atlin, 1234 (i).

Mess from Senate, 4119 (iii).

Mess. from His Ex., Estimates (read) 2597 (ii), 6092, 7065 (iv).

Mess. from His Ex., Opening (read) 7 (i).

——— (prorogation) 7086 (iv).

Mines and Minerals, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 6919 (iv).

Miner, Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. J. D. Taylor) —(ruling) 1823-4 (i).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) on Amt. (Mr. Conmee) to M. for 3°, 6129 (iv).

N. B. Central Ry. Commission's Report, on M. (Mr. Foster) to lay on Table (ruling) 5488, 5624 (iii).

N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report *re* Hon. Mr. Pugsley, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 5646 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 5659, 5680 (iii).

Newmarket Canal, Irrelevancy of Debate (remarks) 3141 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s Bill, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sproule) 1116 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Campbell), Members remarks checked, 6779 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Conmee) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 4291 (iii).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec. (read) 7074 (iv).

Railway Act (commissioners) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) to M. for 3°, (ruling) 6306 (iv).

Ry. Act (sanitary conditions) Amt. B. 111 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 3363 (ii).

Ry. Commission, Ques. of Order, 2662 (ii).

Railway Commission Vacancy, Ques. of Order, on prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2629 (ii).

Restaurant Com., Mess. from Senate, 378 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Customs—Members remarks checked, 585 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

House of Commons (debates) 3437; (promotions) 3436 (ii); (salaries) 6775 (iv); (voters' lists) 3436 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bonaventure) 3278 (ii).

Speaker, Election of (remarks) 6 (i).

Speech from Throne (read) 9 (i).

Yukon Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 2120 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) *South Perth.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., Members remarks checked, 4455 (iii).

Budget, The, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) 5060 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., on Ques. of Order (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3019; (ruling) 3020 (ii).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 2062 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. McIntyre) on Amt. (Mr. Rutan) 3041 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ont. Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 3410 (ii).

Cedar Rapids Mfg. & Power Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Boyer) on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) 3409 (ii).

Civil Service Salaries, Members remarks checked, 407 (i).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., Irregular Voting (ruling) 568 (i).

Fisheries Development, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crosby) 519 (i).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature, Member remarks checked, 1667 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1683 (i).

Govt. Policy *re* Public Buildings, Ques. of Order, 2507 (ii).

Govt. Tenders, Opening, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crothers) 572 (i).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) on Amt. (Mr. Neely) 3949 (ii).

Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. Molloy) on objections (Mr. Clarke) to Com., 5483 (iii).

Miner, Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 950 (i).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., Amt. (read) 5231 (iii).

N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 5764 (iii).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., (ruling) *re* Quoting from Newspapers, 4484 (iii).

——— in Com., Members checked, 5356, 5571 (iii).

——— in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Middlebro) 5972 (iv).

St. Mary's and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 70) 1°*, 1318 (i).

SUPPLY.

Arts, &c. (live stock industry), Ques. of Order, 5855 (iii).

Ocean and River Service, Ques. of Order, 6680 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Man., Ques. of Order (ruling) 1545 (i).

Public Works—Man.: Member's remarks checked, 2999 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. Members remarks checked, 1524 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1537 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers,—N.B., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1635.

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Sandy Cove) 2475 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R., Members' remarks checked, 2926 (ii).

Weights and Measures, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3687 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4446 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 750; in Com., 756 (i).

Bills of Lading Bill, Discussion *re* (remarks) 6918 (iv).

Bowden, Annie Relief (B. 194) 1° m., 6917 (iv).

Brazilian Electro Steel and Smelting Co.'s B. 10 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 1023 (i).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4437 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3036 (ii), 5482 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. S. Sharpe) to ref. back to Banking Com., 4164 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Henderson) to ref. back to Special Com., 5435 (iii).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1688 (i).

Canadian Medical Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Roche) in Com., 4840 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 3410 (ii).

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Dubeau) on Senate Amts., 4164, 4593 (iii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

C.P.R. Additional Stock, Distribution of, on M. (Mr. Macleau) to Com. of Sup., 426 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 785 (i).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 11 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 987 (i).

Cassels Report: *See* 'Investigations.'

Catholic Immigration, Instructions to Agents, Par. in Mail and Empire, 2672 (ii).

Cedar Rapids Mfg. & Power Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. Boyer) in Com., 3407 (ii).

Civil Service Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6325 (iv).

Civil Service Salaries Increase B. 187 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for Com. on Res., 322; in Com. on Res., 415, 955, 963 (i); in Com., 6347; on M. for 3°, 6830 (iv).

Cold Storage Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6742 (iv).

Cold Storage for Fruit, Amount shipped to G.B. for 1907-8 (M. for ret.*) 3056 (ii).

——— Amount, System, &c. (Ques.) 2817 (ii).

Cold Storage (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6833 (iv).

Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5204 (iii).

Commissions: *See* 'Secret,' &c.

Committees, Special, Ref. to of Deptl. Reps. (remarks) 2026 (ii).

Criminal Code (flogging) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 569 (i).

Debates, Official 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 1476 (i).

Dominion Lands Act Amt. (B. 64) 1° m., 1234 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt., Memorandum *re* Ques. of Priv., 3002 (ii).

External Affairs Dept., on prop. Res. (Mr. Murphy) 1988 (i).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ont. Govt. Legislation, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 6923 (iv).

Fort Erie and Buffalo Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. German) in Com., 3403 (ii).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1670 (i).

French SS. Line: *See* 'Can.-France.'

Fruit Marks Act, Regulations *re* Inspection, on M. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4414 (iii), 5897 (iv).

Govt. Loans B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6710 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr Reid) 204 (i).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 4099; on M. for 2°, 5138; in Com., 5260 (iii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Great West Permanent Loan Co.'s incorp. B. 40 (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com., 2569 (ii).

Harvey-Salisbury Railroad Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 2°, 777 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 2009 (i).

Imperial Defence; *See* 'Naval.'

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6693; in Com., 6705, 6802 (iv).

Investigations into Depts. by Mr. Justice Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3729 (ii).

King, Mr. Mackenzie, Result of his Mission, &c. (remarks) 4121 (iii).

Kingston Military Buildings, Ques. of Order, 2507 (ii).

Labour Department B. 165 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6729 (iv).

Lafferty, Dr., Expenses *re* Tuberculosis Convention (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).

Loans: *See* 'Govt. Loans.'

London and Northwestern Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3984 (ii).

Mail Cars, Recommendation of Ry. Commission *re* Changes (Ques.) 3652 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3954 (ii).

Mayes Affidavit, on Ques. of Order to Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 4258 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order *re* Reading original document, 4297 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order 'imputing motives,' 4401, 4408 (iii)).

McAvity-Mayes Dredging Contract, ref. to in debate on Govt. Tenders, 205 (i).

Mileage of Ry. Construction (remarks) *re* Question, 1076 (i).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 1841 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 192 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6744 (iv).

Natural Resources Conservation Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 6371 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 370 (i).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3555 (ii).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3149 (ii).

Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 2571 (ii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 1030 (i); in Com., 4479, 5303, 5406 (iii).

——— (M.) that Com. rise, 4532 (iii).

——— Ques. of Priv. *re* Speaking, 1115 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Ottawa Buildings, Taxes by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1610 (i).

Ottawa Service Corps, Complaints *re* Padding Pay Lists (Ques.) 6784 (iv).

Penitentiaries and Prison Labour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).

Piers, Wharves, &c., constructed by day labour, Procedure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2519 (ii).

See 'Govt. Harbours,' &c.

Post Office Act (registered letters) Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 738 (i).

Private Bills, Refunding of Fees, on M. (Mr. Ethier) 5889 (iv).

Public Health Bureau, Establishment of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1109 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6208 (iv).

Ry. Act (electric power) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1119 (i).

Railways, Two-cent Fares, Refunds by G. T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 2917 (ii).

Salisbury-Harvey Ry. Co.'s B. 35 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1513 (i).

Secret Commissions Prevention B. 31 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1122 (i).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 1445 (i).

Souris Postmaster, Dismissal of, &c. (remarks) on Com. of Sup., 6853 (iv).

Steel Cars, Introduction of on I. C. R., &c. (Ques.) 481 (i).

S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations (remarks) 2226 (ii).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4539 (iii).

Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3963 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c., (cold storage for fruit) 6983 (iv); (Gold and Silver Marking Act) 809; (Public Works Health Act) 810 (i); (swine commission) 6984 (iv); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 810 (i).

Canals—Lachine (cement) 797; (wharfs and basins) 786 (i).

Canals—Welland (Port Maitland) 2033 (ii).

Canals—Soulanges (slope trimmings) 1570 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (experimental farm) 6982 (iv); (salaries) 643 (i).

Civil Govt. (charges of management) 399 (i).

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 391 (i).

Civil Govt.—Customs (Board of Customs) 602 (i).

Civil Govt.—Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 398 (i).

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (salaries) 428 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 440 (i).
Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 3665 (ii).
Customs—Miscellaneous (printing and stationery) 609 (i).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 7011 (iv).
Indians—B. C. (cleansing orchards) 1160; (destitute) 1139; (schools) 1142; (surveys commission) 1151 (i).
Indians—Generally (grist and saw mills) 1016; (inspectors) 1162; (oil boring) 1170; (triennial clothing) 1014 (i).
Indians—Ont. (legal expenses) 994; (surveys) 989 (i).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (schools) 983, 989 (i).
Indians—P. E. I. (Lennox wharf) 1001 (i).
Indians—Sask. (farm implements) 1002 (i).
Indians—Yukon (schools) 1160 (i).
Interior—Miscellaneous (buffalo herds) 6994 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamer) 6912; (construction) 6904; (ice breaking in Thunder Bay) 6915.
Marine and Fisheries (fisheries conference) 3689 (ii).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship canal) 6877 (iv).
Militia (salaries) 2278 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff, roads and bridges) 1171; (Banff, water works) 1171 (i).
Northwest Mounted Police (force) 3660 (ii).
Northwest Ter. Govt. (salaries) 1171 (i).
Penitentiaries (supplies) 916 (i).
Post Office (country postmasters) 1703 (i).
Printing and Stationery (salaries) 807 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers, &c.) 1619; (heating) 1614; (lighting) 1616 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, P. O.) 1549 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 1284; (Halifax) 1289 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture) 1605; (museum) 1277; (Rideau Hall, grounds) 1611; (Rideau Hall, heating) 1612; (telephones) 1606 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (rents, &c.) 1620 (i).
Public Works—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 1620 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 2511 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver) 1622; (Buctouche) 1624; (Moncton) 1628 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2343 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 3298 (ii).
Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 2049 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Aston track scale) 3418 (ii); (board of commissioners) 6989 (iv); (Windsor) 3421 (ii).
Railways—N.T.R. (surveys, &c.) 6985 (iv)
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 2047 (ii).

Telephones in Canada, Control of Rates, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1770 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Tenders: *See* 'Govt. Tenders,' 'Investigations.'
Water Carriage of Goods, Regulations *re* (Ques.) 2764 (ii).
Water Powers leased on Canals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2039 (ii).
Weights and Measures, Discussion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3684 (ii).
Welland Canal Water Power, Lease to Cataract Power Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).
Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. Knowles) in Com., 2564 (ii).
Wharfs: *See* 'Govt. Harbours,' &c.
Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4185 (iii).
Yukon Ordinances (beer tax) on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 5893 (iv).
Yukon Ordinances (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7075 (iv).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*

Canadian Coasting Trade, Number of British or Canadian, &c. (Ques.) 5633 (iii).
Coasting Trade, O.C. *re* Change of Date, &c. (Ques.) 3051 (ii).
Dickie, Alfred, Payments to *re* Damages by Fire (Ques.) 1075 (i).
Dom. Arsenal, Quebec, Names of Bidders, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3050 (ii).
I.C.R., Classification of Employees, Hours of Labour, &c. (Ques.) 1723 (i), 2156 (ii).
——— Freight Clerks, Betterments, Govtl. Intention (Ques.) 1561 (i).
——— Motor Cars, Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 1719 (i).
——— Truro Staff, Number of Employees for Sept., Oct., Nov. and Dec., 1908 (Ans.) 244 (i).
——— number employed, &c. (Ques.) 328 (i).
——— Station at Truro, Erection of (Ques.) 824 (i).
——— Stationery and Printing, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2374 (ii).
Londonderry Station to Great Village, Mail Contract, Name, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 824 (i).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2393 (ii).
Shad Fisheries, Rep. of Prof. Prince, Inquiry for Ret., 3254 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents) 2453 (ii); (water) 1619 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Westville) 1292 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 1296 (i).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (bridges) 2474; (Brule) 2460; (Economy) 2460 (ii); (Tatamagouche) 1621 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (Truro) 2754 (ii).

Tatamagouche Bay Wharf Expenditure for Oct. and Nov., &c. (Ques.) 185 (i).

Truro Armoury, Apptmt. of Caretaker, &c. (Ques.) 186 (i).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald*

Assiniboine River Improvements, Cor., Vouchers, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1191 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3254 (ii).

Brandon City, Exchange of Lands, Issue of Patent, &c. (Ques.) 2322 (ii).

Budget, The (remarks) 5063 (iii).

C.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. McIntyre) in Com., 3160 (ii).

Election Act (ry. employees) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 1°, 3472 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Live Stock, &c. (M for ret.*) 1420 (i).
——— (Ques.) 546 (i).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1959 (i).

Govt. Tenders, Ques. of Order, 285 (i).

Patents for Lands of Sections 16, 20 and 22, &c., Payment of Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 4900 (iii).

Ry. Commissioners Board, Pet. *re* Vacancy, &c. (Ques.) 529 (i).
——— Apptmt. of Practical Farmer from N.W. (prop. res.) 2625 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, 2648 (ii).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2802 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 696; (Gold and Silver Marking Act) 809 (i); (live stock industry) 5837 (iii); (Public Works Health Act) 810 (i).
Excise (methylated spirits) 449 (i).
Penitentiaries Generally (supplies) 899; St. Vincent de Paul (Supplies) 914 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 1543; (Winnipeg P.O.) 1549 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 618 (i)
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 3332 (ii).

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Purchase by Govt., Sales, &c. (Ques.) 477 (i).

Telephone Rates in Canada, Control of by Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1784 (i).

Thompson Municipality Patent, Grant, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6280 (iv).

Usury Act, 1908, Prosecutions, Penalties, &c., (Ques.) 481 (i).

STEWART, Mr. T. J., *West Hamilton.*

Budget, The, 5089 (iii).

Criminal Code (concealed weapons) Amt. (B. 101) 1° m., 2217 (ii).

Foresters Insurance Business, Complaints *re* (remarks) 6510 (iv).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6321 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (fraudulent marking) 456 (i).
Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (salaries) 429 (i).

STRATTON, Mr. J. R., *West Peterborough.*

I.C.R. (remarks) on Annual Stmnt., 2700 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (construction) 3178 (ii).

SUTHERLAND, Hon. R. F., *North Essex.*

Budget, The, 4616 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6764 (iv).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ont. Govt. Legislation, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 6922 (iv).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6106 (iv).

Mayes Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Emmerson) 277 (i).

Salvation Army Governing Council incorp. (B. 142) 1°*, 4411 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6539 (iv).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4469 (iii).

Anglo Canadian and Continental Bank (B. 118) 1°*, 3703 (ii).

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Dubeau) on Senate Amts., 4594 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Locations, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1941 (i).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6127 (iv).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3622 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5153; on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to M. for 3°, 5618 (iii).

House of Commons Classification, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6111 (iv).

Immigration to U.S., Repatriation, &c., on M. (Mr. Paquet) for Cor., 855 (i).

Imperial General Staff, Prop. Organization, O.Cs. Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1420 (i).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

Japanese Immigration, Sir P. Lake's Speech at Toronto (Ques.) 1065 (i).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3962 (ii).

Mayes-McAvity Affidavit, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) Ques. of Order, 4280 (iii).

Proportional Representation, Ques. of Order, 2599 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Militia (salaries) 2282 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Saguenay dredging) 2814 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. Geo., *Leeds.*

Agricultural Estimates, Delay in Considering (remarks) 4412 (iii).

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4448 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 751 (i).

Australian Trade with Canada, Subsidy, &c., on M. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 6473 (iv).

Aylesworth, Geo. Anson, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 248 (i).

Black Lake Postmaster, Complaints, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 4896 (iii).

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 85) 1°*, 1813 (i).

Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Names of Stockholders, Passenger Rates, Freight, &c. (Ques.) 3473 (ii).

Budget, The, (remarks) 3649 (ii).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res. 4443 (iii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5481; on M. (Mr. Henderson) to ref. back to special Com., 5443; Ques. of Order, 5458 (iii).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 11 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 987 (i).

Carson, Mr. Geo., Emplymt. by P. O. Dept., Absence, &c. (Ques.) 4697 (iii).

Charlottetown Post Office, Sidewalk Construction, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4228 (iii).

Coal conserved for the Home Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 3109 (ii).

Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of (remarks) 4120 (iii).

Commercial Feeding Stuffs B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5208 (iii).

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 1st Rep. of Som., 1478 (i).

Debt of Canada, Jan. 31, 1909, Increase from 1908 (Ques.) 1079 (i).

Easter Adjournment (remarks) 3649 (ii).

External Affairs Dept. B. 90 (Mr. Murphy) in Com., 4436 (iii).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1657 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4423, 4430 (iii), 5907 (iv).

Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 284 (i).

G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3609 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5123; in Com., 5250 (iii).

G.T. Ry., Indebtedness to Canada (M. for O.Cs.*) 3056 (ii).

—— Interest Due, &c. (Ques.) 2759 (ii).

Griffith, Mr. Wm., Apptmt. as Immigration Agent, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1415 (i).

Higgs, Deportation by Immigration Dept. (Ques.) 147 (i).

House of Commons, Additional Rooms, Allotment, &c. (Ques.) 177, 466 (i).

House of Commons Elevators, Repairing and Running (remarks) 2337 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6182 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. Bill, Progress in Senate, 7069 (iv).

I.C.R. Freight Clerks Disputes, Letter of Dep. Min. of Rys. *re* Award of Board (Ques.) 4697 (iii).

Inverness Harbour, C.B. Improvement, Purchase of land, &c. (Ques.) 4637 (iii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, by Judge Cassels, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3910 (ii).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s (B. 80) 1°*, 1648 (i); in Com., 3411, 3605 (ii).

Lacas, Emile, Absence from Dept. for 1906-7-8, Pay, &c. (Ques.) 4635 (iii).

Lansdowne Drill Shed, Tenders, Contract *re* Repairs (Ques.) 5630 (iii).

Margaree Island Lighthouse, Expenditure *re* Road (Ques.) 6090 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Purchases, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brodeur) 4044 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 154 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5235 (iii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5234 (iii).

Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 34 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5570 (iii).

Parliament Hill Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 6473 (iv).

Port Hood Breakwater, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 4892 (iii).

Priv., Ques. of (Mr. Conmee) *re* 'Special Trains,' 4295 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Pub. Accounts, &c. to Com., 1479 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2394 (ii).

Sessional Allowance Deduction (remarks) 4119 (iii).

TAYLOR, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*

Sorel Ship Yards, Repairs of Boats owned by Marine Officials, &c. (Ques.) 4702 (iii).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4539 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 5833 (iii); (Year-book) 704, 726 (i).

Canals—Galops (collector) 1574 (i).

Canals—Lachine (cement) 1566; (cement testing) 794 (i).

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 1591 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 649 (i).

Civil Govt.—Aud. General (salaries) 383 (i).

Civil Govt (charges of management) 399 (i).

Civil Govt.—Customs (board of customs) 582; (contingencies) 590 (i).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 383 (i).

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 613 (i).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 720 (i).

Civil Govt—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 385 (i).

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 387. 714 (i).

Customs—Miscellaneous (printing and stationery) 609; (revenue cruisers) 611 (i).

Fisheries (dog fish plant) 6950; (international commission) 6968; (transportation) 6956 (iv).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 7002 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (destitute) 1141; (schools) 1143 (i).

Indians—Generally (legal expenses) 996 (i).

Indians—N. S. (seed grain) 998 (i).

Indians—Ont. (annuities) 998 (i).

Indians—P. E. I. (Lennox wharf) 1000 (i); (medical attendance) 1000 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (biological stations) 6954 (iv); (fisheries conference) 3691 (ii).

Militia (salaries) 2302 (ii).

Mines (geological specimens) 7063 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 3437 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Kingston (skis) 7056 (iv); (supplies) 886 (i).

Penitentiaries—St. Vincent de Paul (supplies) 914 (i).

Penitentiaries—Stony Mountain (supplies) 919 (i).

Post Office (miscellaneous) 1716 (i).

Printing and Stationery (salaries) 805 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armmouries) 1596 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 1548 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Cornwall) 1360; (R. M. College) 1383; (Whitby) 1542 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additional wing) 1256; (astronomical observatory) 617; (grounds) 1601 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Johns) 1317 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 1592 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6539 (iv); Mar. Provs. (plant) 3346 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 2997; (Portage la Prairie) 3333 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blanche river) 2966; (bridges, repairs) 2972; (Burlington piers) 2967; (Collingwood) 3294; (Goderich) 2968; (Gravenhurst) 2981; (Kingston channel) 2979; (Lake Nipissing) 3309; (Little Current) 2974; (McGregor's Creek) 2974; (Magnetawan) 2983; (Meaford) 2984; (Richard's Landing) 2978 ; (Sault Ste. Marie) 2980 ; (Southampton) 3317; (Spanish River) 3528; (Toronto) 2980; (Wolfe Island canal) 3504 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Batiscan) 3276; (Bonaventure) 2559, 3282; (Cap St. Ignace) 2523; (Lake St. Francis) 2555; (Laprairie ice piers) 2899 ; (Saguenay dredging) 2805; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 2902; (St. Francis river) 2898 ; (St. Francis du Lac) 3286; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 2908; (St. Nicholas) 2909 (ii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 6543 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 3349 (ii).

Quarantine ('Challenger') 5884 (iii).

Railways—I. C. R. (working expenses) 3421 (ii).

Railways—P.E. I. (Charlottetown) 2960 ; (Harmony-Elmira) 2957 (ii).

Wharfs: *See* 'Govt. Harbours,' &c.

Wire Fencing. Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 354 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1321 (i).

Wire Fencing purchased in 1908, Tenders, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 245 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D., *New Westminster*

Address, The, 120 (i).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 762 (i).

Bourke, Mr., Retirement of: *See* 'Miner, Bill.'

B.C. Penitentiary, Escape of Convict Bill Miner, Rep. *re* Investigation (Ques.) 350 (i)

B. C. Timber Lands, Leases granted since 1896, Names, Addresses, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1923 (i)

Budget, The, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) 5060 (iii).

Cable between Vancouver and Mainland, Application *re* (Ques.) 1073 (i).

Chilliwack Post Office Site, Plans, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1414 (i).

Chilliwack Public Building, Negotiations *re* Purchase of Property (Ques.) 1073 (i).

Fisheries in B. C., Depletion by American Fishermen, on M. for Sup., 6500 (iv).

Fisheries Regulations *re* International Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6967 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i).

——— Ques. of Order, 1683 (i).

Fraser River, Flooding at Delta, Rep. of Mr. Coste, &c. (Ques.) 2587 (ii).

Gillis, Angus, Claims *re* Compensation for Injuries on I. C. R. (Ques.) 6089 (iv).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 5905 (iv).

G. T. P., Siberian Labourers (Ques.) 4898 (iii).

——— Information *re* Answer to Question, 4989 (iii).

G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5328 (iii)

G. T. P., Sub-contractors on B. C. Section, Importation of Labour, &c. (remarks) 3959 (ii).

——— Unpaid Wages, Claims of Stationmen, &c., Payments *re* (Ques.) 5629 (iii).

Hickman, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3054 (ii).

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3921 (ii) .

Labour Hours for Working Men, Restriction, &c., on M. (Mr .Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5944 (iv).

Mail Contracts, Fair Wage Clause (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3430 (ii).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 925 (i), 7035 (iv).

——— Ques. of Order, 950 (i).

——— Cor. Reps., &c. (M. for ret.) 1192 (i).

Miner, Bill, Escape from B.C. Penitentiary, Investigation *re*, on M. for Sup., 1813 (i).

——— Ques. of Order, 1821 (i).

——— Letter *re* Visit of Alex. D. McIntyre, &c. (Ques.) 2595 (ii).

——— Moneys received previous to escape from Penitentiary (Ques.) 4898 (iii).

See 'B.C.,' &c.

New Westminster Dry Dock, Application for Govt. Aid (Ques.) 3048 (ii).

New Westminster Post Office, Free Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i).

Nickel Ore, Export Duty *re* (Ques.) 5634 (iii).

Oriental Immigration into B.C., Res. *re* Royal Commission (Ques.) 1242 (i).

——— Inaccurate Answer, 1248 (i).

Piers, Wharfs, &c., constructed by Day Labour, Procedure *re* (remarks) in Com of Sup., 2521 (ii)

Political Weekly Letter, Franking and Distribution by Govt. (Ques.) 1920 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Postal Law Violation, Number of Prosecutions, Penalties, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1924 (i).

Railway Belt, B.C., Litigation between Dom. and B.C. (Ques.) 3043 (ii).

Registered Stock, Arrangements *re* Importation from U.S., Regulations *re* (Ques.) 2379 (ii).

Richmond Rifle Range, Protection *re* Shooting (Ques.) 1722 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 729 (i); (experimental farm) 5940 (iv); (live stock industry) 5875 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 724 (i).

Fisheries (biological stations) 3438; (international fisheries commission) 3459 (ii); 6967 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (surveys commission) 1144 (i).

Militia (ordnance) 2310 (ii).

Penitentiaries (B.C.) 7035 (iv); (retirements) 924 (i).

Post Office (rural mails) 3430 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 2090; (Victoria immigration) 2086; (Williams Head) 2090 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 1598 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 623; (Major's Hill) 1601 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6540 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Okanagan) 6549 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews rapids) 2108 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. Andrews) 1645; (St. John tributaries) 1639; (Welchpool Campobello) 1646 (i).

Public Works—Harbour and Rivers—N.S. (Cow Bay) 2471; (generally) 2118 (ii).

Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 808 (i).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Inland Revenue) *Comox-Atlin.*

Agricultural Fertilizers (B. 110) 1°m, 2910 (ii); in Com., 4446, 5202 (iii).

Belleville and Corbyville, Retirements and Apptmts. (Ans.) 4894 (iii).

Commercial Feeding Stuffs (B. 127) 1°m, 3936 (ii); in Com., 5204 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6743 (iv).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2846 (ii).

Inland Revenue Seizures, on Inquiry for, 2773 (ii).

James Bay and Labrador, Exploratory Party (Ans.) 4697 (iii).

Kelly, Douglas Co.: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works,' &c.

Patent Medicines Act, Apptmts. of Analysts, &c. (Ans.) 3476 (ii).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. Wm.—*Con*

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 3673 (ii).
Mines (assay office, B.C.) 7063; (geological specimens) 7063; (ore tests) 7063 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 3355 (ii).

Weights and Measures *re* Ve sels, Owners and Rvs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3683 (ii).

THOBURN, Mr. W., *North Lanark.*

Insurance Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6703 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 734 (i).
Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 912; Dorchester (supplies) 917; St. Vincent de Paul (supplies) 916; Stony Mountain (supplies) 923 (i).
Public Works—Dredging (generally) 6540 6554 (iv).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4140 (iii).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J., *Durham.*

Cobourg Harbour Expenditure for 1908, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3988 (ii).

Meteorological Station at Port Hope, Situation, &c. (Ques.) 3985 (ii).

Meteorological Stations in Ont., Number erected in 1908, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3195 (ii).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 2782 (ii).

SUPPLY

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Newcastle) 6543 (iv).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis ice piers) 2356 (ii).

TODD, Mr. W. F., *Charlotte.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 15 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (peat testing) 1391 (i).

TOLMIE, Mr. J., *North Bruce.*

Parsons, Frank, Relief (B. 130) 1°*, 4286 (iii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 20 (i).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 1859 (i).

Experimental Farms, Location, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1947 (i).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A.—*Con.*

Labour Hours for Working Men, Restriction, on M. (Mr. Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5925 (iv).

Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3540 (ii).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4543 (iii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. J. P., *Quebec County.*

Investigations into Deptl. Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3932 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (docks, &c.) 2896 (ii).

Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 4214 (iii).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6127 (iv).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2209 (ii).

N.B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, on Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 1442 (i).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia.*

American Silver, Exportation of (remarks) 6780 (iv).

Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1813 (i).

Australian Trade Direct for Eastern Canada, on M. for Sup., 6469 (iv).

Blackhall, Victor Eccles Relief (B. 115) 1°*, 3651 (ii).

Brandon Transfer Ry. Co.'s (B. 9) 1°*, 159 (i).

British Colonial Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 114) 1°*, 3651 (ii).

Canada Life Assurance Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3005 (ii), 5481 (iii), 6047 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5448 (iii).

C.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com. (amt.) 3041 ; in Com., 3155 (ii).

C.P.R. and G.T.P. Joint Section at Fort William Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 290; in Com., 1718 (i).

C.P.R., New Stock, Closing of Law Suit (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2920 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1334 (i).

Civil Service, Names and Positions of those receiving no Increases (Ques.) 1558 (i).

Civil Service Salaries, Increase B. 187 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 406 (i); in Com. 6346 (iv).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*

Coltman, Anne Louisa Relief (B. 116) 1°*, 3651 (ii).
Cowan, John Christopher, Relief (B. 184) 1°*, 5997 (iv).
Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Grenville-Hawkesbury Provl. Bridge, Bonus *re* (Ques.) 1558 (i).
G.T.P. Lake Superior Branch Subsidy (B. 30) 1°*, 290; 2° m., 666, 1024, 1364 (i).
G.T.P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 3644 (ii).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3951 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6075 (iv).
Markham Post Office, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6406 (iv).
Mexican Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 168) 1°*, 5623 (iii).
Railway Act (construction) Amt. (B. 65) 1° m., 1236 (i).
Railway Act (fires) Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 377 (i).
Superior and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 78 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3971 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 395 (i).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 7006 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (original construction) 2926 (ii).
Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 2064 (ii).
Union Station, G.T.P. &c. at Portage la Prairie (B. 28) 1°*, 290 (i).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2139 (ii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*

Budget, The, 4757 (iii).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, Restrictions, &c. (Ques.) 3704 (ii).
Labour Hours for Working Men, Restrictions, &c., on M. for Sup., 5913 (iv).
Public Works, Hours of Labour (B. 22) 1°*, 240 (i).
Public Works, Hours of Labour (B. 35) M. to dischg. from Order Paper, 4990 (iii).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G., *Centre York, Ont.*

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease, &c. (Ques.) 6784 (iv).
Budget, The, 4970 (iii).
———Remarks, 4855 (iii).
Chinaware, Customs Duty, &c. (Ques.) 4636 (iii).
Etobicoke Postmaster, Apptmt. of, Salary, &c. (Ques.), 671 (i).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G.—*Con.*

Holland (Newmarket) Canal, Expenditure *re* Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1915 (i).
Lowndes, Charles Bowerbank, Relief (B. 144) 1°*, 4411 (iii).
Market Garden Produce, Total Imports 1901-1908, Duty collected (Ques.) 5096 (iii).
Milk River, Mackie Lease, Particulars *re* (Ques.) 6405 (iv).
Moore, Isaac Relief (B. 145) 1°*, 4411 (iii).
Newmarket Canal, Holland River, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 112; Amt. Neg. (Y. 71; N. 112) 3176 (ii).
Newmarket Canal to Lake Wilcox, Construction, Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 5157 (iii).
Post Office Payments in Newmarket and Aurora, to Mail Carriers, &c. (Ques.) 1560 (i).
Somerville, Thos., Payments to by Post Office Dept. (Ques.) 1559 (i).
S.A. Patriotic Fund, Names of Beneficiaries (Ques.) 2157 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (Holland River) 1590, 1886 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Markham) 1386 (i).

WARBURTON, Mr. A. B., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Budget, The, 4923 (iii).
Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening, on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) to prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 218 (i).
Ice-breaking Steamers, Superannuation of Officers, Reps. (M. for copies) 1469 (i).
Naval Defence of Canada, Aid to G. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3534 (ii).
P.E.I. Winter Communication with the Mainland, (M. for ret.) 6448 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Service Commission (salaries) 710 (i).
Railways—P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira) 2956 (ii).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *North Renfrew.*

Graham Post Office, Pet. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1713 (i).
Natural Resources Conservation Commission B. 159 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6382 (iv).
Petewawa Camp, Number of Permanent Force, Date of Opening, &c. (Ques.) 5639 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 1908 (i).
Militia (ordnance) 2309; (properties) 2316 (ii).
Penitentiaries—Generally (supplies) 896 (i).
Post Office (ry. clerks) 1699 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture) 1605 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Petewawa) 3307 (ii).

WHITE, Mr. W. H., *Victoria, Alberta.*

Campbell, Aaron Wm. Morley Relief (B. 183) 1**, 5997 (iv).

Deferred Elections, on prop. Res. (Mr. Burrell) 2866 (ii).

WILSON, Mr. C. A., *Laval*

Budget, The, 4792 (iii).

Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of, on M. (Mr. Clarke) for Cor., 1740 (i).

Jesus River Dredging, Amount of Expropriation, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1069 (i).

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Repairs to, &c. (Ques.) 1557 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Insufficient Number of Guards, &c. (Ques.) 1417 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 791 (i).

Civil Govt.—Civil Service Commission (salaries) 398 (i).

Wharfs between Longue Pointe and Pointe-aux-Trembles, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 1068 (i).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Agriculture Committee's Rep. of 1908, Printing and Distribution (remarks) 3938 (ii).

Dorland and U. E. Loyalist Mail Route, Mail Carrier, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 334 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6181 (iv).

Immigration Agents, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1405 (i).

Immigration, Printing and Advertising, Amount expended for 1908-9 (Ques.) 2381 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 2597 (ii).

Interior, Deptl. Rep., Inquiry for, 876 (i).

Miller, Mr. N. B., Immigration Agent, Fraudulent Returns (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).

Napanee River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2093 (ii).

——— Surveys, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 333 (i).

Roblin and Forest Mills Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 333 (i).

Sillsville and The Pines Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 333 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 3189; (fruit transportation) 3187 (ii); (Year Book) 703 (i), 3186 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 6994; (deportations) 7021 (iv).

Penitentiaries—Dorchester (supplies) 917; Generally (supplies) 910 (i).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Port Arthur) 2093 (ii); (Toronto drill hall) 1504 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec citadel) 3211 (ii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Annual Drill, Discontinuance of, &c. (Ques.) 343 (i).

Bisley Team, Use of Ross Rifle (Ques.) 5642 (iii).

Brewster, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., *re* Immigration (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

Costello, Thos., Rep. *re* Woollen Industry. &c. (Ques.) 1176 (i).

Eastern Townships Cavalry Brigade. Site for &c. (Ques.) 5644 (iii).

Militia Camps in Eastern Townships, Selection of Site, &c. (Ques.) 343 (i).

Navy of Canada or G.B., Contributions *re* (M. for cor.*) 1191 (i).

Quebec Camps of Instruction, Date of Regiments attending, &c. (Ques.) 5641 (iii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 3258 (ii).

Rifles, Swiss and Foreign imported, Regulations *re* (Ques.) 2381 (ii).

Ross Rifle, Authority *re* Adoption by Can. Govt. (Ques.) 1072 (i).

——— Bayonet Contracts, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 344 (i).

——— Bisley Competitions, Description of (Ques.) 343 (i).

——— Factory Bayonets, Instalment of Machinery, &c. (Ques.) 670 (i).

——— Mark I and Mark II, used by Canada at Bisley, Description, &c. (M. for ret.*) 684 (i).

——— Rep. of Small Arms Com., Date of last Contract (Ques.) 471 (i).

——— Reps. *re* Merit or Demerit, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.) 1189 (i).

Sherbrooke Armoury, Completion of, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5643 (iii).

Sherbrooke New Regiment, Construction, Appropriations *re* Band (Ques.) 5643 (iii).

S.A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* (remarks) 2232 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Service Commission (salaries) 714 (i)

Militia (ordnance) 2308; (salaries) 2289 (ii).

WRIGHT, Mr. WM., *Muskoka.*

Agricultural Fertilizers B. 110 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4451 (iii).

Budget, The, 5007 (iii).

Canada-France SS. Subsidy B. 146 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 4438 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6393 (iv).

WRIGHT, Mr. Wm.—*Con.*

Dom. Elections, Payments to Officials, &c. (Ques.) 1067 (i).

Georgian Islands, Sale of, Advertisements *re* (Ques.) 3991 (ii).

Govt. Harbours and Piers Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4417, 4431 (iii).

G.T.P. Loan, B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) in Com on Res., 3631 (ii).

——— on M. for 3° (remarks) 5550 (iii).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 159 (Mr. Fisher) on prop. Res., 6377; in Com., 6383 (iv).

Newmarket Canal, Holland River, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com., of Sup., 3126 (ii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 2392 (ii); in Com., 6224 (iv).

Submarine Co.'s Patent Relief B. 77 (Mr. Proulx) in Com., 4540 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 700 (i); (experimental farm electric ry.) 3192; (Patent Record) 3186 (ii).

Canals—Grenville (macadamizing road) 2029; (St. Anne's locks) 2029 (ii).

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 1578, 1895 (i); (construction) 3177 (ii).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 1908 (i); (Port Maitland) 2031 (ii)

Civil Govt.—Customs (board of customs) 586 (i).

Fisheries (commissions) 6957; (dog fish plant) 6950; (protection cruiser) 6947 (iv).

WRIGHT, Mr. Wm.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Immigration (deportations) 7021; (St. Boniface hospital) 7035 (iv).

Indians—B. C. (surveys commission) 1152 (i).

Indians—Generally (inspectors travelling expenses) 1161; (timber inspectors) 1161 (i).

Interior (St. Mary's and Milk River diversions) 6270 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (hospitals) 6946 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Bridgewater) 1286 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Markham) 1386; (Whitby) 1393 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 620; (Major's Hill) 1601 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Gravenhurst) 2980; (Montreal River) 2977; (Tiffin) 2115; (Toronto) 2980; (Victoria) 2117 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Sackville) 2935 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (unforeseen items) 2054 (ii).

Sussex Street Govtl. Buildings, Architects Plans, Ownership, &c. (Ques.) 4638 (iii).

Welland Canal, Lease to Cataract Power Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2037 (ii).

Wharfs on Inland Waters (remarks) in Com of Sup., 3331 (ii).

Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 2140 (ii).

Yukon Ordnances (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7076 (iv).

INDEX—SUBJECTS

Abitibi and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12; Moved (Mr. Todd) 15; Seconded (Mr. Turcotte) 20 (i).

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden 23; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 33; (Mr. Foster) 46; (Mr. Cowan) 57; (Mr. Brodeur) 63; (Mr. Barnard) 70; (Mr. Burrell) 72; (Mr. Lemieux) 80; (Mr. R. Smith) 94; (Mr. Goodeve) 111; (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 120; (Mr. Lewis) 128; (Mr. Campbell) 132 (i)

—— Ques. of Order (Mr. R. Smith) 134; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 134 (i).

Adulteration Act: *See* 'B. No. 107.'

Adulteration of Food, Fraudulent Marking: in Com. of Sup., 455 (i).

Aerial Navigation, Experiments by Canadians, Govt. Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2383 (ii).

Agricultural Fertilizers: *See* 'B. No. 110.'

AGRICULTURE.

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 12 (i).

—— Deptl. Employees, Name, Position, Salary, Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1058 (i).

——Expenditure *re* Employees: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2756 (ii).

—— Expenditure *re* Farms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1070 (i).

—— French Translation of Documents: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2762 (ii).

—— Outside Service at Ottawa, Names, Position, Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 823, 1409 (i).

—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 673, 688, 809 (i).

Agricultural Estimates, Delay in Considering: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4112 (iii).

Agricultural Industry, Number of Farmers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 151 (i).

Animals, Health of, Inspection, &c., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 821 (i).

Bacon Curing Industry for 1907-8, Number of Hogs condemned, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 342 (i).

Cold Storage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6833 (iv).

See main heading.

Dairy and Fruit Industries, Cold Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3187 (ii).

Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 5947 (iv).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Experimental Farms or Stations, Establishment of since Jan., 1908, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 156 (i).

Experimental Farms, Live Stock, Number, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 546 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Staples) 1420 (i).

Experimental Farms, Locations in Eastern Canada, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1925 (i).

'Farm Weeds,' Number distributed, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 2757 (ii).

Foot and Mouth Disease, States quarantined, Prevention, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. T. Chisholm) 684 (i).

Fruit Imports into B.C. from U.S., Value, Quantity, &c.: (Mr. Burrell) 3550 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act, Number of Inspectors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3477 (ii).

Hogs killed from Nov., 1907, to Nov., 1908, Condemnation of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Beattie) 684 (i).

Hogs, Dressed, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCoig) 2758 (ii).

Holstein Cattle at Experimental Farm, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2756 (ii).

Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 5833 (ii).

Nappan Experimental Farm, Names of Employees, Rate of Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5640 (iii).

Potatoes sold in Bags, Statue *re* Measurements: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).

Registered Stock, Arrangements *re* Importation from U. S., Regulations *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2379 (ii).

Stork, W. W., Inspector of Animals, Details *re* Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 6092 (iv).

Tobacco, Canadian, Encouragement of: in Com. of Sup., 5881 (iii).

Aids to Navigation, Light System, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6904 (iv).

Aids to Navigation on N. S. Coast, Applications *re* Personal Inspections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 5640 (iii).

Alberta Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 23'

Alberta and Saskatchewan Annual Allowance, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 2589 (ii).

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Algoma Rifles, 97th Reg., Removal from Sault Ste. Marie to Sudbury: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1411 (i).
Algoma Steel Co., N. T. R. Contracts *re* Rails, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 336 (i).
Alien Labour Act, Proposed Amts.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 166 (i).
Allegash River, Diversion of Waters, Reps., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Michaud) 3082 (ii).
All-Red Line, Negotiations *re*, Progress, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 148 (i).
——— Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 158 (i).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7070 (iv).
Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
American Bar-Lock Co.: *See* 'B. No. 123.'
American Fishing Vessels; Seizures, Courts of Trial Procedure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 172 (i).
American Immigration Agents, Interference with Canadians: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 2242 (ii).
American Silver, Exportation of: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 6780 (iv).
American Tariff, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5103 (iii).
Amherst Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1282 (i).
Ammonal Explosives (1908) Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
Animals Contagious Diseases Act : *See* 'B. No. 18.
Animals, Health of, Inspection, &c., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 821 (i).
Annapolis Ice Piers, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2338 (ii).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 2311, 3422 (ii).
Annual Drill, Discontinuance of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 343 (i).
Annuities Act, Number of Applicants, Amount &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. Haggart) 3477 (ii).
Annuities and Administration Treaty of Indians: in Com. of Sup., 998 (i).
Annuities for Old Age, Administration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6660 (iv).
See 'Old Age,' 'Pensions,' &c.
Anse a la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2512 (ii).
Anse a l'Ilot: in Com. of Sup., 2513 (ii).
'Anticosti' Str., Amount of Work, Tenders *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 671 (i).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 688 (i).
Arisaig Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3233 (ii).
Armouries built since 1896, Number, Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 157 (i).
——— Incomplete, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2128, 3937 (ii).
Armouries, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1596 (i).
Armouries supplied by Officers, Policy of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 824 (i).
Arnprior and Pontiac Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No 87.'
Ashcroft-Dawson Telegraph Lines, Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3349 (ii)
Ash Wednesday Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1320 (i).
Asiatic Exclusion in B.C., Tel. of Mr. Borden: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in debate on Address, 39 (i).
——— Denial (Mr. R. L. Borden) 39 (i).
——— Telegram to Victoria Colonist: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 290 (i).
——— Memorandum from Bishop of Columbia: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1394 (i).
——— Telegraphic Rep. of Toronto 'News'; Ques. of Priv. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 664 (i).
Assaults against the Person: *See* 'B. No. 88.'
Assay Office, Vancouver, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iv).
Assets of Canada in Detail for Dec. 31st, 1908: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 172 (i).
Assiniboine River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3332 (ii).
——— Cor., Vouchers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Staples) 1191 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Staples) 3254 (ii).
Assiniboine River, Pets., &c., *re* Straightening of: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 472 (i).
Assiniboine River Works, Cost per yard for Sept. and Oct.: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 1239 (i).
Associated Press Despatches, Amount contributed, Supervision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 331 (i).
Aston Junction Track Scale: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).
Astronomical Observatory, Boundaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6263 (iv).
Astronomical Observatory, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6263 (iv).
Athabasca Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 68'
Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 84.'
Aud. Gen.'s Office, Extra Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 3434 (ii).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Vols. 1 and 3: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 12 (i).
——— Part O.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1393 (i).
——— Vol. II.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 1474
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 140, 876, 1250 (i).

Australian Trade Direct with Canada, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Turriff) 6469 (iv)

Automobile Accidents: *See* 'B. No. 60.'

Avonport Piers, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2453 (ii).

Aylen, Mr. J., Emplymt. by Transcontinental Ry: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5096 (ii).

Aylesworth, Geo. Anson, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 248 (i).

Aylwin, F. P.; Grant of Land *re* Irrigation Purposes, Cor. Reps., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Magrath) 1190 (i).

Bacon Curing Industry for 1907-8, Number of Hogs condemned, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 342 (i).

Baddeck Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2453 (ii).

Bailey's Brook Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).

Bait Freezers, Cold Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6959 (iv).

Band of 36th Regiment, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 4892 (iii).
See 'Militia.'

Banff Fish Hatchery, Establishment of, Representations *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 871 (i).

Banff Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup. 1171 (i).

Banff Water Works, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1171 (i).

Banfield Creek Life Boat, Cost, Wreck, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1730 (i).

Bank Act Amt., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1732 (i).

Bank Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'

Bar-Lock Patent: *See* 'B. No. 123.'

Batiscan Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 3274 (ii).

Bay St. Lawrence Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2455 (ii).

Beauharnois Water Power Leases: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).

Beaver Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1622 (i).

Beet Sugar Refineries, Duty *re* Preferential Tariff: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3047 (ii).

Bell, Charles F., Conditions of Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2322 (ii).

Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1356 (i).

Belleville and Corbyville, Collectors of Inland Revenue, Retirements, Apptmts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 4893 (iii).

Belleville Drill Hall, Land Site, Officers' Quarters: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 673, 817 (i).

——— Quarters for Officers of 40th Hastings Rifles: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1076 (i).

Bérubé, Rev. E. P., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3986 (ii).

Bibbington, Thos., Concellation of Pilotage Certificate: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Barnard) 3991 (ii).

Big Bras d'Or Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2455 (ii).

Big Grass Marsh Swamp Lands, Transfer of, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Molloy) 3056 (ii).

Bills of Lading, Discussion *re* Bill: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6918 (iv).

——— Jurisdiction by Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 1179 (i).

Bills, Procedure *re* in absence of Promotors: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4445 (iii).

Bills, Royal Assent, 4122 (iii), 7086 (iv).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).
1°*, 9 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Passenger Tickets Act.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).
1°*, 91; 2°m., 550 (i).

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°, 91; on Order for 2°, 555 (i).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°, 92; 2°m., 556; in Com., 567 (i).

Bill (No. 5) To amend the Naturalization Act.—(Mr. Murphy).
1°, 93; dschgd., 378 (i).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 93; 2°, 374; in Com., 375; 3°m., 521; 3°*, 876 (i).

Bill (No. 7) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°, 94; 2°, 375 (i).

Bill (No. 8) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°, 94; 2° and in Com., 379; 3°*, 402 (i); Sen. Amts., 2911 (ii).

Bill (No. 9) Respecting the Brandon Transfer Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 159; 2°*, 327; in Com., and 3°*, 989 (i).

Bill (No. 10) Respecting the Brazilian Electro Steel and Smelting Company, Limited.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 159; 2°*, 327; in Com., 1023; 3°*, 1024 (i).

Bill (No. 11) To incorporate the Canadian Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 159; 2°*, 327; in Com., 986; 3°*, 988 (i).

Bill (No. 12) Respecting the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 159; 2°*, 327; in Com., and 3°*, 989 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 160; 2°*, 327; in Com., and 3°*, 1364 (i).

Bill (No. 14) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 160; 2°*, 327; in Com., and 3°*, 989 (i).

Bill (No. 15) Respecting the Mexican Land and Irrigation Company, Limited.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 160; 2°, 1024 (i).

Bill (No. 16) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 160 (i).

Bill (No. 17) Respecting Immigration.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 240; 2°m., 2009 (i), 4413, 5217 (iii); in Com., 6129 (iv).

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Animals Contagious Diseases Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 240; 2°m., 749; in Com., 750; 3°, 770 (i).

Bill (No. 19) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).
1°, 241; 2° and in Com., 738; 3°*, 882 (i).

Bill (No. 20) To amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 241; 2°, 770; in Com., 779; 3°*, 780 (i).

Bill (No. 21) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 242; 2° and in Com., 1117; 3°*, 1122 (i).

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Hours of Labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).
1°*, 240 (i).

Bill (No. 23) Respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°, 290; 2°*, 437; in Com., and 3°*, 1696 (i).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°, 290; 2°*, 438; in Com., and 3°, 1363 (i).

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Joint Section of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, at Fort William, Ontario.—(Mr. Turiff).
1°*, 290; 2°*, 438; in Com., 1718; 3°*, 1718 (i).

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 290; 2°*, 438; in Com., and 3°*, 1364 (i).

Bill (No. 27) To incorporate the London and Lancashire Plate Glass and Indemnity Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 290; 2°*, 438 (i); in Com., 2146; 3°*, 2147 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 28) Respecting the Union Station and other joint facilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Midland Railway of Manitoba, at Portage la Prairie.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 290; 2°*, 438; in Com., and 3°*, 1696 (i).

Bill (No. 29) Respecting the Winnipeg and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 290; 2°*, 438 (i); in Com., 2067, 2130; 3°*, 2146 (ii).

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Subsidy from the Ontario Government to Lake Superior Branch of G. T. Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 290; 2° m., 66, 1364 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3415 (ii).

Bill (No. 31) To prevent the payment or acceptance of illicit or secret commissions, and other like practices.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 325; 2° and in Com., 1122; in Com., 1479; 3°*, 1490 (i); Sen. Amt., 4412 (iii).

Bill (No. 32) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Barr).
1°, 326; 2°, 876 (i).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 465; 2°*, 779 (i), in Com., 2571; 3°*, 2571 (ii).

Bill (No. 34) To incorporate the Ontario and Michigan Power Company.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°*, 465; 2°, 1026 (i); in Com., 4472, 4593, 5296, 5352, 5559 (iii), 5958, 6000; 3° m., 6001 (iv).

Bill (No. 35) To incorporate the Salisbury and Harvey Railroad Company.—(Mr. Emmerson).
1°*, 465; 2°, 775; in Com., 1363, 1513; 3°, 1513 (i).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 465; 2°, 778 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2067 (ii).

Bill (No. 37) To incorporate the Western Canadian Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Knowles).
1°*, 465; 2°, 778 (i); in Com., 2564; 3°*, 2569 (ii).

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Dubeau).
1°*, 465; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1696 (i); Sen. Amts., 4164, 4593, 5486 (iii).

Bill (No. 39) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Northrup).
1°, 465 (i).

Bill (No. 40) To incorporate the Great West Permanent Loan Company.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg).
1°*, 626; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., 2569; in Com., and 3°*, 2578 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 41) Respecting the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Schell).
1°*, 626; 2°*, 988; in Com., and 3°*, 1696 (i).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert).
1°*, 626; 2°*, 988 (i); in Com., 2063; 3°*, 2057 (ii).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 626; 2°*, 988 (i); in Com., 2067; 3°*, 2067 (ii).

Bill (No. 44) To incorporate the Canadian Liverpool and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Girard).
1°*, 626; 2°*, 988; in Com., 1685, 1719, 1858 (i), 2058, 2129; 3°*, 2129 (ii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting Load Lines on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 663 (i).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Railway Company, and to change its name to 'British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba Railway Company.'—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 738; 2°*, 988; in Com., and 3°*, 1719 (i).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Guelph and Goderich Railway Company.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°*, 738; 2°*, 988 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2067 (ii).

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Montreal Terminal Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 738; 2° m., 1147; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2951 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Devlin).
1°*, 738; 2°*, 988 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2539 (ii).

Bill (No. 50) To incorporate La Compagnie du Chemin de fer International de Rimouski.—(Mr. Ross).
1°*, 738; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2539 (ii).

Bill (No. 51) To incorporate the Royal Casualty and Surety Company of Canada.—(Mr. McLean, Sunbury and Queens).
1°*, 738; 2°*, 988 (i); in Com., 2575, 2717; 3°*, 2720 (ii).

Bill (No. 52) Respecting the Bank of Vancouver.—(Mr. Cowan).
1°*, 738; 2°*, 989 (i); in Com., 2147; 3°*, 2148 (ii).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—(Mr. Donnelly).
1°*, 738; 2°*, 989 (i); in Com., 2147; 3°*, 2068 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 54) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Nantel).
1°, 813 (i).

Bill (No. 55) To incorporate the British Columbia Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Cowan).
1°*, 868; 2° m., 1147; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2578 (ii).

Bill (No. 56) Respecting the Canada Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 868; on Order for 2°, 1147; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., 2571, 3004, 3041, 3411 (ii), 4164, 4472, 5093, 5429, 5480 (iii), 5995, 6006; 3°*, 6058 (iv).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting the Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).
1°*, 868; 2°*, 1055 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2148 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 868; 2°*, 1055 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2148 (ii); Sen. Amt., 4445 (iii).

Bill (No. 59) To incorporate the Victoria and Barkley Sound Railway Company—(Mr. R. Smith).
1°*, 868; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com and 3°*, 2539 (ii).

Bill (No. 60) To amend the Criminal Code respecting injuries to Persons due to Motor Vehicles.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 952 (i).

Bill (No. 61) Respecting the Burrard Westminster Boundary Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 1116; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2539 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) To incorporate the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Neely).
1°*, 1116; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., 2530; in Com., and 3°*, 2578 (ii).

Bill (No. 63) To incorporate the Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Ames).
1°*, 1116; 2°*, 1366 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii); Sen. Amts., 6788 (iv).

Bill (No. 64) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Sproule).
1°, 1234 (i).

Bill (No. 65) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°, 1236 (i).

Bill (No. 66) Respecting the Abitibi and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Nipissing).
1°*, 1318; 2°*, 1513 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2951 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°*, 1318; 2°*, 1513 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2951 (ii).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°*, 1318; 2°*, 1513 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2951 (ii).

Bill (No. 69) To incorporate the Fort Erie and Buffalo Bridge Company.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 1318 (i); 2°*, 2579; in Com., 3403; 3°*, 3404 (ii).

Bill (No. 70) Respecting the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Perth).

1°*, 1318; 2°*, 1513 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2951 (ii).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting a Patent of Thomas L. Smith.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 1318; 2°*, 1513 (i); in Com., 2578; 3° m., 2578, 2950 (ii).

Bill (No. 72) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°, 1318 (i).

Bill (No. 73) To provide for the Government Inspection of Vessels.—(Mr. Lewis.)

1°, 1319 (i).

Bill (No. 74) Respecting Wireless Telegraphy on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis.)

1°, 1393 (i).

Bill (No. 75) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.)

1°*, 1479 (i); 2°*, 2148; in Com., 3409; 3°*, 3984 (ii).

Bill (No. 76) To incorporate the Canadian National Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg.)

1°*, 1479; 2°*, 1719 (i); in Com., 2578; 3°, 2578 (ii).

Bill (No. 77) Respecting a Patent of the Submarine Company.—(Mr. Proulx.)

1°*, 1479 (i); 2°*, 2148 (ii); in Com., 4538; 3° m., 4544, 4592; 3°*, 4836 (iii).

Bill (No. 78) To incorporate the Superior and Western Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Conmee.)

1°*, 1479 (i); 2°*, 2257; in Com., 3845, 3963; 3°*, 3983 (ii).

Bill (No. 79) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona.)

1°*, 1648 (i); 2°*, 2148; in Com., 3039, 3151; 3°*, 3162 (ii).

Bill (No. 80) Respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, Leeds.)

1°*, 1648 (i); 2°*, 2148; in Com., 3411, 3472, 3605; 3°*, 3606 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 81) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash.)

1°*, 1648 (i); 2°*, 2148; in Com., 3844, 3942; 3°*, 3963 (ii); Sen. Amt., 5486 (iii), 6073 (iv).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Monarch Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Beattie.)

1°*, 1648 (i); 2°*, 2148 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 83) To amend the Criminal Code respecting offensive Weapons and Capital Offences.—(Mr. Lewis.)

1°, 1716 (i).

Bill (No. 84) Respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)

1°*, 1813 (i); 2°*, 2148; in Com., and 3°*, 3984 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, Leeds.)

1°*, 1813 (i); 2°*, 2148; in Com., and 3°*, 3984 (ii).

Bill (No. 86) Respecting the Cobalt Range Railway Company.—(Mr. Hodgins).

1°*, 1813 (i); 2°*, 2148; in Com. and 3°* 3847 (ii).

Bill (No. 87) To incorporate the Arnprior & Pontiac Railway Company.—(Mr. Hodgins.)

1°*, 1970 (i); 2°*, 2148 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4839 (iii).

Bill (No. 88) Respecting Assaults and Offences against the Person.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1971 (i).

Bill (No. 89) To amend the Government Harbour and Piers Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°*, 1972 (i); 2° and in Com., 4414 (iii), 5896, 6123; 3°*, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 90) To create a Department of External Affairs.—(Mr. Murphy).

Res. prop., 1813; M. for Com. on Res., 1978; in Com. on Res., 1996; 1°* of B. 2008 (i); 2° and in Com., 4436, 4470; 3°*, 4471 (iii).

Bill (No. 91) To incorporate the Prudential Trust Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonell.)

1°*, 2019; 2°*, 2579 (ii); in Com., 5484 (iii); 3°*, 6068 (iv).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting Patents of the Hart-Otis Car Company, Limited.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)

1°*, 2019; 2°*, 2267 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) Respecting Patents of Ammonal Explosives (1908), Limited.—(Mr. Macdonell.)

1°*, 2120; 2° m., 2579, 2720 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 94) Respecting the Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Company.—(Mr. Boyer.)
1°*, 2120; 2°*, 2579; in Com., 3404, 3472, 3605; 3°*, 3605 (ii).

Bill (No. 95) To incorporate the Royal Guardians.—(Mr. Lachance.)
1°*, 2120; 2°*, 2579 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 96) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°*, 2120; 2°*, 2579; in Com., and 3°*, 3847 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) Respecting Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 2121; 2°, 2564 (ii); Res. prop., 6687; in Com., 6704, 6788; 3°*, 6822 (iv).

Bill (No. 98) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 2127 (ii); 2° and in Com., 5349; 3°*, 5350 (iii).

Bill (No. 99) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°, 2127 (ii).

Bill (No. 100) To amend the Adulteration Act.—(Mr. Sexsmith).
1°, 2217 (ii).

Bill (No. 101) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Stewart).
1°, 2217 (ii).

Bill (No. 102) To incorporate the London and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Beattie).
1°*, 2318; 2°*, 2579; in Com., 3846, 3983; 3°*, 3984 (ii).

Bill (No. 103) Respecting the National Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 2318; 2°*, 2579 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 104) Respecting the Thessalon and Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Smyth).
1°*, 2318; 2°*, 2579 (ii); in Com., 5483, 5574 (iii), 6062; 3°*, 6068 (iv).

Bill (No. 105, from the Senate) Relating to the Water Carriage of Goods.—(Mr. Miller).
1°*, 2670 (ii); 2°, 6774; in Com., 6774 (iv).

Bill (No. 106) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Graham).
Res. prop., 2323; in Com. on Res., 2384; 1°* of B., 2402 (ii); 2°, 6186; in Com., 6200, 6293; 3° m., 6302; 3°*, 6313; Sen. Amt., 7068 (iv).

Bill (No. 107) To amend the Adulteration Act.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).
1°, 2490 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 108) Respecting the Saving of Daylight.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 2491; 2°, 3468 (ii).

Bill (No. 109, from the Senate) To amend the Government Annuities Act, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°*, 2670 (ii); 2°, 6773; in Com., and 3°*, 6774 (iv).

Bill (No. 110) Respecting Agricultural Fertilizers.—(Mr. Templeman).
1°, 2910 (ii); 2° and in Com., 4445, 5202; 3°*, 5217 (iii).

Bill (No. 111) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 3362 (ii).

Bill (No. 112) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°, 3468 (ii).

Bill (No. 113) To amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 3565 (ii).

Bill (No. 114, from the Senate) To incorporate the British Colonial Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 3651; 2°*, 3847 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 115, from the Senate) For the relief of Victor Eccles Blackhall.—(Mr. Sutherland).
1°*, 3651; 2°*, 3847 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 116, from the Senate) For the relief of Annie Louise Coltman.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 3651; 2°*, 3847 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 117) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively March 31, 1909, and March 31, 1910.—(Mr. Fielding).
In Com. of Ways and Means, 4051; 1°, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4051 (iii).

Bill (No. 118, from the Senate) Respecting the Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°*, 3703; 2°*, 3848 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 119, from the Senate) Respecting the Quinze and Blanche River Railway Company.—(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 3703; 2°*, 3848 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4839 (iii).

Bill (No. 120, from the Senate) Respecting the Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 3802; 2°*, 3984 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4839 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 121, from the Senate) For the relief of John Grant Ridout.—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 3802; 2°*, 3984 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4839 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) To incorporate the Cabano Railway Company.—(Mr. Gauvreau).
1°*, 3802 (ii); 2°*, 4067; in Com., 4839; 3°*, 4840 (iii).

Bill (No. 123, from the Senate) Respecting certain Letter Patent of the American Bar-Lock Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 4041; 2°*, 4165; in Com., and 3°*, 5429 (iii).

Bill (No. 124, from the Senate) Respecting the Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Schell).
1°*, 4041; 2°*, 4165; in Com., and 3°*, 5487 (iii).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company (Mr. Schell).
1°*, 4041; 2°*, 4165; in Com., and 3°*, 5487 (iii).

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) Respecting the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Dubeau).
1°*, 4041; 2°*, 4165; in Com., 4836; 3°*, 4839 (iii).

Bill (No. 127) Respecting Commercial Feeding Stuffs.—(Mr. Templeman).
1°, 3936 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5204; 3°, 5213 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6743 (iv).

Bill (No. 128) To authorize a Loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 2670; M. for Com. on Res., 3569, 3606 (ii), 4052; 1°* of B., 4118; 2° m., 5103, 5159; in Com., 5250, 5309, 5488; 3° m., 5496, 5575; 3°*, 5621 (iii).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) For the relief of Evelyn Martha Keller.—(Mr. Pardee).
2°*, 4445; in Com., and 3°*, 4839 (iii).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) For the relief of Frank Parsons.—(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 4286; 2°*, 4445; in Com., and 3°*, 4839 (iii).

Bill (No. 131) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 4124; 2° and in Com., 5218; 3°*, 5218 (iii).

Bill (No. 132, from the Senate) Respecting certain Letters Patent of Franklin Montgomery Gray.—(Mr. Rankin).
1°*, 4221; 2°*, 4445; in Com., 4883, 5028; 3°*, 5028 (iii).

Bill (No. 133. from the Senate) To incorporate the Kootenay and Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Knowles).
1°*, 4286; 2°*, 4445; in Com., and 3°*, 4839 (iii)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canadian Medical Association.—(Mr. Roche).
1°*, 4221; 2°*, 4445; in Com., 4840; 3°*, 4891 (iii).

Bill (No. 135, from the Senate) For the relief of Hannah Ella Tomkins.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).
1°*, 4411; 2°*, 4891 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6068 (iv).

Bill (No. 136) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 3802 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4237; 1°* of B., 4253 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6313; 3°*, 6324 (iv).

Bill (No. 137) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 3802 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4237; 1°* of B., 4253 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6324; 3°*, 6330 (iv).

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec Oriental Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 4286; 2°*, 4445; in Com., and 3°*, 5487 (iii).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate) Respecting the Ottawa Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to Ottawa Assurance Company.—(Mr. Perley).
1°*, 4286; 2°*, 4445; in Com., and 3°*, 4594 (iii).

Bill (No. 140, from the Senate) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Miller).
1°*, 4411; 2°*, 4545; in Com., and 3°*, 5487 (iii).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate) Respecting the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 4411; 2°*, 4545; in Com., 5483; 3°*,5483 (iii).

Bill (No. 142, from the Senate) To incorporate the Governing Council of the Salvation Army in Canada.—(Mr. Miller).
1°*, 4411; 2°*, 4545 (iii); in Com., 6068; 3°*, 6070 (iv).

Bill (No. 143, from the Senate) For the relief of Mildred Gwendolyn Platt Patterson.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 4411; 2°*, 4545; in Com., and 3°*, 4891 (iii).

Bill (No. 144, from the Senate) For the relief of Charles Bowerbank Lowndes.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°*, 4411; 2°*, 4545; in Com., and 3°*, 4891 (iii).

Bill (No. 145) from the Senate), For the relief of Isaac Moore.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°*, 4411; 2°*, 4545; in Com., and 3°*, 4891 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 146) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—Mr. Brodeur).

Res. prop., 2017 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4436; 1°* of B., 4445; 2° and in Com., 5219; 3°*, 5249 (iii).

Bill (No. 147) To amend the Cold Storage Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 4471 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6742; 3°, 6742 (iv).

Bill (No. 148) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4631 (iii); 2° m., 6383; in Com., 6391, 6756; 3°*, 6769; Sen. Amt., 7084 (iv).

Bill (No. 149) To amend the Extradition Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 4634; 2° and in Com., 5236; 3°*, 5249 (iii).

Bill (No. 150) To amend the Navigable Waters' Protection Act.—(Mr. Conmee).

1°, 4690 (iii).

Bill (No. 151) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4695 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6744; 3°*, 6756 (iv).

Bill (No. 152) To amend the Navigable Waters' Protection Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 4797; 2° and in Com., 5225 (iii); 3°, 6128 (iv).

Bill (No. 153) Respecting the National Transcontinental Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 4798; 2° and in Com., 5235; 3°*, 5235 (iii).

Bill (No. 154) Respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 4798; 2° m., 5234 (iii); in Com., 6559; 3°*, 6583 (iv).

Bill (No. 155) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).

1°, 4801 (iii).

Bill (No. 156) To amend the Yukon Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4882; 2° and in Com., 5235; 3°*, 5236 (iii).

Bill (No. 157, from the Senate) For the relief of John Denison Smith.—(Mr. McLean, Lunenburg).

1°*, 4988; 2°*, 5487 (iii); in Com., 6070; 3°*, 6073 (iv).

Bill (No. 158, from the Senate) Respecting the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Molloy).

1°*, 4988; 2°*, 5487 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 159) To establish a Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 5249 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6362; 1°, 4988; in Com., 6381; 3°*, 6383 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 160, from the Senate) to incorporate the Canadian Red Cross Society.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°, 4988; 2°*, 5487 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6068 (iv).

Bill (No. 161, from the Senate) To incorporate the Equity Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°, 4988; 2°*, 5487 (iii); in Com., 6625; 3°*, 6628 (iv).

Bill (No. 162) To amend the Customs' Tariff (Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 4584; in Com. on Ways and Means, 5099; 1° of B., 5103; 2° and in Com., 5103; 3°*, 5103 (iii).

Bill (No. 163, from the Senate), To incorporate the Prairie Provinces Trust Company.—(Mr. Sutherland).

1°*, 5248 (iii); 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 164) To amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 5248 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6740; 3°*, 6741 (iv).

Bill (No. 165) To establish the Department of Labour as a separate Department of the Government of Canada.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

In Com. on Res., 5350, 1°* of B., 5350 (iii); 2° m., 6712; in Com., 6717; 3°, 6738 (iv).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate), Respecting the Central Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Ethier).

1°*, 5623 (iii); 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) To incorporate the Board of Elders of the Canadian District of the Moravian Church in America.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°*, 5623 (iii); 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 168, from the Senate) Respecting Mexican Transportation Company, Limited, and to change its name to Mexican Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland).

1°*, 5623 (iii); 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 169, from the Senate) Respecting the Patents of Washington R. McCloy.—(Mr. Rivet.)

1°*, 5623 (iii); 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 170 from the Senate, Respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Marshall.)

1°*, 5623 (iii); 2°*, 6247; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 171, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Michaud.)
1°*, 5623 (iii); 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 172) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe.)
1°, 5625 (iii).

Bill (No. 173) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe.)
1°, 5626 (iii).

Bill (No. 174) To correct a Clerical error in Chapter 63 of the Statutes of 1908, respecting Railway Subsidies.—(Mr. Graham.)
1°, 5628 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6741; 3°*, 6742 (iv).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate), Further to amend Chapter 92 of the Statutes of 1901, respecting the Canadian Patriotic Fund Association.—(Sir Frederick Borden).
1°*, 5887 (iii); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 6739 (iv).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate) To incorporate the St. Maurice and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)
1°*, 5777 (iii); 2°, 6083; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) Respecting the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company, and to change its name to the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Sutherland).
1°, 5885 (iii); 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate) For the relief of John Wake.—(Mr. McCraney.)
1°*, 5886 (iii); 2°, 6081; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 179) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Edwards.)
1°*, 5889 (iv).

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate) Respecting the Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company.—(Mr. Ecrement.)
1°*, 5997; 2°*, 6082; in Com., 6628; 3°*, 6630; Amts., 6917 (iv).

Bill (No. 181, from the Senate) For the relief of Laura McQuoid.—(Mr. Nesbitt.)
1°*, 5997; 2°*, 6082; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate) For the relief of Fleetwood Howard Ward.—(Mr Lewis).
1°*, 5997; 2°*, 6083; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 183, from the Senate) For the relief of Aaron William Morley Campbell.—(Mr. White, Alberta.)
1°*, 5997; 2°*, 6083; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill No. 184, from the Senate) For the relief of John Christopher Cowan.—(Mr. Turriff.)
1°*, 5997; 2°*, 6083; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 185, from the Senate) To incorporate the Catholic Church Extension Society of Canada.—(Mr. Parent.)
1°*, 6083; 2°*, 6247; in Com., and 3°*, 6624 (iv).

Bill (No. 186) Respecting certain Aid for the extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.—(Mr. Graham.)
1°*, 6292; 2°, and in Com., 6739; 3°*, 6740 (iv).

Bill (No. 187) To authorize certain increases of Salaries to Members of the Civil Service. Inside Service.—(Mr. Fisher).
Res. prop., 160, 292; in Com. on Res., 324, 403, 953, 1135 (i); 1°*, 6330; 2 m., 6330; in Com., 6346; 3° m., 6822; Sen. Amts., 7068 (iv).

Bill (No. 188, from the Senate) Respecting the Prudential Life Insurance Company of Canada, and to change its name to the Security Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Proulx).
1°*, 6402; 2°*, 6625; in Com., 6781; 3°*, 6784 (iv).

Bill (No. 189, from the Senate) To incorporate the Commerce Insurance Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 6403; 2°*, 6625; in Com., and 3°*, 6788 (iv).

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate) Respecting the Fidelity Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 6403; 2°*, 6625; in Com., and 3°*, 6788 (iv).

Bill (No. 191) To authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the public service.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 6292; in Com. on Res., 6708; 1°* of B., 6711; 2° and in Com., 6711; 3°*, 6822 (iv).

Bill (No. 192) To provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Brodeur).
Res. prop., 3197 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6743; 1°* of B., 6744; 2° and in Com., 6744; 3°*, 6744 (iv).

Bill (No. 193) To amend the Judges' Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
Res. prop., 6122; in Com. on Res., 6769; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 6773 (iv).

Bill (No. 194, from the Senate) For the relief of Annie Bowden.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°, 6917; 2° and in Com., 6918; 3°*, 6985 (iv).

Bill (No. 195) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of Canada for the year ending 31st March, 1909, and the year ending 31st March, 1910.—(Mr. Fielding).
In Com. of Ways and Means, 7080; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 7081; 3°*, 7084 (iv).

Biological Stations and Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iv).
Biological Stations, Marine: in Com. of Sup., 3438 (ii).
Birdsall Landing Wharf, Rice Lake, Cost of Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 825 (i).
Birtle Agency, Purchase of Live Stock: Statement (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1168 (i).
Birtle Hospital, Attendance of Dr. Wright *re* Indians: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
Bisley Team, Use of Ross Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5642 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 5644 (iii).
Blackhall, Victor Eccles, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 115.'
Black Lake Postmaster, Complaints, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4896
Blanche River, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 2966 (ii).
Blankets for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i). *See* 'Indians.'
Blind River Wharf in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii).
Blood Indian Reserve, Lease *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 6784 (iv).
—— Sale of Land: Remarks (Mr. Margrath) in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
Blue Rocks Harbour Improvements: in Com of Sup., 2455 (ii).
Boat Harbour, Pictou Co., N.S., Total Expenditure, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2318 (ii).
Boat Harbour, Skinner's Cove, Yearly Expenditure, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2817 (ii).
Boivin, Ernest, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2759 (ii).
Bonaventure Public Works, Amount expended prior to 1900, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 173, 353 (i).
—— Inquiry (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 1320 (i), 2218, 3004 (ii).
Bonaventure River Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2559, 3277 (ii).
Bonin, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5950 (ii).
Bonuses and Subsidies overdue, &c.: Ques. (Mr J. A. Currie) 2763 (ii).
Books entering Canada under British Preference Tariff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).
Bounty on Steel Shipbuilding, Delegation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 6090 (iv).
Bourke, Retirement of: *See* 'Miner, Bill.'
Bowden, Annie, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 194.'
Brandon City, Exchange of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 2322 (ii).
Brandon Transfer Co.: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Brazilian Electro Steel and Smelting Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 10.'
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2456 (ii).
Brewster, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., *re* Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3483 (ii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1283 (i).
Brighton and Campbellford Mail Route, Increase in Contract Price: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 3479, 3655 (ii).
Brighton Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 3314 (ii).
British Canadian Accident Insurance Co : *See* 'B. No. 63.'
British Colonial Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
B. C. Life Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 55.'
B. C. Penitentiary, Retirements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 924 (i).
—— Escape of Convict Bill Miner, Rep. *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 350 (i).
See 'Miner,' &c.
B. C. Ry. Belt Lands, Settlers Titles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 1727 (i).
B. C. Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
B.C. Subsidy in B.C., Promises *re*: Ref to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 41 (i)
B. C. Timber Lands; Leases granted since 1896, Names, Addresses, &c.: M. for ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1924 (i).
B. C. Wharfs: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Barnard) 3004 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry., Names of Stockholders, Passenger Rates, &c.: (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3473 (ii).
Brophy's Post Office, Name of Postmaster, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 1186 (i).
Brule Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 2460 (ii).
Buctouche Channel: in Com. of Sup., 1623 (i).
Budget Speech: Annoucement (Mr. Fielding) 4220 (iii).
Budget, The,—Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 4546 ; Reply (Mr. Foster) 4585, 4595 ; (Mr. Sutherland) 4616; (Mr. Perley) 4642 ; (Mr. Harris) 4653; (Mr. Ames) 4663; (Mr. M. Clark) 4687, 4703; (Mr. Jameson) 4717; (Mr. Ralph Smith) 4727; (Mr. Cowan) 4751; (Mr. Verville) 4757; (Mr. Edwards) 4760; (Mr. Gladu) 4774; (Mr. Nantel) 4780; (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 4792; (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4794; (Mr. Nesbitt) 4804; (Mr. Henderson) 4814; (Mr. Miller) 4845; (Mr. Wallace) 4855; (Mr. Campbell) 4866; (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4901; (Mr. Armstrong) 4910; (Mr. Paterson, remarks) 4915; (Mr. Warburton) 4923; (Mr. Maddin)

Budget, The.—*Con.*
4936; (Mr. Neely) 4951; (Speaker, Mr.) Ques. of Order (ruling) 4957; (Mr. Schaffner) 4968; (Mr. Wallace) 4970; (Mr. Loggie) 4974; (Mr. Fraser) 4980; (Mr. Macdonald) 4991; (Mr. Wright) 5007; (Mr. McKenzie) 5021; (Mr. Bradbury) 5044; (Mr. Molloy) 5059; (Mr. Fielding) Ques. of Order, 5060; (Mr. Staples) 5063; (Mr. Lake) 5079; (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 5085; (Mr. T. J. Stewart) 5089 (iii).

Budget Speech, 1898, Statement *re* Finances; M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 173 (i).

——— Inquiry for Statement (Mr. Ames) 1321 (i).

Budget, The: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1813 (i), 4125 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3649 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3111 (ii).

Buell, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. before Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3252 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3002 (ii).

Buffalo Herds in N. W. Parks: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).

Buildings, Public; erected in Villages, &c., Names, Cost of Maintenance, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3055 (ii).
See 'Pub. Works.'

Burks Falls and Trout Creek Mail Routes, Contract, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 3196 (ii).

Burlington Channel Piers Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2966 (ii).

Burrard, Westminster Boundary Ry. and Nav. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'

Burrows, T. A., Permit *re* Sections in Twps. 30 and 31: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 2592 (ii).

Business of the House, Adjournment for Easter: Remarks re Assent to Bills (Mr. Fielding) 4119 (iii).
See 'Govt Business.'

By Elections, Comox-Atlin and Carleton, Discrepancy in Answers: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 825 (i).
See 'Carleton,' &c.

Cabano Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 122.'

Cable between Vancouver and Mainland, Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1073 (i).

Caledonia and Liverpool Ry. Lines, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1734 (i).

Calgary Electoral District, Dep. Returning Officers, Scrutineers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 685 (i).

——— Voters Lists, Copy, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. McCarthy) 685 (i).

Campbell, Aaron William Morley, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 183.'

Campbell, Bush, Emplymt. on Trent Canal: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1066 (i).

Campbellford and Brighton Mail Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 3479, 3655 (ii).

Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

Campbellton Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).

Canada Eastern Railway, Original Price, Expenditure *re* Repairs, Valve, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2149, 2579 (ii).

——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 3363 (ii).

Canada and G.B. SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 3437 (ii), 6650 (iv).

Can. Life Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 56.'

Canada Line SS. Service with Germany, Negotiations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowke) 2589 (ii).

Canada and Mexico SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6650; Conc., 7074 (iv).

Canada and Newfoundland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

Canada and New Zealand: in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

'Canada Posten,' Winnipeg, Amounts received from Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 3992 (ii).

Canada and South Africa SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

Canada and W. Indies Trade Relations, Commission *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6556 (iv).

Canadian Coasting Trade, Number of British and Canadians, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5633 (iii).

Canadian Economic Lubricant Co., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 176, 188 (i).

Canadian Imports, Percentage entering Can. in 1908 via Can. Ports: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1728 (i).

Canadian Liverpool and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'

Can. Medical Association: *See* 'B. No. 134.'

Can. National Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 76.'

Can. Northern Ry., Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 186.'

Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'

Can Northern Quebec Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'

C. P. R., Extensions of: *See* 'B. No. 79.'

C. P. R. and G. T. P. at Ft. William: *See* 'B. No. 25.'

C. P. R., Additional Stock, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 416 (i).

——— Increase, O. Cs. *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. F. Maclean, 685 (i).

——— Ref. to Courts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W F. Maclean) 882 (i).

——— O. Cs., &c.: Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 780 (i).

C. P. R., New Stock, O. Cs.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1321 (i).

C. P. R., New Stock, Closing of Law Suit: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) on M. for Sup., 2920 (ii).

——— Gimli Branch Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 2965 (ii).

Can. Patriotic Fund Association: *See* 'B. No. 175.'

Canadian Railways, Improved Service, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 626 (i).

Can. Red Cross Society: *See* 'B. No. 160.'

Can. Shipping Act: *See* 'B. No. 131 and 179.'

Canadian Ships, Docking for Repairs, Res. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 3053 (ii).

Canadian Ships repaired in Foreign Countries, Duties *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 2762 (ii).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 11.'

CANALS :

Beauharnois Water Power Leases: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).

Canal Staff and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2071 (ii).

Carillon Canal, Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).

Carillon Dam, Repairs to Gap: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (ii).

——— Water Power, Lease of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1557 (i).

Carillon and Grenville Canals, Number of Employees from July to Oct., 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1396 (i).

——— Number of Employees, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Perley) 1734 (i).

——— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).

Cement Testing, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 791 (i).

Chambly Canal, St. Johns' Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 1571 (i).

——— Surveys, Boundaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).

Cornwall Canal, Repairs to North Bank: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).

——— Repairs to Washout in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).

Galops Canal, Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).

——— Toll Collector: in Com. of Sup., 1574 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal, Pet. *re* Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 6415 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal and Welland Canal Enlargements: Statement (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).

Lachine Canal, Basin No. 2: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).

——— Cement Contracts: Explanation (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*

Lachine Canal, Concrete Walls: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).

——— Slope Trimmings: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).

——— Slope Walls: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (ii).

——— Wharfs and Basins: in Com. of Sup., 786, 1563 (i).

Lake Nipissing and Monetteville Canal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1559 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (ii).

——— Jones' Falls Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 2030 (ii).

St. Anne's Lock, Renewing Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).

St. Lawrence Canals: in Com. of Sup., 1572 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Construction: in Com. of Sup., 1909 (i).

Soulanges Canal, Amount expended for Repairs, Suspension of Mr. A. Sauve: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 1404 (i).

——— Fire Proof Building: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).

——— Number of Employees, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 869 (i).

——— Slope Trimmings: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).

Trent Canal: in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

——— Campbell, Bush, Emplymt.: Ques. Mr. S. Sharpe) 1066 (i).

——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 1577 (i), 2074 (ii).

——— Damages in Peterborough County: Inquiry for Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5777 (iii).

——— Fenelon Falls Lockmaster, Payments to, Allowances, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1067 (i).

——— Fish Slides: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 2672 (ii).

———Holland River, Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3112; Neg. (Y. 71; N. 112), 3176 (ii).

——— Holland River Canal, Deputation *re* Construction, Rep. Expenditures, &c: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2153 (ii).

——— Holland River Canal, Land Valuations, Remuneration *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2591 (ii).

——— Holland River Canal, Newmarket: in Com. of Sup., 1578, 1587, 1886 (i).

——— Holland River at Newmarket, Rep. *re* Flow of Water: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 472 (i).

———Holland River Canal, Newmarket, Tenders for section 1, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3253 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*
Trent Canal, Holland River Canal, Expenditure *re* Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 1915 (i).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2030 (ii).
Lake Simcoe and Newmarket Canal, Cor. *re* Construction, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 172 (i).
—— Land Damages, Amounts paid *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 4641 (iii).
—— Land Values, Expropriations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3177 (ii).
Newmarket Canal to Lake Wilcox, Construction, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5157 (iii).
Welland Canal, Electric Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
—— Employees, Number for Sept. and Oct.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 470 (i).
—— Feeder Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).
—— Number of Employees, Total Salaries, Revenue, &c: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 815 (i).
—— Port Maitland Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2030 (ii).
—— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2034 (ii).
—— Steel Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).
—— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 1909 (i).
—— Total Cost, Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCall) 2154 (ii).
—— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
Water Power Leases on Canadian Canals: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2037 (ii).
Canned Meats, Contract called for by G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1238 (i).
Canning Factories, Numbers, Salaries: Ques.
Cape Breton South, Election Payments to (Mr. Marshall) 822 (i).
Cape Bald Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).
Cape Breton South, Election Payments to Returning Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5636 (iii).
Cape Tormentine Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).
Capital Supply Co., and Govt. Patronage, Names of Promoters, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 683 (i).
Cap St. Ignace Station, Construction, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. C. Roy) 3992 (ii).
—— Tank, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. C. Roy) 3992 (ii).
Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2522 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.'
Cariboo Breakwater or Causeway, Yearly Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 2152 (ii).
Cariboo Mail Service, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 1731 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 3424 (ii).
Carillon and Grenville Canal, Number of Employees, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Perley) 1734 (i).
—— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).
Carillon Canal Dam, Repairs to Gap: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (ii).
—— Water Power, Lease of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1557 (i).
Carillon Canal, Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).
Carleton and Comox-Atlin, Issue of Writ: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 401 (i).
Carleton Electoral Division, Resignation of Member: Notification (Mr. R. L. Borden) 94 (i).
—— Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 159 (i).
—— Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1556 (i).
Carson, Mr. Geo., Emplymt. by Govt., Absences of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4697 (iii).
Carter, Mr. Edward S., Emplymt. as Sessional Clerk: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5094 (iii).
Cassels, Judge, Investigation *re* Marine, Action of Govt. *re* Report: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2218, 3003, 3249, 3568 (ii).
See 'Depts. of Govt.' 'Govt. Tenders,' 'Patronage.'
Cataract Water Power Supply, Leases on Welland Canal: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).
Catholic Church Extension Society of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Catholic Immigration, Par. in 'Mail and Empire' *re* Limitations: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2672 (ii).
Cattle Guards at Ry. Crossings, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1724 (i).
Cattle Guards, Killing of Live Stock, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 680 (i).
Cattle Guards on Rys., Failure of Rys. to erect, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1409 (i).
Cattle Quarantine Station Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1620 (i).
Caughnawaga Indian Reserve, Grants to Churches: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1410 (i).
—— Return of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1410 (i).
Cedar Rapids Manufacturing and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 94.'
Cement, Contract to W. G. Hartsanft Cement Co., Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3985 (ii).
Cement Testing, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 791 (i).
Census and Statistics Bulletins, French Translation: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1404 (i).

Census, Statistics, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 696 (i).
Census Vote for 1910, Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 531 (i).
Central Bank of Canada, Liquidation, &c. Ques. (Mr. Donnelly) 2151 (ii).
Central Park, B.C., Mail Delivery, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 2590 (ii).
Central Ry. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Central Ry. of N.B., Rep. of Commission *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4125 (iii).
See 'N. B. Central,' &c.
Chambly Canal, St. Johns Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 1571 (i).
——— Surveys, Boundaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).
See 'Canals.'
Charlottetown, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2959 (ii).
Charlottetown Post Office, Sidewalk Construction, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4228 (iii).
Chartered Banks, Unpaid Balances for five years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2592 (ii).
Charters of Rys., Mileage, Construction: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Chatham, Diversion of Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Chesley Post Office, Amount of Vote *re*: Ques. (Mr. Donnelly) 543 (i).
Chesley Post Office Site: Remarks (Mr. Donnelly) in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i).
Cheverie Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2456 (ii).
Chicoutimi Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2523 (ii).
Chicoutimi Pier, Contract of T. Desbiens, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 2161 (ii).
Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amount due by Govt. *re* Booms: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4222 (iii).
——— Sale of Booms: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4891 (iii).
Chicoutimi Wharf, Expropriation of Land, Prices paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr .Girard) 4222 (iii).
Chilliwack Post Office Site, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1414 (i).
Chilliwack Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 2090 (ii).
——— Negotiations *re* Purchase of Property: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1073 (i).
Chinaware, Customs Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 4636 (iii).
Chinese Immigration Act, Administration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6655 (iv).
Chinese Seizures in Nova Scotia, Legal Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 3466 (ii).
Church Point Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).
Cigarette Prohibition, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 246 (i).
Civil Service Salaries: *See* 'B. Nos. 137, 187.'
Civil Service Res., Conc. before Easter Adjournment: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3702 (ii).
Civil Service Act, Apptmt. of Officials in 1908, Names, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 827 (i).
——— Delay *re* Schedule, Blocking, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5895 (iv).
Civil Service Act, Promotions, Transfers, Apptmts. under: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 352 (i).
Civil Service, Apptmts. since July, 1908, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 142 (i).
——— since Sept., 1908: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 143 (i).
Civil Service Commissioners, O. Cs. Deptl. Orders, Regulations, &c. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 158 (i).
——— Printing: in Com. of Sup., 7065 (iv).
——— Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 874, 1022 (i), 2241 (ii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 705 (i).
Civil Service Bill, Preparation of Schedules: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5998 (iv).
——— Classification : Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 325 (i).
——— Classification *re* Schedules, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 2404 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3254 (ii).
Civil Service Examiners Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4047 (iii).
Civil Service Increases since April, 1908, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1069 (i).
——— O.C. *re* Increase: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1395 (i).
——— Defective Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1562 (i).
Civil Service, Inside Employees, Total Payments to in 1896: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1913 (i).
Civil Service Salaries, Names of those receiving no Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1726 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Turriff) 1558 (i).
Civil Service, Payments in 1896 and 1908-10: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2148 (ii).
———Reoranization, Temporary Clerks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 142 (i).
——— Schedules: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2336 (ii).
——— Schedules of Senate: Remarks (Mr Foster) 6061 (iv).
Civil Service Temporary Clerks, Classification under sec. 7. of C.S. Act, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 354 (i).
Clarke City, Seven Islands Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2526, 2540, 2887

Clark's Harbour Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 2462 (ii).
Clarke, Mrs. A. G., Compensation *re* death of her son: in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iv).
Coal Conserving for the Home Market: Prop. Res. (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 3087 (ii).
Coal Oil Explosions, Investigation as to Deaths, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1056 (i).
——— Evidence, Rep., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Schaffner) 1421 (i).
Coal Royalties, Total Amount paid to March 31, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 2588 (ii).
Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4120 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. McCarthy) 5351 (iii).
Coal and Timber Lands, Owned or Leased by Private Individuals, Corporations, &c. Revenue collected, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 1420 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1185 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 1978 (i).
Coasting Trade, O. C. *re* Change of Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3051 (ii).
——— O. C. *re* Privileges to Foreign Ships: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 6123 (iv).
Coast Line and Seaports Protection: Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) Remarks, 549 (i).
See 'Naval Defence,' 'Imperial Defence.'
Cobalt Lake Act, Disallowance of by Dom. Govt. Cor., &c.: M. for Papers (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1735 (i).
Cobalt Range Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Cobourg Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2967 (ii).
Cobourg Harbour Expenditure for 1908, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 3988 (ii).
Cochrane Town Site, G.T.P., Interference *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).
Coinage at Canadian Mint, Date of, Circulation, Profit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1401 (i).
Colclaugh, F. W., Cor., Pets., &c., *re* Fishery Operations with Commercial Companies: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1191 (i).
——— Return: Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 2674, 3655 (ii).
Cold Storage Act: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Cold Storage for Apples: Remarks (Mr. D. A. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 3187 (ii).
Cold Storage in Halifax, Res. of Commercial Committee *re* Establishment: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 3567 (ii).
Cold Storage Plant, Govt. Assistance to: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2756 (ii).
Cold Storage Shipments of Fruit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2817.
——— Amount shipped to G.B. for 1907-8: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 3056 (ii).
Cold Storage for Fruit, Experiments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6983 (iv).
Cold Storage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6833 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3294 (ii).
——— Payments to Mr. Battle: in Com. of Sup., 3294 (ii).
Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 12.'
Colonization and Repatriation Society, Lake St. John, Detailed Statements, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Girard) 3991 (ii).
Coltman, Annie Louise, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Commerce Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 189.'
Commercial Feeding Stuffs: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Commissions, Illicit or Secret: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. to Prepare List (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12 (i).
——— Rep. presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 325 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 664 (i).
——— Change of Names: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2217 (ii).
Committees Standing, Change of Rules *re* Prop. Res. (Mr. Brodeur) 1319 (i).
Committees, Reference of Reports to, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2024 (ii).
Comox-Atlin Electoral District, Resignation of Mr. W. Sloan: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 14 (i).
Comox-Atlin and Carleton, Writs for Election, Issue of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 327 (i).
Comox-Atlin Election, Issue of Writ for 11th Parlt., Date of Nomination, Instructions to Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 682 (i).
——— Correction *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 874 (i).
——— Certificate of Election (Mr. Speaker) 1234 (i).
Concealed Weapons: *See* 'B. Nos. 83 and 101.'
Conservation of Natural Resources: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
See 'Natural Resources,' &c.
Conservation Commission: in Com. of Sup., 7064 (iv).
Contagious Diseases Act: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
Cookshire Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1293 (i).
Co-operative Societies: Remarks (Mr. Monk) on M. for Sup., 2323 (ii).
Cornwall Canal, Repairs to Washout in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).
See 'Canals.'
Cornwall Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i).
Corporation Securities, Total Amount deposited with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Sifton) 247 (i).

Costello, Thos., Rep. *re* Woollen Industry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1176 (i).
Country Postmasters' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).
Courtenay Bay, Dredging Contracts: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).
See 'St. John.'
Cowan, John Christopher, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Cow Bay Run and Osbornes: in Com. of Sup., 2473 (i).
Cow Bay, Port Morien Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2463 (ii).
Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Creosoted Timber Purchases in Mar. Provs: in Com. of Sup., 2511 (ii).
Cribbin's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2473 (ii).
Criminal Code: *See* 'B. Nos. 4, 60, 83, 88, 101 and 148.
Criminal Code (general amts.): *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Crossings of Rys.: See 'B. Nos. 3, 6, 106.
Cummings Cove, Deer Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).
Cushing & Co., Claims *re* Seizures of Schooner 'Evolution': in Com. of Sup., 3450 (i).
Customs Tariff: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
CUSTOMS—
Beet Sugar Refineries, Duty *re* Preferential Tariff: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3047 (ii).
Books entering Canada under British Preference Tariff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).
Canadian Imports, Percentage entering Can. in 1908 via Can. Ports: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1728 (i).
Canadian Ships repaired in Foreign Countries, Duties *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 2762 (ii).
Chinaware, Customs Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 4636 (iii).
Chinese Seizures in Nova Scotia, Legal Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 3466 (ii).
Customs, Board, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 581 (i).
——— Collection, Inland Rev.: in Com. of Sup., 448 (i).
——— Collector at Bathurst, N. B., Leave of Absence: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5157 (iii).
——— Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 590 (i).
——— Inspectors' Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 608 (i).
——— Printing and Stationery: in Com. of Sup., 609 (i).
——— Revenue Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i).
CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Customs Seizures for 1904-5-6-7-8, Number Dates, Sale of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 826 (i).
Farm and Garden Produce, Quantity imported into Sault Ste Marie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 339 (i).
Hay from U. S., Entries at Kingston, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1177 (i).
Hickory and Ash Handles for Farm Implements, Number imported for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 1239 (i).
Hull Customs Duties, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 1418 (i).
Imports and Exports of Merchandise for 1908, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4288 (iii).
Market Garden Produce, Total Imports from 1901-8, Duty collected: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5096 (iii).
Meagher, Mathias, Apptmt. to Customs Staff at Debec, N. B., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3655 (ii).
Nails, Quantity imported, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 2156 (ii).
Oshawa Customs Collector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1972 (i), 2372 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 2672 (ii).
Passover Bread, Higher Rate of Duty, Request *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3986 (ii).
Pork, Bacon, &c., from U. S., Entries at Kingston, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1176 (i).
Port Credit Customs Revenue, Superannuation of Collector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3049 (ii).
Quebracho Extract, Quantity imported, Pet. *re* Duty: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 1178 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Farm and Garden Imports, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 339 (i).
Steel Importations from 31st March, 1908 to Jan. 31st, 1909: M. for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 355 (i).
Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes: M. (Mr. Lennox) 4126 (iii).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada for 1907, Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 149 (i).
Dairy and Fruit Industries, Cold Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3187 (ii).
Dartmouth Post Office, Insufficient Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3255 (ii).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1543 (i).
Daylight Saving Act: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
Daylight Savings Bill, Request to place on Govt. Orders (Mr. Lewis) 3203 (ii).
Death Penalty Commutations, Number for the last 25 years: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 670 (i).

Debates, Official: in Com. of Sup., 3437 (ii).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 1474 (i).

Debates, Official, Cost of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1720 (i).

—— French Translation Staff, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1722 (i).

Debt of Canada, Jan. 31, 1909, Increase from 1908: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1079 (i).
See 'Finance.'

Deferred Elections, Amt. (Mr. Burrell) to Com. of Sup., 2818; Neg. (Y. 69; N. 115) 2876 (ii).

—— Notice of Motion (Mr. Burrell) 2815; Prop. Res., 2818 (ii).

Delisle River Fishway, Reps. Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Boyer) for Copies, 1733 (i).

Departments of Govt., Investigation by Mr. Justice Cassels: Amt. (Mr. Doherty) to Com. of Sup., 3706; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 94) 3954 (ii).

—— Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* 'trust funds,' 3849 (ii).

Debate (Mr. Brodeur) 3706; (Mr. Sproule) 3729; (Mr. Maddin) 3736; (Mr. Kyte) 3746; (Mr. Crothers) 3756; (Mr. Ecrement) 3771; (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3774; (Mr. Rivet) 3791; (Mr. Meighen) 3798, 3803; (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3808; (Mr. Foster) 3832; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3848; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* 'Manipulation of Trust Funds,' 3849; (Mr. Speaker) 3849; Ruling, 3855; (Mr. Conmee) 3850; (Mr. R. L. Borden) on Ques. of Order, 3852; (Mr. R. L. Borden) on Amt., 3863; (Sir Frederick Borlen) 3866; (Mr. Devlin) 3871; (Mr. Price) 3877; (Mr. Parent) 3879; (Mr. Boyce) 3883; (Mr. C. Roy) 3890; (Mr. Jos. Demers) 3893; (Mr. Lanctot) 3896; (Mr. Pugsley) 3899; (Mr. Daniel) 3907; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3910; (Mr. Lemieux) 3917; (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3921; (Mr. Gladu) 3925; (Mr. Edwards) 3927; (Mr. Séguin) 3931; (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 3932 (ii).

See 'Cassels,' &c.

Deptl. Payments to Companies *re* Marine and other Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Ralph Smith) 2322 (ii).

Deptl. Statistical Publications: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4642 (iii).

Desjardins, Capt., Employment by Marine Dept., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 4696 (iii).

Destitute Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

Dickie, Alfred, Payments to *re* Damages by Fire: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1075 (i).

Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2473 (ii).

Disraeli Wharf, Number of Vessels calling at: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2761, 2816 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2350 (ii).

Divorce: *See* 'B. Nos. 115, 121, 129, 130, 135, 143, 144, 145, 157, 178, 181, 182, 183, 184 and 194.'

Dixon's Entrance, Prince Rupert, Rep. from Imp. Govt., *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 2590 (ii).

Dog-Fish Reduction Plants, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 158 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3254 (ii).

—— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iv).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Payment for Berths, &c. Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 542 (i).

Dom. Arsenal, Quebec, Names of Bidders, Tenders, *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3050 (ii).

Dominion Atlantic Ry., Examination by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).

—— Interview with Manager: Remarks (Mr. Black) 3003 (ii).

Dominion Buildings, Heating: in Com. of Sup., 1613 (i).

—— Lighting: in Com. of Sup., 1616 (i).

—— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1617 (i), 2075, 2452 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'

Dom. Buildings, Stamp Cancelling Machines, Power, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1617 (i).

Dom. Public Buildings, Engineers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1619 (i).

—— Water Powers: in Com. of Sup., 1619 (i).

Dom. Elections Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 16, 112.'

Dom. Elections, Payments to Ret. Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 1067 (i).

Dom. Lands Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 8, 64.'

Dom. Lands Act, Memorandum *re*: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sproule) 3002 (ii).

—— French Translation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 532 (i).

Dom. Lands Advertising, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6285 (iv).

Dom. Lands, Expenditures charged to Capital Account: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 173 (i).

Dom. Lands Maps: in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).

Dom. Lands, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3463 (iii), 6273 (iv).

Dominion Loans, Amount Redeemable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 545 (i).

Dominion 4 per cent Loan, Amount of Sinking Fund: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 545 (i).
See 'Govt. Loans,' &c.

Dorchester Penitentiary, Electric Lighting Plant: in Com. of Sup., 884 (i).

—— Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 916 (i).

Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 3237 (ii).

Dorland and U. E. Loyalist Mail Route, Mail Carrier, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 334 (i).

Doucet's Landing Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2543 (ii).

Douglastown Pier Addition: in Com. of Sup., 2546 (ii).

Dover Wharfs on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

Dredge, Govt.-owned employed in N.S. under Contracts, Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2320 (ii).

Dredges owned by Govt., Number, Construction, Price, &c.: M. (Mr. German) for Ret.* 2596 (ii).

Dredge on Lake Winnipeg, Expense *re* moving Str. 'Mikado' from Sand Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 869 (i).

Dredges purchased by Public Works Dept., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 145 (i).

Dredging Contract of McAvity-Mayes, Recovery of mounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 166 (i). *See* 'Mayes,' &c.

Dredging Contracts in Ontario and Quebec for 1907-8, Renewals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3049 (ii).

Dredging Contracts: Inquiry for O.C. (Mr. Foster) 255 (i).

Dredging, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).

Dredging Mar. Provs. Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6553 (iv).

——— Plants, Contracts, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3339 (ii).

Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River: in Com. of Sup., 6885 (iv).

Dredging Vessels, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3338 (ii).

Drummondville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2949 (ii).

Dry Docks, Construction under Subsidies Act, Negotiations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 478(i).

Dry Docks, Montreal and Quebec: Remarks (Mr. Turcotte) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).

Dry Dock Subsidies Act, Annual Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 246 (i).

Dumping Clause, Orders from Treasury Board *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4412 (iii).

'Duty of the Hour' Pamphlet, Distribution of, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 25 (i).

Easter Adjournment: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3649 (ii).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3705 (ii).

Eastern Townships Cavalry Brigade, Site of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5644 (iii).

East Huron Public Works, Expenditure during 20 years: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3477 (ii).

East Point Lighthouse keepers, Resignation of L. McDonald, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3194 (ii).

Eastville Subway Crossing: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).

Eatonville Wharf, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4638 (iii).

Economy Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 2460 (ii).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 24.'

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s Bill: Remarks (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 1362 (i).

Election Expenses in North and South Ontario, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2587 (ii).

Electrical Engineers' Branch, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).

Electric Light Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 452 (i).

Electric Power exported at Niagara Falls. Names of Licensees, Taxation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 345 (i).

Electric Power Export: in Com. of Sup., 455 (i).

Elevators, &c., Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3228 (ii).

See 'House of Commons.'

Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William, Govt. Operation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3993 (ii).

Debate (Mr. Lake) 4011; (Mr. Neely) 4017; (Mr. Bradbury) 4024; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4034; (Mr. Herron) 4035 (ii).

Elmira Branch and Harmony Ry., P.E.I., Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1243 (i), 6787 (iv).

English Oats, Number of Bushels purchased, Prices paid: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1734 (i).

Envelopes, Complaints *re* Mutilation through Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 349 (i).

Equity Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'

Esquimalt Garrison: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 2298 (ii).

Esquimalt Naval Fortifications, Expenditure by Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 474 (i).

——— Maintenance by Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 349 (i).

Esquimalt Permanent Corps, Inspection, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2764 (ii).

Estimates (1909-10): Presented (Mr. Paterson) 327 (i).

——— (1908-9): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2597 (ii).

Estimates, Passing of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3203 (ii).

——— Suppl. (1909): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6092 (iv).

——— Suppl. (1910): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7065 (iv).

Estimates, Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 140 (i).

Etobicoke Postmaster. Apptmt. of, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 671 (i).
Ewart, Mr. J. S., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Hague Tribunal: Remarks (Mr .Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7059 (iv).
——— Emplymt. *re* Newfoundland Fisheries : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5629 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (appeal) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Exchequer Court Act (registrar) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Excise Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Excise Travelling Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 727 (i).
Exhibitions subsidized by Dom. Govt., Amounts, Officials, &c: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 544 (i).
Expenditures and Receipts of Dom. for 1908-9, N.T.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4288 (iii).
Experimental Farms : in Com. of Sup., 5947 (iv).
——— Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1598 (i).
Experimental Farms, Live Stock, Number of Cattle, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Staples) 1420 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Staples) 546 (i).
Experimental Farms, Locations in Eastern Canada, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lapointe) 1925 (i).
Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Electric Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 3192 (ii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6982 (iv).
Experimental Farms or Stations, Establishment of since Jan., 1908, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 156 (i).
Experimental Farming Stations, Establishment of : Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 823 (i).
Expropriation of Ry. Lands, Complaints *re* Remarks (Mr. Mackenzie) 4802 (iii).
External Affairs, Dept. of: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
External Affairs, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7064 (iv).
Extradition Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Fagin, Thos., Employee of Marine Dept., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2154 (ii).
Fairy Lake Indian Reserve, N. S., Conditions of Lease, Revenue, &c., Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2816 (ii).
'Falcon' and 'Fearless' Strs., Purchase of, Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 187 (i).
Falconer, Mr. K., Total Payments to *re* Marine Bookkeeping: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1729 (i).
Falconer, Mr. R. S., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 332 (i).
Farm Crossings over Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
Farm and Garden Produce, Quantity imported into Sault Ste Marie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 339 (i).
Farm Implements and Tools, Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
'Farm Weeds,' Pamphlet, Number distributed, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 2757 (ii).
Father Point Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2548 (ii).
Feeding Stuffs: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Fenelon Falls Lockmaster, Payments to, Allowances, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1067 (i).
Fenian Raid Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 812 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Legislation *re* Bounty: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3478 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6277 (iv).
Fertilizers re Agriculture: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Fidelity Life Insurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 190.'
File Indian Agency, Resignation of Mr. Godfrey, Charges against Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 3045 (ii).
Financial Statement—The Budget (Mr. Fielding) 4546; Reply (Mr. Foster) 4585 (ii).
See 'Budget.'
FINANCE—
American Silver, Exportation of: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 6780 (iv).
Assets of Canada in Detail for Dec. 31, 1908: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 172 (i).
Bank Act Amt., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1732 (i).
Bank of Montreal, Commissions *re* Debt: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 399 (i).
Central Bank of Canada, Liquidation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Donnelly) 2151 (ii).
Chartered Banks, Unpaid Balances for five years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sharpe) 2592 (ii).
Coinage at Canadian Mint, Date of, Circulation, Profit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1401 (i).
Corporation Securities, Total Amount deposited with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Sifton) 247 (i).
Debt of Canada, Jan. 31, 1909, Increase from 1908: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1079 (i).
Finance, Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 3436 (ii).
Funded Debt, Redeemable, Total Sinking Fund: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 342 (i).
Govt. Credit, Cash on Deposit, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 173 (i).
Govt. Deposits in Banks, Discrimination *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 245 (i).
Govt. Loans, Amount Redeemable, &c., Ques. (Mr. Ames) 545 (i).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Govt. Loans, Amount and Dates falling due prior to 1913; Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3654 (ii).

——— Loans or Advances since Dec., 1908, Purposes for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 163 (i).

——— Loans, Expenditure *re* Negotiations: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1724, 1921 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2161 (ii).

——— 4 per cent Loan, Amount of Sinking Fund: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 545 (i).

——— Loan of 1874, 4 per cent, Date of First Notice: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3654 (ii).

——— Loans from July, 1896, Amounts, Conditions, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 172 (i).

——— Loans negotiated from 1st Jan., 1907, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 685 (i).

——— Loan of Dec., 1907, &c., Sums available for Public Works, &c. Ques. (Mr. Ames) 669 (i).

——— Loan falling Due on Nov. 1, 1908, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 147 (i).

——— Loans of Dec., 1907, and Oct., 1908, Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1075 (i).

——— Loans of Jan., 1909, Expenditure *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2596 (ii).

——— Loans falling due prior to 1913: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3704 (ii).

——— Temporary Loans, Details of $20,606,-333 for Jan., 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1408 (i).

——— Temporary Loans, Interest for 12 and a quarter years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4898 (iii).

——— Temporary Loans, Liabilities between April, 1907 and Dec., 1908: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 172 (i).

Govt. Savings Banks, Amounts of Deposits on Oct., 1889, 1896, 1897, 1898: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1723 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1924 (i).

Liabilities, Contingent or Nominal on 1st Jan., 1909: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 173 (i).

National Trans. Ry., Loans *re* Construction, Eastern Div., Rates of Interest: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 679 (i).

Net Debt of Canada, Present Amount, Increase of: Ques.: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 147 (i).

Revenue Details *re* Amount of $699,235.52 in December, 1908: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 158 (i).

Savings Bank Deposits, Increase of Interest: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1396 (i).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Savings Deposits and Loans, 3 per cent, &c., Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 679 (i).

Silver Currency coined in Canada for 1905-6-7-8, Profits, U. S. Silver circulated in Can., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 868 (i).

Specie Reserve, Date of Last Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 869 (i).

Usury Act, 1908, Prosecutions, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 481 (i).

Fires caused by Locomotives: *See* 'B. No. 7.'

Fish Island Lightkeeper, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6786 (iv).

FISHERIES—

American Fishing Vessels, Seizures, Courts of Trial, Procedure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 172 (i).

Bait Freezers, Cold Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iv).

Banff Hatchery, Establishment of, Representations *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 871 (i).

B.C.: *See* 'Manitoba.'

Bounties, Delay in sending Forms: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1187 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 1249 (i).

——— Bounties, Payments to in Liverpool County: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crosby) 3992 (ii).

Colclaugh, F. W., Cor., Pets., &c., *re* Fishery Operations with Commercial Companies: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1191 (i).

Commissions: in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).

Commission, International: in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).

——— Names, Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1073 (i).

——— Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iv).

——— Regulations, Adoption of: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 6411 (iv).

Conference, Prof. Prince's Salary, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3688 (ii).

Convention, Ref. to the Hague Tribunal: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1395 (i).

Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 6947 (iv).

——— Number owned by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2769 (ii).

——— for Pacific Coast, Tenders accepted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2155 (ii).

Customs Officers, Payments *re* Licenses: in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).

Deslisle River Fishway, Reps., Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Boyer) for Copies, 1733 (i).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iv).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 158 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Ewart, J. S., Emplymt. *re* Newfoundland Fisheries: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5629 (iii).

Fish-Breeding Establishments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iv).

Fish-Curing Establishments, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iv).

Fisheries Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).

Fisheries Convention, Ref. to the Hague Tribunal: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1395 (i).

Fisheries Development and Protection, Apptmt. of Sel. Com.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 483 (i).

Fisheries Jurisdiction with Provs., Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2018 (ii).

Fisheries of Man., Cor. with J. H. Davis, Cor., Pets., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 1190 (i).

Fisheries in Pembina River, Regulations, &c., with U.S., Cor., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 548 (i).

Fisheries Regulations with U.S., Action of Ontario Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) 6519 (iv).

Fishermen's Union of N.S., Documents, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2161 (ii).

Fishing in Lake Winnipegosis, Pet. *re* Summer Closing: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 2381 (ii).

Fish Transportation, Conservation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6955 (iv).

Hatcheries, Number in Canada: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3479 (ii).

Hatchery, Establishment at Sault Ste. Marie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 337 (i).

Hatchery, Lake Winnipegosis, Amount expendel, Qualifications of Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 820 (i).

Inspectors for Cape Breton Island, Apptmt. of Successor to A.C. Bertram: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5631 (iii).

Lac du Bonnet, Opening for Summer Fishing: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1728 (i).

Lake Ontario Fishing Industry, Regulations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 381 (i).

Lake Winnipeg, White Fishing, Extension of Close Season, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 340 (i).

Leases on Nelson River, &c., Cancellation of: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 340 (i).

Leases in Northwest, Cancellation of: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 354 (i).

LeBlanc, O. J., Dismissal as Fishery Overseer, Complaints, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2595 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Licenses issued to Wikwinikong Indians, Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 6407 (iv).

Lobster Licenses in P.E.I., Number issued, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1076 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Fraser) 2160 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries, Violation of Act, Par. in St. John Standard: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 3705 (ii).

Lobster Packing Licenses granted in N.S. for 1908, Names and Addresses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 328 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries, Apptmt. of Icelander *re* Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 3255 (ii).

——— Depletion of by American Fishermen: on M. for Sup., (Mr. Bradbury) 6942, 6475 (iv).

——— Depletion in B.C. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6500 (iv).

Northwest Fish Company's Leases, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6776 (iv).

Officers at Port Joli, N.S., Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4697 (iii).

Pictou County Fishery Overseers, Prosecutions of Salmon Illegal Fishing: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5632 (iii).

Seasons and Leases, Extensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 169 (i).

Seine Licenses, Number on Pacific Coast: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 3482 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Cowan) 3992 (ii).

Settlement with Provs., Rep. of Mr. Bastedo: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 327 (i).

Shad Fisheries, N.S., Rep. of Prof. Prince· Inquiry for (Mr. Stanfield) 3254 (ii).

Sturgeon Breeding in Lac du Bonnet, Sale of Fish, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 531 (i).

Wardens in Victoria County N.S., Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5637 (iii).

Warships discarded by G. B., Offer to Fisheries Protection Service: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2379 (ii).

Weirs in Passamaquoddy Bay, Investigations *re* Ownership: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6088 (iv).

Whitefish Spawn for Lake Winnipegosis, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1403.

Whitefish, Sturgeon, Winter and Summer, Quantity caught, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 826 (i).

Winnipegosis Hatchery, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1402 (i).

Young, W. S., Payment *re* Collection of Whitefish Eggs: in Com. of Sup., 6982 (iv).

Flint Island Fog Alarm, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5636 (iii).

Florence Mining Co.'s Appeal *re* Ontario Legislation: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Lennox) 6920; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 6921 (iv).

Foley, T. P., Emplymt. in Interior Dept.: Ques (Mr. Lake) 2320 (ii).

Foot and Mouth Disease, Precautionary Measures *re* Prevention, Apptmt. of Officials, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sharpe) 521 (i).

——— Present Conditions, Embargo, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 334 (i).

——— States quarantined, Prevention, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. T. Chisholm) 684 (i).

Foran, Mr. Wm., Apptmt. of Successor: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3363 (ii).

Foreign Correspondence, Number of Letters, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Currie) 3986 (ii).

Forests, Waters, &c.: 3rd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Sifton) to conc., 6919 (iv).

Foret, Land Lease of N. A. Bourbonnais, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 2591 (ii).

Fort Cumberland Land, Govt. Ownership, Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3481 (ii).

Fort Erie and Buffalo Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 69.'

Fort Malden, Representations *re* Sale of: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 6087 (iv).

France and Canada Commercial Treaty, Present Condition: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4896 (iii).

——— Announcement *re* Signing: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden), 140 (i).

——— Approval of Convention by France: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 148 (i).

——— Delay *re* Approval by France: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 166 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3254 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1977 (i), 7070 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Minimum Tariff on Farm Products: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5158 (iii).

——— O. Cs., Cor. between G. B. and France: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 157 (i).

——— Supplementary Rep., Mess from His Ex- Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2148 (ii).

Franking Privilege, Abuse of by Member: Remarks (Mr. Smyth) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

Franking Privilege *re* Campaign Literature, Names of Minister, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2585 (ii).

Franking Privilege *re* Political Literature: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1653 (i).

Fraser River, Flooding at Delta, Rep. of Mr. Coste, &c.: (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2587 (ii).

Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Names, Mail Routes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2585 (ii).

'Free Press,' Man.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 1978 (i).
See 'Winnipeg.'

French Language on Govt. Works, Govtl. Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 249 (i).

French Language used by Ry. Cos., Telephone Cos., &s.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Paquet) 1421 (i).

French SS. Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 146.'

French Translators, Number, Amount of Work &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyer) 1733 (i).

Fruit, Cold Storage: *See* 'B. No. 147.'

Fruit Imports into B. C. from U. S., Values, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 3250 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act, Number of Inspectors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3477 (ii).

——— Regulations *re* Inspection: M. (Mr. Burrell) on M. for Sup., 3364 (ii).

Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 809 (i).

Funded Debt, Redeemable, Total Sinking Fund: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 342 (i).
See 'Debt,' &c.

Gabriel, Capt., Payment *re* Recruiting for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 4893 (iii).

Galops Canals, Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).

——— Toll Collector: in Com. of Sup., 1574 (i).

Garrison Common, Transfer of Property to Exhibition Association, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 182 (i).
See 'Toronto.'

Garthby Wharf, Lake Aylmer: in Com. of Sup., 2549 (ii).

Gaspé Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2550 (ii).

Gaspé and Gulf of St. Lawrence Schooner Service: in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

Gaspé-Percé Mail Contract, Expiration of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2596 (ii).

Geodetic Survey Bureau, Establishment of: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3056 (ii).

Geological Specimens, Purchase of: in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iv).

Georgetown Marine Agent, Name, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3194 (ii).

Georgetown Public Building, P.E.I.: in Com., of Sup., 1292 (i).

Georgian Bay Ship Canal, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 14 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal and Welland Canal Enlargements: Statement (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal, Pet. *re* Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 6415 (iv).

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale of, Advertisements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 3991 (i).

Germany and Canadian Treaty Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4125 (iii).

Gerrymander, &c., Ref. to in Debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 24 (i).

Gibson Siding I.C.R., Passenger Cars: in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).

Gillis Angus, Claims *re* Compensation for Injuries on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6089 (iv).

Gimli, Hiransa, &c.: Placing of Lights, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1403 (i).
Girard, Mr. L. P., Emplymt on Saguenay Dredging Works: Stmnt. in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Pugsley) 2811 (ii).
Glace Bay Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
Glace Bay Mails, Contract for collecting: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5775 (iii).
Glace Bay Post Office, Inspector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5635 (iii).
Glace Bay Public Bulding: in Com. of Sup., 1287 (i).
Glace Bay Range Lightkeeper, Applicants, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5636 (iii).
Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1361, 1366 (i).
'Glimpses of Northeastern Canada,' Copies circulated, Payments *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4640 (iii).
Goderich Harbour, Repairs to Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2968 (ii).
Godin, Dr., Payments to *re* Land Damages: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3990 (ii).
Gold and Silver Marking Act: in Com. of Sup., 809 (i).
Gorman, L. F., Remuneration *re* Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 6982 (iv).
Govt. Annuities Act: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Govt. Business: M. to take in Mondays (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4041 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3938 (ii).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2017 (ii).
Govt. Credit, Cash on Deposit, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 173 (i).
Govt. Deposits in Banks, Discrimination *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 245 (i).
Govt. Employees, Interference in Elections: Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 6867 (iv).
Gov. Gen's Office, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 3434 (ii).
Govt. Harbours and Piers: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Govt. Liabilities Return: Inquiry for: Remarks (Mr. Ames) 4119 (iii).
Govt. Loans, Expenditure *re* Negotiations: Purposes for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 163 (i).
Govt. Loans, Amounts and Dates falling due prior to 1913: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3654, 3704 (ii).
Govt. Loans Expenditure *re* Negotiations: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1724 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2161 (ii).
Govt. Loans from July 1896, Amounts, Conditions, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 172 (i).
Govt. Loans: *See* 'Loans,' &c.
Govt. Policy *re* Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Owen) on M. for Sup., 2507 (ii).
Govt. Rys. Act: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Govt. Railways: *See* 'I.C.R.' &c.
Govt. Savings, Amounts of Deposits on Oct., 1889, 1896, 1897, 1898, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1723 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1924 (i).
Govt. Ships purchased from G. B. since 1896, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 3195 (ii).
Government Steamers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6670 (iv).
Govt. Temporary Loans, Liabilities between April, 1907, to Dec., 1908: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 172 (i).
Govt. Tenders, Receiving and Opening: Prop. Res. (Mr. Reid) 188; Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) 199 (i).
----- Notice of Prop. Res. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 170 (i).
Govt. Tenders, Opening, &c., resmg. adjnd. debate (Mr. Miller) 571 (i).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Crothers) 571, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 573 (i).
——— Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) Agreed to (Y. 118; N. 76) 580 (i).
See 'Depts.' &c.
Govt. Tenders, O. C. *re* Opening, &c.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 171 (i).
Gowganda Postal Facilities: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1395 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 1703 (i).
Graham's Pond, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 2507 (ii).
Graham Post Office, Pet. *re*: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 1713 (i).
Grain Elevator at Vancouver, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 2590 (ii).
Grain Weights, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
Grand Bend Dock, Approaches, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).
Grand Etang Channel, Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
G. T. P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
G. T. P. and C. P. R. at Ft. William: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
G. T. P., Lake Superior Branch Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
G. T. P. Ry., Loan to: *See* 'B. No. 128.'
G. T. P. Loan B. 128 (Mr. Fielding) Prop. Res. 2670, 3569 (ii), 4109; 1°*, 4118 (iii); (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3583; (Mr. Hughes) 3577; (Mr. Ames) 3578; (Mr. J. Haggart) 3579; (Mr. Northrup) 3579, 3614; (Mr. Pardee) 3599; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3609; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3612; (Mr. Talbot) 3622; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 3629; (Mr. Maddin) 3636; (Mr. Turriff) 3644 (ii); (Mr. Ames) 4052; (Mr. Middlebro) 4075; (Mr. Donnelly) 4089; (Mr. Perley) 4091; (Mr. T. Chisholm)

G. T. P. Loan Bill—*Con.*
4091; (Mr. Foster) 4104; (Mr. Sproule) 4113 (iii).
Debate on 2° (Mr. Fielding) 5103; in Com., 5189; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5103; (Mr. Graham) 5117; (Mr. Lennox) 5118; (Mr. Ames) 5190; (Mr. Northrup) 5120; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 5123; (Mr. Sproule) 5138; (Mr. J. Haggart) 5141; (Mr. Monk) 5147; (Mr. Nantel) 5152, 5159; (Mr. Talbot) 5153; (Mr. Ethier) 5154; (Mr. McCall) 5168; (Mr. Burrell) 5173; (Mr. Lancaster) 5185; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 5250; (Mr. Fielding) 5251; (Mr. Lalor) 5252; (Mr. Porter) 5254; (Mr. Armstrong) 5255; (Mr. J. Haggart) 5256; (Mr. Sproule) 5260; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5261, 5309; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5265, 5277, 5326; (Mr. Middlebro) 5265, 5322; (Mr. Crothers) 5266; (Mr. Perley) 5267, 5331; (Mr. Northrup) 5269; (Mr. Blain) 5270; (Mr. Lancaster) 5272; (Mr. Goodeve) 5276; (Mr. Foster) 5283, 5323; (Mr. Lennox) 5291, 5317; (Mr. Graham) 5291, 5309; (Mr. Hughes) 5294; (Mr. Burrell) 5327; (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 5328; (Mr. Armstrong) 5329; (Mr. Lake) 5330; (Mr. Fielding) 5323; (Mr. Perley) 5331; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5337; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5345; (Mr. Foster) 5488, 5496, (Mr. Fielding) 5489; (Mr. Blain) 5493; (Mr. J. Haggart) 5495 (iii).
Debate on 3° (Mr. Foster) 5496; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5513; (Mr. Crothers) 5530; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5537; (amt.) 5544, neg. (Y. 70; N. 106) 5592; (Mr. Conmee) 5546; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5556, 5575; (Mr. Carvell) 5579; (Mr. Crosby) 5585; (Mr. Loggie) 5588; (Mr. Ames) 5593, (amt.) 5597; (Mr. Fielding) 5597; (Mr. Barker) 5602; (Mr. Middlebro) Amt., 5604; (Mr. Fielding) 5611; (Mr. Perley) Amt., 5614; (Mr. Meighen) Amt., 5616 (iii).
G. T. P. and Midland Ry. of Manitoba: *See* 'B. No. 28.'
G. T. P. Ry.: *See* 'National Transcontinental Ry.
G. T. R. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—
Alleged Over-classification, Action by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 178 (i).
Amount of Guaranteed Bonds of N. T. R. Western Div.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1398 (i).
Bonds guaranteed by Govt., Available for Prairie Section: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2589 (ii).
Branch Lines, Plans *re* Orillia Branch: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1077 (i).
Brunet, A., Emplymt. of: in Com. of Sup., 2012 (ii).
Cochrane Town Site, Interference *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).
Commissioners, Revised Stmt. as to Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1056 (i).
Construction Commission, Names of Employees, Residences, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Gervais) 826 (i).
Contracts for North Bay Sections, Estimated Cost per Mile: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 819 (i).
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Cost per Mile: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 2494 (ii).
Cost of N. B. Section: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 2383 (ii).
Dismissal of Engineers, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 817 (i).
Disputes with N. T. R. *re* Classifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2321 (ii).
Eastern Div., Expenditures *re* Loans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4634 (iii).
Employees, Total Number, Nationality, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sifton) 249 (i), 3042 (ii).
G. T. P. Ry. Co., and Transcontinental Ry., Classification, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3055 (ii).
G. T. P. and N. T. R. Classification, Reference *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4899 (iii).
Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 2048 (ii).
Lake Superior Branch, Number of Miles completed, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 4286 (iii).
Lands sold along Route, Price, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 352 (i).
Lands sold for Stations, Town Sites, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 143 (i).
Legislation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2219 (ii).
Loans, Cor., Reps., &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2771, 3111 (ii).
—— Security: Remarks (Mr. Ames) 3258 (ii).
Mileage Construction of N. T. Ry., Average Cost per Mile: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1184 (i).
Miles of Western Division completed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1398 (i).
Montreal Branch, Agreement, Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 816 (i).
N. T. Ry., Eastern Div., Quantity of Work executed, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1923 (i).
See 'Transcontinental.'
Negotiations *re* Proposed Loan prior to Oct., 1908: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 4290 (iii).
Number of Miles of Western Division completed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1398 (i).
Prairie Section Contracts, Names of Contractors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 3987 (ii).
Prairie Section and Mountain Section, Detailed Stmnt. of Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3256 (ii).
Pusher Grades, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4883 (iii).
Resignation of Mr. Morse, Action of Govt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 344 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Siberian Labourers: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 4898 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 4989 (iii).
Sub-contractors on B. C. Section, Importation of Labour, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D Taylor) 3939 (ii).
Tenders, Advertisements *re* Ties: Ques (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6091 (iv).
Tenders: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 4801 (iii).
Terminal Town Sites Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 2194 (ii).
Total Expenditure to Feb., 1909, *re* Building and Equipment of Winnipeg-Moncton Section: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3704 (ii).
Total Expenditure *re* Construction of N. T. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1181 (i).
Unpaid Wages, Claims of Stationmen, &c., Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 5629 (iii).
Wainwright, Mr., Statement *re* Inception: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1560 (i).
Winnipeg Terminal Site, Negotiations *re* Purchase: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 1070
—— Purchase by Rothwell & Co. from Kern & Matthews, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bradbury) 1081 (i).
G. T. Ry., Indebtedness to Canada, Payments made, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 3046 (ii).
—— Indebtedness to Canada: M. for O. Cs. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3056 (ii).
—— Prior Lien on G. T. P. Assets, Opinion of Law Officers of Crown: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4228 (iii).
—— Stock Outstanding, Total Liabilities, &c: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3651 (ii).
Gravenhurst Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).
Gray, Franklin Montgomery, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
Grazing Leases, Total Area, Annual Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 3703 (ii).
G. B. and Her Colonies: *See* 'Imperial Partnership.'
Great West Permanent Loan Co.: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Greenfield, P.E.I., Post Office, Removal of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 5776 (iii).
Greenwood and Grand Forks, Post Office Sites, Options *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 814 (i).
Grenville-Hawkesbury, Provl. Bridge, Govt. Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Turriff) 1558 (i).
Gretna Quarantine Building, Total Cost, Price of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. H. Sharpe) 824 (i).
Grey, Earl, Extension of Time as Governor General: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5351 (iii).
Griffith, Mr. W., Apptmnt. as Immigration Agent, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1415 (i).
Grist and Sawmills for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Grosse Isle, Disinfecting Apparatus: in Com. of Sup., 3210 (ii).
Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Guysborough County Public Works, Expenditure of Votes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 819 (i).
Guysborough Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1288 (i).
Hague Tribunal, Apptmts., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7057 (iv).
See 'Ewart,' &c.
Half-Breeds living in U.S., Allotment of Scrip, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 1735 (i).
Halifax and Canso SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).
Halifax Customs House, Total Cost, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 815 (i).
Halifax Dom. Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1288 (i).
Halifax Increased Accommodation, I C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2935 (ii).
Halifax Militia, Delay in Overdue Pay: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 2672 (ii).
Halifax and Newfoundland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).
Halifax Post Office, Contract *re* Reconstruction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 814 (i).
Halifax and Southwestern Ry. Subsidy, Negotiations *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Graham) 1561 (i).
Halifax and Spry Bay SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Hand Hills, Alberta, Post Office, Applications, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Magrath) 2162 (ii).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 2985 (ii).
—— N.S., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i), 2118, 2474 (ii).
Harbour, Rivers and Bridges, General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
—— Ont., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2968 (ii).
—— P. E. I., General Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2507 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
Harbours and River Works, Piers, &c., Govt. Procedure *re* Construction by Day Labour: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2513 (ii).
Harmony-Elmira Branch of P. E. I. Ry., Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1243 (i), 6787 (iv).
Hart-Otis Car Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 92.'
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Hay from U. S., Entries at Kingston, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1177 (i).

Hazel Ridge Post Office, Application *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Heating, &c., Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3233 (ii).

Hecate Straits, Status, &c., Cor. with U. S. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4882. 4990 (iii).

Heron Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Hickman, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3054 (ii).

Hickory and Ash Handles for Farm Implements, Number imported for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 1239 (i).

Higgs, Deportation of by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 147 (i).

Highways, Removal of Planks, Instructions from Ry. Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 1022 (i).

Hoffman, Mr., Emplymt. by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 4696 (iii).

Hogs killed from Nov., 1907, to Nov., 1908, Condemnation of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Beattie) 684 (i).

Hogs Dressed, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCoig) 2758 (ii).

Hog Tariff from U.S. to Canada, Increase of: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 821 (i).

Holland River Canal, Newmarket: in Com. of Sup., 1578, 1587, 1886 (i).

Holland (Newmarket) River Canal, Expenditure *re* Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 1915 (i).

——— Deputation *re* Construction, Rep., Expenditures, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2153 (ii).

——— Land Valuators, Remuneration *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3055 (ii).

——— Land Valuations, Remuneration *re* Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2591 (ii)

——— Rep. *re* Flow of Water: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 472 (i).

——— Tenders for Section 1, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3253 (ii).

See 'Newmarket,' 'Canals,' &c.

Holstein Cattle at Experimental Farm, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2756 (ii).

Homestead and Pre-emptions in Man., &c., Number of Acres, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1180 (i).

Homestead and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold, Moneys received, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 482 (i)

Homesteads for Volunteers, Duties performed by Substitutes: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1078 (i).

See 'S. A.,' &c.

Homesteads West of Lake Winnipeg, Rep. *re* Unfitness for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 3251 (ii).

Honora Dock, Manitoulin, Construction, Dimensions, &c., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr Smyth) 6408 (iv)

——— Yearly Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 7072 (iv).

Hopper Scows, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1185 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

Additional Wing to Building, Cost of Construction, Disposal of Rooms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 140 (i).

Additional Rooms, Allotments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 177, 466 (i).

——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr Foster) 170 (i).

Additional Wing: in Com. of Sup., 1253 (i).

Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3204, (ii).

Carter, Mr. Edward S., Emplymt. as Sessional Clerk: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5094 (iii).

Debates, Official: in Com. of Sup., 3437 (ii).

——— Cost of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1720 (i).

——— French Translation Staff, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1722 (i).

Elevators, Repairs, Running, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 2337 (ii).

Franking Privilege, Abuse of by Member: Remarks (Mr. Smyth) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

French Translators, Number, Amount of Work, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyer) 1733 (i).

House of Commons, New Wing, Payments to Deptl. Staff: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2149 (ii)

——— Promotions, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3436 (ii), 6775 (iv).

——— Staff Classification: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 2493 (ii).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 6094 (iv).

Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 160 (i).

Members Indemnity *re* Absences: in Com. of Sup., 7065 (iv).

Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5159 (iii).

Representation: *See* 'Proportional.'

Restaurant Committee. 2nd Rep. of Joint Com.: M. (Mr. Pugsley) to adopt 290, 401 (i).

——— Interim Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 402 (i).

——— Mess. from Senate (Mr. Speaker) 378 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Roof Garden, New Wing, H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7074 (iv).

Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5644 (iii).

Sessional Allowances: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4119 (iii).

Sessional Messengers appointed or dismissed since 1880: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 521 (i).

Statutes, French Translation, Designation of Titles: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) on M. for Sup., 2020 (ii).

Ventilation and Fire Escapes of New H. of C. Wing: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6781 (iv).

Howell, H. M., Payments to, Itemized Statement: M. for Copy* (Mr. Smyth) 3892 (ii).

Hudson Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 43.'

Hudson Bay Lands, Number of Acres Homesteaded, Pre-empted, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Hughes) 1421 (i).

Hudson Bay Ry. Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 2960 (ii).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 685 (i).

Hudson Bay Ry., Total Expenditure, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 1055 (i).

Hull Customs Duties, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Devlin) 1418 (i).

Humboldt Election Officials, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1731 (i).

Hungry Bay Dike, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 349 (i).

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 14.'

Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 6284, 6916 (iv).

Ice-Breaker for Northumberland Straits, Contract with Messrs. Vickers, Sons & Maxim: M. for Cor.* (Mr. J. A. Currie) 3056 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 674 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 3437 (ii), 6673 (iv).

Ice-Breaking Steamers, Superannuation of Officers and Crews: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. Warburton) 1469 (i).

Icelander River Dredging, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 347 (i).

Immigration Act: *See* 'B. No. 17.'

IMMIGRATION—

Agents, Apptmts. in France since 1908, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 678 (i).

——— Bonus Commissions: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1407 (i).

Agents in Can. locating Immigrants, Names, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 2160 (ii).

Agents in France, Number, Reps., Resignation of J. E. Cyr: Ques. (Mr. Ecrément) 1414 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Agents in G. B., &c., Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 7014 (iv).

Agents, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1405 (i).

——— Resident in Canada: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3989 (ii).

——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).

American Agents, Interference with Canadians: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 2242 (ii).

Asiatic Exclusion in B.C., Tel. of Mr. Borden: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in debate on Address, 39 (i).

——— Denial (Mr. R. L. Borden) 39 (i).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 290 (i).

——— Rep. of Toronto 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 664 (i).

——— Forged Telegram, Memorandum from Bishop of Columbia: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1394 (i).

Berube, Rev. E. P., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3986 (ii).

——— Bonuses, Abolition of, Restrictions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 3704 (ii).

Bonuses to Societies, Names, Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 1406 (i).

——— Bounties for 1907-8, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 678 (i).

Brewster, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3483(ii).

Catholic Immigration, Par. in 'Mail and Empire' *re* Limitations: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2672 (ii).

Deportations: in Com. of Sup., 7021 (iv).

——— Amount of Expenditure *re*: Ques. Monk) 1975 (i).

Destitute Immigrants, in Toronto: Par. in 'Toronto Telegram' (Mr. Russell) 2335 (ii).

Griffith, Mr. W., Apptmt. as Immigration Agent, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1415 (i).

Higgs, Deportation of by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 147 (i)

Immigrants, Arrivals for present year, Names, Addresses of Agents in Canada: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1404 (i)

Immigrants, British Subjects, prevented entering Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 478 (i).

Immigrants from G. B. to Canada direct Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1919 (i).

Immigrants prevented from landing in Canada, Nationality, &c.: Ques. (Mr Lennox) 478 (i).

Immigrants rejected and deported, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 677 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Immigrants for 1907-8, Number from U.S., G.B. and France and Belgium, Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 678 (i).

Immigration of Uudesirables into Canada, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1406 (i)

Immigration to U.S., and Repatriation, Cor. with Dept. of Interior and Colonization Societies: M. for Copy (Mr. Paquet) 827 (i).

Immigration Supply, Absence of Ministers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5832 (iii).

Inspectors, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1406 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 2160 (ii).

Japanese Immigration, Sir P. Lake's Speech at Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 1065 (i).

Miller, Mr. N. B., Immigration Agent, Fraudulent Returns: Cor. read (Mr. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).

Orientals in B. C. on Jan. 1, 1909, Number naturalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1920 (i).

Oriental Immigration into B.C., Res. *re* Royal Commission: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1242 (i).

——— Inaccurate Answer: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1248 (i).

——— Corrected Answer (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1976 (i)

Printing and Advertising, Amount expended for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2381 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 2597 (ii).

Quebec Detention Hospital in Savard Park: in Com. of Sup., 3221 (ii).

Regulations, O.Cs., Application of, &c: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 250 (i).

St. Boniface Immigration Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7035 (iv).

Imperial Defence, Conference *re*: Action of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6942 (iv).

——— Cor. laid on Table: (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7069 (iv)

Imperial Defence: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for 3° of Supply Bill, 7081 (iv).

See 'Naval.'

Imperial General Staff, Prop. Organization, O.Cs., Cor.: M. for Copies (Mr. Talbot) 1420 (i).

Imperial Partnership with G.B. and Her Colonies: Amt. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).

Imports and Exports of Merchandise for 1908, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4288 (iii).

Indian Point Dredging, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1397 (i); 2763 (ii).

INDIANS—

Agency Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).

INDIANS—*Con.*

Agricultural Grants to Indians: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

Annuities and Administration Treaty for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 998 (i).

Annuities: Man. in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).

Birtle Agency, Purchase of Live Stock: Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1168 (i).

Blankets for Indians: in Com. of Sup. 976 (i).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wallace)6784 (iv).

B. C., Cleansing Orchards: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).

——— Relief of Destitutes: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).

——— Schools: in Com. of Sup., 1141 (i).

——— Surveys Commission: in Com. of Sup., 1144 (i).

Caughnawaga Indian Reserve, Grants to Churches: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1410 (i).

Caughnawaga-Iroquois Indian Reserve, Returns of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1410 (i).

Destitute Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Payment for Berths, Lapses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 542 (i).

Fairy Lake Indian Reserve, N.S., Conditions of Lease, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2816 (ii).

Farm Implements and Tools, Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).

File Indian Agency, Resignation of Mr. Godfrey, Charges against Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 3045 (ii).

General Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).

Grist and Sawmills for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 14 (i).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).

Inspectors of Timber: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).

Jacobs, F. Macdonald, Complaints *re* Fines collected from Caughnawaga Indians: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyce) 1420 (i).

Kitsilano Indian Reserve, Tel. to Mr. McInnis *re* Transfer to City of Vancouver: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1973 (i).

Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

Lennox Wharf for Indians, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).

Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 1172 (i).

Live Stock for Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 1005 (i).

Man. Annuities: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).

Man. Seed Grain, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Medical Attendance: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 1169 (i).
Medical Relief, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 3462 (ii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 998 (i), 3462 (ii).
——— Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
——— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 3461 (ii).
Nipissing Indian Reserve, Open for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 684 (i).
Oil Borings: in Com. of Sup., 1170 (i).
Rama Indians Trust Fund, Amount held by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 543 (i).
Rand, Dr. F. A., Payments *re* Indians: Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1168 (i).
Reserves, Reduction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Barnard) 1734 (i).
St. Nicholas Indian Island, Disposal of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1410 (i).
St. Peters Reserve, Patents *re* Surrender: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 1191 (i).
——— Instructions of Mr. Vaughan, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 354 (i).
——— Instructions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1421 (i).
——— Removal to Fisher's Lake: in Com. of Sup., 3462 (ii).
Schools: in Com. of Sup., 976, 1015 (i).
Seed Grain, Relief, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 998 (i).
Seed Grain, &c., Man.: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
Steamers on Lake Winnipeg for Indian Dept., Lease. Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1403 (i).
Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
Surveys Commission, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1144 (i).
Surveys, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Purchase by Govt., Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 477 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
Indian Timber Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Timber Lands, Sale of: List read in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Oliver) 1165 (i).
Triennial Clothing: in Com .of Sup., 1014 (i).
Yukon. Schools: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
Industrial Disputes: *See* 'B. No. 113.'
Industrial Disputes Act, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 4641 (iii).
——— Statistics *re* Strike, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 154 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act: in Com. of Sup., 655 (i).
Inspection of Ships: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Insurance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Insurance Bill, Addresses, Reps., &c., made to Com. of 1907-8: M. (Mr. Miller) to lay on Table, 2489 (ii).
——— M. to ref. to Special Com. on Banking and Commerce, 2490 (ii).
Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6290 (iv).
——— Inquiry *re* Legislation (Mr. Percy) 971, 1022 (i).
——— Progress in Senate: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7069 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Omission of Evidence of British Actuaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 243 (i).
Intercolonial Bureau of Weights and Measures: in Com. of Sup., 455 (i).
Intercolonial Railway: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys. Provident Fund: *See* 'B. No. 164.'
See 'Govt. Rys.' &c.
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—
Annual Statement, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Graham) 2675; Reply (Mr. J. Haggart) 2709 (ii).
Apptmts. by Commission since its creation, Places, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 172 (i).
Aston Junction Track Scale: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).
Board of Management, Apptmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 4803 (iii).
——— Rules, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).
Branch Lines, Acquisition of by Govt.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2162 (ii).
——— Rep. *re* Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 351 (i).
——— M. for Copy (Mr. Emmerson) 882 (i).
——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Emmerson) 664, 875, 1718 (i).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 2931 (ii).
Campbellton Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).
Cap St. Ignace Station, Requests *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. Roy) 3476 (ii).
——— Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Roy) 3992 (ii).
——— Tank, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roy) 3992 (ii).
Chatham, Diversion of Line: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Claims for Damages, Settlement of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2157 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rhodes) 3054 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Classification of Employees, Hours of Labour, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1723 (i), 2156 (ii).

Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 2753 (ii).

——— Survey *re* at Amherst, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 529 (i).

Drummondville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2949 (ii).

Earnings from Freight Shipments, Ticket Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5632 (iii).

Employees, Dismissed or Suspended for 1908, Names, Dates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3055 (ii).

Employees at Moncton, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 330 (i).

Employees, Settlement *re* Conciliation Act: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6686 (iv).

Employees Strikes Disputes, Rep. of Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 289 (i).

Extensions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).

Facilities and Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2947 (ii).

Frauds, Suspension of Officials: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 2673 (ii).

Freight Clerks, Betterments, Govtl. Intentions: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1561 (i).

——— Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 3568 (ii).

——— Conciliation Board Rep.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Crosby) 2597 (ii).

——— Settlement by Arbitration: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 2127 (ii).

Freight Clerks, Settlement of Labour Dispute: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 3258 (ii).

——— Letter from Dep. Min. of Rys. *re* Award: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4697; Cor. &c. read (Mr. Graham) 4698 (iii).

——— Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 246 (i).

Gibson Siding for Passenger Cars: in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).

Gillis, Angus, Claims *re* Compensation for Injuries: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6089 (iv).

Halifax, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2935 (ii).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Earnings and Working Expenses, Monthly: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 162 (i).

——— Earnings and Expenditures for Oct., 1907 and the year 1908: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1415 (i).

——— Total Working Expenditures and Receipts, Amount of Capital Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5641 (iii).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Employees, Number for each month, 1908: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1173 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

I.C.R., &c., Employees, Permanent and Temporary, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 243 (i).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Items in Public Accounts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 173 (i).

Leasing, Proposal *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 164 (i).

Lebel, Mr. Achille, Application for Pet. of Right *re* I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3253 (ii).

Loggieville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2753 (ii).

Machinery for Shops: in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii).

——— Purchase of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clare) 1191 (i).

Moncton Cut-off: in Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).

Moncton Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).

Motor Cars, Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1719 (i).

Officials: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4641 (iii).

Original Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2925 (ii).

Percentage of East Bound Traffic: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 528 (i).

P.E.I. Ry.: *See* main heading.

Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii).

Running Privileges, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 351 (i).

Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2948 (ii).

Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2934 (ii).

Speed of Special Mail Trains, Instructions *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 872 (i).

Stationery and Printing, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2374 (ii).

Steel Cars, Introduction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 481 (i).

Stellarton Station, Area of Concrete Walks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 5630 (iii).

Sydney Mines, Diversion of Line: in Com. of Sup., 2936 (ii).

Truro, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2754 (ii).

——— Staff, Number employed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 244, 328 (i).

——— Station, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 824 (i).

Wallberg Contract, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3475 (ii).

Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 2947 (ii).

Williams, Thos., Emplymt. at Moncton, Superannuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 330 (i).

Windsor Branch, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 3421 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Wire Fencing: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1321 (i).

Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 3421 (ii), 6985 (iv).

INTERIOR—

Aylesworth, Geo. Anson, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 248 (i).

Brandon City, Exchange of Lands, &c.: Ques (Mr. Staples) 2322 (ii).

B.C. Ry. Belt Lands, Settlers' Titles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 1727 (i).

B.C. Timber Lands; Leases granted since 1896, Names, Addresses, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1924 (i).

Foley, T. P., Emplymt. in Interior Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2320 (ii).

Homestead and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold, Moneys received, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 482 (i).

Hudson Bay Lands, Number of Acres Homesteaded, Pre-empted, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Hughes) 1421 (i).

Interior Clerks, Outside and Temporary, Increases, Resignations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 532, 1064 (i).

Interior Deptl. Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 876 (i).

—— Presented (Mr. Oliver) 1021 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Salaries, Promotions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6247 (iv).

—— Salaries for Outside Service: in Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).

Interior Officials, Dismissals Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2380 (ii).

Lands in Man. and N.W., Undisposed of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2374 (ii).

School Lands, Alberta, Total Area, Fund, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 7072 (iv).

Turtle Mountain Squatters, Removal, Compensation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1417 (i).

Internal Economy Commission: Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 160 (i).

International Fisheries Commission: in Com. of Sup., 3439 (ii).

—— Names, Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1073 (i).

International Institute, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 5882 (iii).

International Waterways Commission: on M for Sup. (Mr. Lancaster) 6630 (iv).

See 'Waterways.'

International Waterways Treaty, Despatch from Col. Sec. Earl of Crewe: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 550 (i).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2019 (ii).

Inverness Harbour, C.B., Improvement, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4637 (iii).

Inverness Harbour, Item of Expenditure of 1908-9 Vote, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6404 (iv).

Investigations, &c.: *See* 'Departments of Govt.'

Irrigation, Investigation *re* Water Supply: Remarks (Mr. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv).

Irrigation Propositions for Land by Percy Aylwin, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 2380 (ii).

Jacobs, F. Macdonald, Complaints *re* Fines collected from Caughnawaga Indians: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyce) 1420 (i).

See 'Indians.'

James Bay and Labrador Exploratory Party: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4696 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, Sir P. Lake's Speech at Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 1065 (i).

Japanese Treaty with G. B., Date of Effect, Notice of Termination: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2152 (ii).

Japanese Treaty, Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 46 (i).

See 'Asiatic.'

Jesus River Dredging, Amount of Expropriation, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1069 (i).

Joggins Mines Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).

Johnston, Capt., Repayment of Moneys *re* Str. '*Hestia*': Remarks (Mr. Price) in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).

Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1293 (i).

Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'

Judges Act (Ont. and Alta.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 193.'

Judges Salaries, Correction of Error in Statutes of 1905: Remarks (Mr. Nantel) 6474 (iv).

Judge, H. A., Emplymt. as Detective by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 1399 (i).

Justice, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 440 (i).

Kamloops and Okanagan Telegraphs: in Com. of Sup., 3348 (ii).

Keller, Evelyn Martha, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 129.'

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co. *See* 'B. No. 96.'

King, Mr. Mackenzie, Total Amount paid *re* Opium Commission: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 6406 (iv).

—— Result of his Mission, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 4121 (iii).

See 'Opium.'

Kingston Artillery Park, Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 3223 (ii).
Kingston Batteries, Tenders *re* Groceries: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4225 (iii).
Kingston Military Buildings, Correction of Figures (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 2539 (ii).
——— Excessive Expenditures: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 2495 (ii).
——— Military College Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1507 (i); M. in Conc. to reduce Vote (Mr. Pugsley) 4049 (iii).
Kingston Military Buildings, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Mr. Edwards) 546 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary, Dep. Warden's Residence, Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2589 (ii).
——— Manufacture of Skis: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iv).
——— Number of Prisoners, Guards, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4226 (iii).
——— Revenue from Sales, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barnard) 1190 (i).
——— Receipts: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Barnard) 3255 (ii).
——— Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 886 (i).
——— Tenders *re* Coal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4226 (iii).
——— Tenders *re* Potatoes: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4227 (iii).
Kingston Veterinary Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 1534 (i).
——— Dimensions, Tenders for Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2149 (ii).
See 'Royal Military College.'
Kitsilano Indian Reserve, Tel. to McInnes *re* Transfer to City of Vancouver: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1973 (i).
Knowlton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1301 (i).
Kootenay and Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 133.'
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 80.'
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 26.'
Kouchibougouac Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).
Laberge, Alphonse, Lease with Govt.: M. for Copy* (Mr. C. Roy) 3992 (ii).
Labour, Dept. of: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Labour Dept., Appointment of Minister, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 186 (i).
Labour Dept., Opium Conference: in Com., of Sup., 3433 (ii).
Labour Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 651 (i).
Labour Gazette: in Com. of Sup., 652 (i).
Labour Hours for Working Men, Restriction, &c.: (Mr. Verville) to Com. of Sup., 5913 (iv).
Labour Hours: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Lacas, Emile, Absence from Dept. of Public Works, for 1906-7-8, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4635 (iii).
Lac du Bonnet, Opening for Summer Fishing: (Mr. Campbell) 1728 (i).
Lac du Bonnet Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 2116, 2985 (ii).
See 'Sturgeon.'
Lachine Canal, Basin No. 2.: in Com. of Sup., 1910 (i).
——— Cement Contracts: Explanation (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).
——— Concrete Walls: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).
——— Slope Trimmings: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i), 3420 (ii).
——— Wharfs and Basins: in Com. of Sup., 786, 1563 (i).
Lachute Mills Post Office, Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Perley) 158 (i).
Lachute Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1301 (i).
La Compagnie du Chemin de fer International de Rimouski: *See* 'B. No. 50.'
'Lady Evelyn' Str., Purchase Price, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 144 (i).
Lafferty, Dr., Expenses *re* Tuberculosis Convention: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
Laffin, R. L., Increase of Salary, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) in Com. of Sup., 6915 (iv).
Lake Dauphin, Mossy River Obstruction: in Com. of Sup., 2997 (ii).
Lakefield Wharf, Amount of Expenditure, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1063 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sexsmith) in Com. of Sup., 3332 (ii).
Lake Manitoba, Rep. *re* Lowering of Waters, Pet. from Settlers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 2593 (ii).
Lake Nipissing Floods, Claims of Settlers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 817 (i).
——— Improvement of Narrows to Monnetteville: in Com. of Sup., 3308 (ii).
Lake Nipissing and Monetville Canal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1559 (i).
Lake St. Francis (Beauce) Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 2554 (ii).
Lake St. John Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2556 (ii).
Lake St. John Ry., Colonization Subsidy Grant &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 678 (i).
Lakes Simcoe and Couchiching, Lowering of Waters, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 685 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2773 (ii).

Lake Simcoe and Newmarket Canal, Cor. *re* Construction, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 172 (i).

Lake Transportation : Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).

Lake Winnipeg White Fish, Extension of close Season, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 340 (i).

Lameque Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Land Grants to Early Settlers: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).

Lands in Man. and N. W., Undisposed of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2374 (ii).

Land Patents of Section 16, 20 and 22, Payments of Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4900 (iii).

Lansdowne Drill Shed, Tenders, Contract *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 5630 (iii).

Laprairie Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).

'La Region du Lac Saint Jean, Guides des Colons,' Distribution in Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 678 (i).

Latchford Dam, Cor. with T. N. & O. Ry. Commission *re* Sale of Lots: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 3320 (ii).

Latchford Dam on Montreal River, Contract *re*, &c.: Ques, (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 543 (i).

Latitude and Longitude in Canadian Cities, Record of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2378 (ii).

Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1386 (i).

Lebel, Mr. Achille, Application for Pet. of Right *re* I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3253 (ii).

LeBlanc, O. J., Dismissal as Fishery Overseer, Complaints, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2595 (ii).

Lee-Enfield Rifle, Issue of New Barrels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 6088 (iv).

Lennox Wharf for Indians, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).

Leonardsville, Deer Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Lethbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1551 (i).

Letter Carriers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1653, 1697, 1712 (i).

Letter Carriers' Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 136.'

Letter Carriers Salaries at St. Thomas: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in Com. of Sup., 3428 (ii).

Letter Carriers' System in Cities, Regulations *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5158 (iii).

Level Crossings of Railways: *See* 'B. Nos. 3, 6, 106.'

Level Crossing Accident Ret., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 1116 (i)

Level Crossings on Rys., Number of Accidents: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 548, 1320 (i).

See 'Rys.'

Level Crossings, Orders of Ry. Com. of Privy Council: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 549 (i).

Levis Graving Dock, Insufficient Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 186 (i).

Levis Harbour Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2094 (ii).

Levis Postmastership, Apptmt. of Successor to Mr. A Lefrançois: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4636 (iii).

Liabilities, Contingent or Nominal on 1st Jan., 1909: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 173 (i).

Library of Parlt., Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 12 (i).

Life-Saving Rewards, Boats, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6675 (iv).

Lighthouse Agencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).

Lighthouse Board, Re-organization of: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1974 (i).

Lighthouse Buoy Steamer, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6910 (iv).

Lighthouses, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6904 (iv).

Lightkeepers, Lake Huron, Increases to: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 336 (i).

Lightkeepers' Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6889, 6981 (iv)

Lighthouses, Maintenance, Repairs, Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6902 (iv).

See 'Marine.'

Lighting, &c., Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3226 (ii).

Lindsay Block, Ottawa, Negotiations *re* Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 681 (i).

Lismore Wharf, Construction, Unpaid Accounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1079 (i).

Litigation Expenses *re* Railways and Canals: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).

Little Current Dredging, Depth, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 7072 (iv).

—— Improvement of Northern Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2973, 3302 (ii).

Little Narrows Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).

Little River Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).

—— Amount expended, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 476 (i).

Live Stock for Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 1005 (i).

Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 5833 (iii).

Load Lines on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 45.'

Loans, Government: *See* 'B. Nos. 128, 186 and 191.'
Loan falling Due on Nov. 1, 1908, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 147 (i).
Loans by Govt., Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1921 (i).
Loan Returns, Inquiry for (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4124 (iii).
Loan of 1874, 4 per cent, Date of First Notice: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3654 (ii).
Loan of Dec., 1907, &c., Sums available for Public Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 669 (i).
Loans of Dec., 1907, and Oct., 1908, Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1075 (i).
Loans of Jan., 1909, Expenditure *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2596 (ii).
Loans negotiated from 1st Jan., 1907, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 685 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4125 (iii).
Loans: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1561 (i), 2674, 3937 (ii).
Loans, Temporary, Interest for 12 and a quarter years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4898 (iii).
——— Details of $20,606,333 for Jan., 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1408 (i).
See 'Govt. Temporary Loans,' &c.
Lobster Fisheries, Violation of Act, Par. in St. John 'Standard': Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 3705 (ii).
Lobster or Fishing Licenses issued in P.E.I. since Jan., 1904, Pets., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Fraser) 2160 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1076 (i).
Lobster Licenses, Refusal to W. C. Henley, Cor., &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4803 (iii).
Lobster Packing Licenses granted in N. S. for 1908, Names and Addresses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 328 (i).
Logberg Printing Co., Payments to by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 1191 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bradbury) 2674, 3255, 3938 (ii).
——— Suppl. Ret.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 4041 (iii).
Loggie, W. S. Co., Payments for 1906-7-8 by Govt., Dates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 479 (i).
——— Payments to *re* Ry. Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 668 (i).
Loggieville Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2753 (ii).
London and Lancashire Plate Glass and Indemnity Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77'.
London and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 102.'
Londonderry Station to Great Village Mail Contract, Name, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 824 (i).
Lorne Valley, P.E.I., Tenders *re* Mail Contract: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 5776 (iii).
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).
Lowndes, Charles Bowerbank, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 144.'
Lussier, J. A., Payments to by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3990 (ii).
——— Returning Officer at St. Johns-Iberville, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2767 (ii).
Mackey's Station Post Office, Complaints *re* Management: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 545 (i).
Macleod Post Office, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).
McAvity-Mayes Dredging Contract: *See* 'Govt. Tenders.'
——— Recovery of Moneys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 153 (i).
See 'Mayes.'
McCloy, Washington R., Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
McDonald, Lachlin, Resignation as Lightkeeper for East Point, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3194 (ii).
McGregor's Creek Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
McKenzie, Calvin, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2152 (ii).
McKenzie, Mr. D., Resignation as Postmaster of Three Brooks, Apptmt. of a Successor: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 4640 (iii).
McLeod, Oswald L., Salary: in Com. of Sup., 3436 (ii).
McPhaiden, Capt. D., Resignation as Shipping Master, Application *re* Position: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1973 (i).
McQuoid, Laura, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Machinery for I.C.R. Shops: in Com. of Sup, 2952 (ii).
Madoc-Eldorado Branch Ry., G.T. Bonus, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 245 (i).
See 'Bills 39 and 106.'
Magdalen Islands and Mainland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Magnetawan River Improvements, Amount expended, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 476 (i).
Magnetawan Wharf, Parry Sound: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
Mail Boxes purchased and entered into Canada free of Duty: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 547 (i).
Mail Clerks, Number killed or injured in past two years: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3476 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' Railways,' &c.
Mail Contracts expiring on 1st April, 1909, Renewals, Tenders, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 685 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 4801 (iii).

Mail Contracts, Fair Wage Clause: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3430 ii).
——— Renewals in April, 1909, without Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 477 (i).
Mail delivered in Towns, &c., Rural Free Delivery, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 157 (i).
Mail Service from Hyde Park Post Office, &c., Middlesex County: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 3251 (ii).
Mail and Stage Routes, Total Number of Miles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 481, 819 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com 6650 (iv)
Major's Hill Park Hotel, Title *re* Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 147 (i).
See 'G. T. R.' &c.
Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 1601 (i).
Makaroff Postmaster's Salary: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).
Malagash, N.S., Mail Contract, Expiry of, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5639 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Memorial *re*: Read (Mr. Roche) 2235 (ii).
——— Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3479 (ii).
——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Campbell) 3862 (ii).
——— Settlement *re* Delimitation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 530 (i).
Manitoba County Court Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 341 (i).
Manitoba Fisheries, Apptmt. of Icelander *re* Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 3255 (ii).
Manitoba Fisheries, Depletion of by American Fishermen: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Bradbury) 6475, 6942 (iv).
——— Depletion in B.C. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6500 (iv).
Man. Grain Act: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Manitoba Post Office, Transfers since Nov. 1908, Names of former Postmasters, Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1414 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche) 1922 (i).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Manitoulin Island Telephone or Telegraph System, Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 6407 (iv).
Manufacturing Industries, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 152 (i).
Maps of Dom. and N. W. Ters., Engraving, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3466 (ii).
Marconi Stations, Construction, Maintenance, Amounts Paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 177 (i).
Marconi Stations between Montreal and Quebec, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 2762 (ii).
Margaree Island Lighthouse, Expenditure *re* Roads to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6090 (iv).
MARINE:
Aids to Navigation, Light System, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6904 (iv).
Aids to Navigation on N. S. Coast, Applications *re* Personal Inspections, &c. Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 5640 (iii).
'Anticosti' Str., Amount of Work, Tenders, *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 671 (i).
Banfield Creek Life Boat, Cost, Wreck, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1730 (i).
Bibbington, Thos., Cancellation of Pilotage Certificate: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Barnard) 3991 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6855 (iv).
Cassels, Judge, Investigation *re* Marine Dept., Action of Govt. *re* Report: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2218, 3249, 3568 (ii).
See 'Marine.'
Desjardins, Capt., Emplymt. by Marine Dept. Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 4696 (ii).
East Point Lighthouse Keeper, Resignation of L. McDonald, &c., Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3194 (ii).
Fagin, Thos., Employee of Marine Dept., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2154 (ii).
Falconer, Mr. K., Total Payments to *re* Marine Bookkeeping: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1729 (i).
'Falcon' and 'Fearless' Strs., Purchase of, Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 187 (i).
Fish Island Lightkeeper, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6786 (iv).
Flint Island Fog Alarm, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5636 (iii).
Georgetown Marine Agent, Name, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3194 (ii).
Gimli, Hiransa, &c., Placing of Lights, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1403 (i).
Glace Bay Range Lightkeeper, Applicants, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5636 (iii).
Gorman, L. F., Remuneration *re* Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 6982 (iv).
Government Steamers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6670 (iv).
Hoffman, Mr., Emplymt. by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 4696 (iii).
Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).
Ice-Breaker for Northumberland Straits: in Com. of Sup., 3437 (ii), 6673 (iv).
———Contract with Messrs Vickers, Sons & Maxim: M. for Cor.* (Mr. J. A. Currie) 3056 (ii).
——— Name of Contractor, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 674 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

Ice-Breaking Steamers, Superannuation of Officers and Crews: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. Warburton) 1469 (i).

Life-Saving Rewards, Boats, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6675 (iv).

Lighthouse Agencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).

Lighthouse Board, Re-organization of: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1974 (i).

Lighthouse Buoy Steamer, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6910 (iv).

Lighthouses, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6904 (iv).

Lighthouse Keepers, Lake Huron, Increases to: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 336 (i).

Lighthouses, Maintenance, Repairs, Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6902 (iv).

Lightkeepers Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6889, 6981 (iv).

McDonald, Lachlin, Resignation as Lightkeeper for East Point, P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3194 (ii).

McPhaiden, Capt. D., Resignation as Shipping Master, Application *re* Portion: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1973 (i).

Marconi Stations, Construction, Maintenance, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 177 (i).

Marconi Stations between Montreal and Quebec, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ecrément) 2762 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Book-Keeping, Result of Change: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1919 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 3702 (ii).

—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 738 (i).

—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 380 (i).

Marine Dept., Halifax County, Number of Employes: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 667 (i).

—— Incorrect Answer: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 875 (i).

—— Answer (Mr. Brodeur) 1080 (i).

Marine Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iv).

—— Care of Sick Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 3438 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Inquiry for Evidence: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 402, 549 (i).

—— Inquiry for Evidence (Mr. Monk) 662 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 632 (i).

—— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

Marine Investigation, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 14 (i).

Marine Investigation by Judge Cassels, Legal Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 167 (i).

—— Prosecutions *re* Judge Cassels Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 152 (i)

Marine and other Supplies, Deptl. Payments to Companies *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ralph Smith) 2322 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchase of, Names of Individuals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3044, 3472 (ii).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2597 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchase by Tender, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2818 (ii).

—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brodeur) 4041 (iii).

—— System of Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1974 (i).

'Minto' and 'Stanley' Strs., Officers off Duty from 12th to 17th Feb., 1909: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1975 (i).

'Montcalm' Icebreaker, Number of Crew, Daily Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 167 (i).

—— Res. of Chamber of Commerce, Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 328 (i).

—— Total Cost of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).

Montreal Harbour Dues, Increase of, Interest due Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1416 (i).

Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 6670 (iv).

Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iv).

Pilotage Rates, Scale of Charges for B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3476 (ii).

Pilots, Pension to F. X. Lamarre: in Com. of Sup., 3137 (ii).

Plaster Mines Lighthouse, Dismissal of Hector McRae, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6784 (iv).

Police Patrol Boats in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 6682 (iv).

Robertson, Thos., Suspension by Pilotage Board, B.C.: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) on M. for Sup., 6855 (iv).

St. John Lighthouse, Purchase of Land, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6915 (iv).

St. Joseph's Hospital, Victoria, B.C., Arrangements for Sick Mariners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3197 (ii).

St. Lawrence Ship Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6877 (iv).

St. Lawrence Channel, Expenditure *re* Dredging, Continuation of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 2150 (ii)

MARINE—*Con.*

Sault Ste. Marie Channels, Contracts *re* Buoys, Competition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3482 (ii).

'Stanley' and 'Minto' Strs., Names and Residences of Officers: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 674 (i).

Supplies for Marine and Public Works Depts., Purchase by Tender, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 141 (i).

Tadousac and Rivière du Loup Winter Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 344 (i).

Telephone Stations between Montreal and Quebec *re* Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement 2594 (ii).

Thunder Bay, Ice Breaking Steamer: in Com. of Sup., 6915 (iv).

West Coast Trail on Vancouver Island: in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iv).

Wrecks, Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 6679 (iv).

Wrecking Plant Subsidy, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).

Maritime Dredging Co., Tenders *re* St. John Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Daniels) 6787 (iv).

Market Garden Produce, Total Imports from 1901-8, Duty collected: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5096 (iii).

Markham Post Office, Total Cost *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 6406 (iv).

Markham Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1386 (i).

Martel, Hormidas, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3990 (ii).

Mayes Affidavit *re* Mr. Pugsley, Original Document, &c., Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 4253; Affidavit (read) 4300; (amt.) 4311 (iii).

Debate:—Order, Ques. of (Mr. Speaker) 4254; (Mr. Pugsley) on Ques. of Order, 4255; (Mr. Foster) on Ques. of Order, 4260; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Ques. of Order, 4262; (Mr. Hughes) on Ques. of Order, 4263; (Mr. Lennox) on Ques. of Order, 4263; (Mr. Conmee) Ques. of Order, 4268; (Mr. Northrup) on Ques. of Order, 4269; (Mr. Devlin) on Ques. of Order, 4272; (Mr. Sproule) 4273; (Mr. Crocket) 4273; (Mr. R. F. Sutherland) on Ques. of Order, 4276; (Mr. Lancaster) on Ques. of Order, 4277; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt., 4281; (Mr. J. Haggart) on Ques. of Order, 4283; (Mr. Pugsley) 4313; (Mr. Daniel) Ques. of Order, 4319; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4297, 4324; (Mr. Crocket) on Amt., 4347; (Mr. Carvell) 4359; (Mr. Northrup) 4369; (Mr. M. Clark) 4381; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4386; (Mr. Foster) 4390; (Mr. Fielding) 4400; Amt. neg. (Y. 60; N. 100) 4409 (iii).

——— on Ques of Order *re* Reading Original Document, 4297; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4297; Ques. of Order (Mr. Daniel) 4313; Amt. neg. (Y. 60; N. 100) 4409 (iii).

Mayes Dredging Contract at St. John Harbour, Condition, Recovery of Amount of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1174 (i).

Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3313 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) in Com. of Sup., 2983 (ii).

Meagher, Mathias, Apptmt. to Customs Staff at Debec, N.B., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3655 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act, Application *re* Exemptions, Instructions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 156 (i).

Medical Association: *See* 'B. No. 134.'

Members Indemnity *re* Absences: in Com. of Sup., 7065 (iv).

Members introduced, 1234, 1813 (i).

Mess. from Senate, *re* Assent to Bills (Mr. Speaker) 4119 (iii).

——— Estimates, 1909-10: Read (Mr. Speaker) 327 (i).

——— Suppl. Estimates: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2597 (ii).

——— Suppl. Estimates, 1910: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7065 (iv).

Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 6915 (iv).

Meteorological Stations in Ont. erected in 1908: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 3195 (ii).

Meteorological Station at Port Hope, Situation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 3985 (ii).

Methylated Spirits, Excise: in Com. of Sup., 448 (i).

Metric System: in Com. of Sup., 454 (i).

Mexican Land and Irrigration Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'

Mexico Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 168.'

Mexican Transportation Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 168.'

Michipicoten Wharf Expenditures, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 338 (i).

Middle River Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).

Mileage of Ry. Construction from 1888 to 1908. Authorized by Charters: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1076 (i).

MILITIA:

Algoma Rifles, 97th Reg., Removal from Sault Ste. Marie to Sudbury: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1411 (i).

Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 2311, 3422 (i).

——— Completion of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 682 (i).

——— Discontinuance of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 343 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Armouries built since 1896 Number, Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 157 (i).

——— Incomplete Ret., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2128 (ii).

Armouries Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1596 (i).

Armouries supplied by Officers, Policy of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 824 (i).

Arsenal, Quebec, Names of Bidders, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3050 (ii).

Belleville Drill Hall, Land Site, Officers' Quarters: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 673, 817 (i).

Belleville Drill Hall, Quarters for Officers of 40th Hasting Rifles: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1076 (i).

Bisley Team, Use of Ross Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5642 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 5644 (iii).

Camp in Eastern Townships, Selection of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 343 (i).

Camps of Instruction, Quebec, Date of, Regiments attending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5641 (iii).

Capital Account, Expenditure *re* since 1895: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 158 (i).

Eastern Townships Cavalry Brigade, Site of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5644 (iii).

Esquimalt Garrison: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 2298 (ii).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance, &c., by Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 349, 474 (i).

Esquimalt Permanent Corps, Inspection, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2764 (ii).

Gabriel, Capt., Payment *re* Recruiting for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 4893 (iii).

Garrison Common, Transfer of Property to Exhibition Ass'on, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 182 (i).

Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 2313 (ii).

Halifax Militia, Delay in Overdue Pay: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 2672, 2773 (ii).

Imperial General Staff, Prop. Organization, O.Cs., Cor.: M. for Copies (Mr. Talbot) 1420 (i).

Kingston Artillery Park, Gun shed: in Com. of Sup., 3223 (ii).

Kingston Batteries, Tenders *re* Groceries: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4225 (iii).

Kingston Land purchased, Name of Agent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 546 (i).

Kingston Military Buildings: M. for Original Tenders (Mr. Edwards) 1922 (i).

Kingston R.M.C. Buildings, Excessive Expenditures: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 2495 (ii).

——— Correction of Figures (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 2539 (ii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Kingston R.M.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3423 (ii).

——— Commandant: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 6660 (iv).

——— Water Supply, Defects, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 682 (i).

Lee-Enfield Rifle, Issue of New Barrels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 6088 (iv).

Militia, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 2307 (ii).

Militia Estimates: Annual Statement (Sir Frederick Borden) 2244 (ii).

Militia Expenditures, Details of Estimate Items: Ques. (Mr. Middleboro) 4634 (iii).

Militia and Defence, Expenditure *re* Capital Account since 1895: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 158 (i).

Militia Expenditures by Public Works Dept. from 1896 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2379 (ii)

Militia Salary of Priv. Sec.: Conc., 4049 (iii).

Militia Supplies, Contracts, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).

Military Properties: in Com. of Sup., 2314 (ii).

Miniature Rifles, Supplies, &c., Extending to Colleges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 681

Mulloy, Pte., Pension *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 2313 (ii).

Ordnance and Arms: in Com. of Sup., 2307 (ii)

Permanent Force: in Com. of Sup., 3422 (ii).

——— Winter Equipment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2376 (ii).

Petewawa Camp, Number of Permanent Force, Date of Opening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 5639 (iii).

Properties: in Com. of Sup., 2314 (ii).

Quebec Citadel, Refurnishing, &c., for Tercentenary: in Com. of Sup., 3211 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Amount subscribed, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1721 (i).

Richmond Rifle Range, Protection *re* Target Shooting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1722 (i).

Rifles, Swiss and Foreign Regulations *re* Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr Worthington) 2381 (i).

Ross Rifle, Authority *re* Adoption by Can. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1072 (i).

——— Bayonet Contracts, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 344 (i).

——— Bisley Competitions, Description of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 343 (i).

——— Claims for Damages *re* Accidents, &c.: Remarks *re* former Answer (Sir Frederick Borden) 548 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Ross Rifle Factory, Bayonets, Installments of Machinery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 670 (i).
—— Number of Employees, Inspection *re* Standards: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1411 (i).
Ross Rifles, Mark I., and Mark II, used by Canada at Bisley, Description, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 684 (i).
—— Number accepted and rejected by Militia Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 245, 329, (i).
—— Reps. *re* Merits and Demerits, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 1189 (i).
—— Rep. of Small Arms Com., Date of last Contract: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 471 (i).
—— Weight, Length, Diameter, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4891 (iii).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, Contract *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2767 (ii).
St. Johns Military Buildings, Lease, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 672 (i).
Sherbrooke New Regiment, Construction, Appropriations *re* Band: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5643 (iii).
Snider Rifles, Disposition of Old Ones: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2381 (ii).
Supplies, Contracts, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).
Thirty-Sixth Regiment, Payments for Storage of Arms: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 4894 (iii).
—— Band, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 4892 (iii).
Transport: in Com. of Sup., 3423 (ii).
Truro Armoury, Apptmt. of Caretaker, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 186 (i).
University Drill Corps, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 683 (i).
Warlike Stores: in Com. of Sup., 2317 (ii).
Woodstock Armoury, Bowling Alley Operations: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5157 (iii).
Milk River, Mackie Lease, Particulars re: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 6405 (iv).
See 'Waterways,' &c.
Miller, Mr. N. B., Immigration Agent, Fraudulent Returns: Cor. read (Mr. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).
Mill's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).
Minasville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).
Minerals, Investigations *re* Tests: in Com. of Sup., 7062 (iv).
Mines, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3673 (ii).
Mines and Minerals, 3rd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Congdon) to conc., 6919 (iv).
Mine Owners and Miners, Percentage of British Origin: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4121 (iii).
Miner, Bill, Escape from B. C. Penitentiary: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 925 (i).
—— Admission of Detectives, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 1182 (i).
—— Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1192 (i).
—— Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7035 (iv).
—— Letter *re* Visit of Mr. A. D. McIntyre: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2595 (ii).
—— Moneys received in Penitentiary previous to escape: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 4898 (iii).
—— Remarks on M. for Sup., 1813 (i).
Miniature Rifles, Supplies, &c., Extending to Colleges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 681 (i).
Minister of Inland Revenue, Information *re* Election: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13 (i).
'Minto' and 'Stanley' Strs., Officers off Duty on 12th to 17th Feb., 1909: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1975 (i).
Mint, Royal, O.C. *re* Fence: Read (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 1356 (i).
Mission River Piers, Advertisement for Tenders: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6919 (iv).
Mistook Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2557 (ii).
Monarch Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'
Moncton Cut-off Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).
Moncton Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Moncton Wharf, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1627 (i).
Montague Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Land Claims: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (ii).
Montcalm Electoral District, Votes polled, spoiled Ballots, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 2597 (ii).
'Montcalm' Ice-breaker, Number of Crew, Daily Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 167 (i).
—— Name of Engineer *re* Investigations: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 548 (i).
—— Res. of Chamber of Commerce, Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 328 (i).
—— Total Cost of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 180.'
Montreal Eastern Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1303 (i).
Montreal Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 3211 (ii).
Montreal as a Free Port, Recommendation of Royal Commission: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4802 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners: *See* 'B. No. 154.'

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Dismissal of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 874 (i).
—— Interest, Loans, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 1734 (i).
—— Promise *re* Wharfage Dues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 874 (i).
Montreal Harbour Dues, Increase of, Interest due Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1416 (i).
Montreal Harbour Improvements, Claims of W. J. Poupore: in Com. of Sup., 3361 (ii).
Montreal Municipal Rights: Par. in 'La Presse' (Mr. Rivet) 1648 (i).
Montreal River, Improvements at Latchford: in Com. of Sup., 2975 (ii).
Montreal Terminal Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Montreal Woollen Mills, Closing *re* Tariff Laws: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2591 (ii).
Monuments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).
Moore, Isaac, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Moravian Church in Canada: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5159 (iii).
Mossy River Dredging, Expenditure of Appropriation, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 816 (i).
Motor Vehicles Accidents: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Mount Pleasant Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 3423 (ii).
Muir Memorial Fund, Request for Govt. Aid: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5095 (iii).
Mulloy, Pension *re*, Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 2313 (ii).
Museum, Victoria Memorial: in Com. of Sup., 1275 (i).
Nails, Quantity imported, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 2156 (ii).
Nanaimo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3224 (ii).
Napanee River Dredging, Surveys, Cost, &c.: (Mr. U. Wilson) 333 (i).
Nappan Experimental Farm, Names of Employees, Rate of Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5640 (iii).
National Accident and Guarantee Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
National Art Gallery, Expenditures *re* Pictures: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6087 (iv).
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
N. T. Ry., Employees, &c., Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4801 (iii), 6919 (iv).
—— Eastern Div., Tenders *re* Construction: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 4990 (iii).
—— Loans *re* Construction, Eastern Div., Rates of Interest: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 679 (i).
—— Surveys, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6985 (iv).
See 'G.T.P.,' 'Transcontinental.'
Nation River Drainage, Cor., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Broder) 686 (i).
Nation River Drainage, Rep. of Engineer *re*: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 1178 (i).
Naturalization Act: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Naturalization Act Amt. Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 971 (i).
Natural Resources of Canada, Conservation of, Apptmt. of Sel. Com.: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 355 (i).
Natural Resources Com., on Order for rsmd. debate: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 688 (i).
—— Special Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1556 (i).
Natural Resources, Lands, &c., Details of Money received, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 685 (i).
Natural Resources: *See* 'Conservation of,' &c.
Naufrage Pond: in Com. of Sup., 2508, 2512 (ii).
—— Protection Works: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) in Com. of Sup., 2461 (ii).
Naval Defence of Canada: Notice of Motion (Mr. Foster) 3203 (ii).
—— Aid to G. B.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 3484 (ii).
See 'Imperial,' &c.
Naval Defence of Sea Coast, Interpretation of Res. in House: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4289 (iii).
Naval Militia and Training Cruiser: in Com. of Sup., 6683 (iv).
Navigable Waters Protection Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 150 and 152.'
Navy of Canada or G. B., Contributions to: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Worthington) 1191 (i).
Net Debt of Canada, Present Amount, Increase of,: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 147 (i).
N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners Rep. and Hon. Mr. Pugsley: Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., 5645; Neg. (Y. 63; N. 90) 5830 (iii).
—— Question of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5646; Questions of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 5658, 5680; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5659, 5690; (Mr. Crocket) 5756, 5777; (Mr. Turgeon) 5825 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 6058 (iv).
N. B. Central Commission, &c., Vote *re*: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Blain) 6409 (iv).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Calvert) 6412 (iv).
N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, O. Cs., &c. M. (Mr. Foster) to lay on Table, 5624 (iii).
—— Rep., Printing: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4236 (iii).
—— Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4296 (iii).
N. B. Supreme Court Vacancies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 6686 (iv).
Newcastle Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Thornton) in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

New Glasgow Public Building Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 1290 (i).
New Liskeard Wharf, Construction *re*· Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 2553 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, Holland River, Amt. (Mr. Wallace) to Com. of Sup., 3112; Neg. (Y. 71; N. 112) 3176 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, to Lake Wilcox, Construction, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5157 (iii).
See 'Holland.'
New Westminster Dry Dock, Application for Govt. Aid: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3048 (ii).
New Westminster Penitentiary, Warden from 1876 to 1888, Escapes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2769 (ii).
New Westminster Post Office, Free Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i).
New York Lubricant Co., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 188 (i).
Niagara-Welland Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Niagara Ice Jam, Assistance of Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 4703 (iii).
Niagara River Falls, Amount of Overflow : Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 1074 (i).
Nickel Ore, Export Duty *re* : Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 5634 (iii).
Nicolet Harbour, Repairs to Jetty : in Com. of Sup., 3246 (ii).
Nipigon River Dredging, Appropriation voted in 1908, Payments *re* : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3653 (ii), 4223 (iii).
—— Estimated Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5635 (iii).
Nipissing Indian Reserve, Open for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 684 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Payments to since Cancellation of Contract, &c: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1071 (i).
North Bay Post Office, Inspector, Apptmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1558 (i).
North Head, Grand Manan Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).
North Saskatchewan River Surveys, Average Cost per Mile: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 870 (i).
'Northumberland Dredge,' Men on Voters' Lists: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) 2403 (ii).
—— Number of Crew, Names, Emplymt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2815 (ii).
Northwest Fish Company's Leases, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6776 (iv).
N.W. Mounted Police Force, Compensations : in Com. of Sup., 3064 (ii).
—— Land Scrip, Refusal of Grants: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1066 (i).
N.W.M.P., Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3656 (ii).
—— Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 3659 (ii).
N.W. Rebellion, 1885, Grants to N.W.M.P., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 184 (i).
N.W. Ter. Govt. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1171 (i).
N.S. Weekly Mail Service, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1731 (i).
Oaths of Office. *See* 'B. No. 1.'
Oats: *See* 'English,' 'Seed.'
Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, Removal &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6679 (iv).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 6670 (iv).
Oil Gas, &c., Borings, Details of Expenditure of $35,000, Cor., &c.: M .for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 684 (i).
Okanagan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6544 (iv).
Old Age Annuities, Number of Employees, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 141 (i).
Old Age Pensions: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Old Man River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).
Olin, Chas., Total Payments *re* Visits to Sweden : Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 871 (i).
—— M. for Copy* (Mr. Goodeve) 881 (i).
Ontario Act, Disallowance of, O.C., *re* : (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4882 (iii).
Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Ontario and Man. Boundaries, Decision *re* Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1074 (i).
Ontario and Michigan Power Co. *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Ontario and Michigan Power Co.'s Bill: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sproule) 1115 (i).
Opening of Parliament., Mess from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7 (i).
Opium Conference, Mr. King's Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 3433 (ii).
'Opportunities in Canada,' Names of Publisher: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 2158 (ii).
—— Number of Copies distributed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 676 (i).
Ordnance and Arms: in Com. of Sup., 2307 (ii).
Oriental Immigration into B.C., Res. *re* Royal Com.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1242 (i).
—— Inaccurate Answer: Remarks (Mr. J D. Taylor) 1248 (i).
—— Corrected Answer (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1976 (i).
See 'Asiatic.'

Orientals in B.C. on Jan. 1, 1909, Number naturalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1920 (i)..
Oromocto Wharf, Total Cost, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2319 (ii).
Oshawa Collector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1972 (i), 2372, 3046 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 2672 (ii).
Oshawa Harbour, Negotiations *re* Acquisition by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1918 (i), 2372 (ii).
Otonabee River Dredging, Amounts paid, Quantity done, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 3044 (ii), 4221 (iii).
Otonabee River Floods, Payments to Property Owners *re* Damages: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sexsmith) 1190 (i).
Ottawa Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 617, 1389, 1494 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Electric Lighting: in Com. of Sup., 1600 (i).
——— Elevators: in Com. of Sup., 1599 (i).
——— Grounds, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3225 (ii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1601 (i).
——— Heating, Salaries to Engineers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3226 (ii).
——— Lavatories, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1392 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, leased by Govt., Rentals, Superficial Area, Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1556 (i).
Ottawa Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Ottawa Buildings, Museum: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3215 (ii).
——— New Deptl. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1250 (i).
——— Staff Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3225 (ii).
——— Steel Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1391 (i).
——— Taxes paid by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 1609 (i).
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 1605 (i).
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 49.'
Ottawa Public Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 1600 (i).
Ottawa Service Corps, Complaints *re* Padding Pay Lists, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6784 (iv).
Owen Sound Harbour Dredging and Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 3315 (ii).
Owen Sound Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).
Owen Sound Post Office, Original and Present Cost, Change of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 247 (i).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iv).
Panmure Island Wharf, Purchase of Right-of-Way, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6403 (iv).
Park Reservations: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
Parliamentary Guide: in Com. of Sup., 7064 (iv).
Parliament Hill Grounds, Condition of: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6473 (iv).
Parsons, Frank, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
Passenger Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 2.'
Passover Bread, Higher Rate of Duty, Request *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3886 (ii).
Patent Bills: *See* Bills Nos. 71, 77, 92, 93, 123, 132 and 169.
Patent Medicines Act, Apptmt. of Analysts, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Seguin) 3476 (ii).
Patent Medicines: in Com. of Sup., 458 (i).
'Patent Record,' in Com. of Sup., 696 (i), 3186 (ii).
Patriotic Fund: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Patronage List, Abolition of, Com. to Judge Cassels: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 876 (i).
Patterson, Mildred Gwendolyn Platt, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Payne, J. Lambert, Duties, Salary, Hours of Work, &c.: (Mr. McKenzie) 1726 (i).
Peat Fuel Testing Building: in Com. of Sup., 1389 (i).
——— Memorandum of Dr. Haanel: Read in Com. of Sup., 1494 (i).
Peigan Indian Agency, Surrender of Land: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
Pembroke Ry. Crossing, Cost of Protection by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2159 (ii).
Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 884 (i), 7035 (iv).
——— Generally, Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 887 (i).
Penitentiaries and Prison Labour: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 903 (i).
Pensions: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Pensions, Mrs. Wilmot, N.W.M.P.: in Com. of Sup., 883 (i).
Pensions, N.W. Rebellion: in Com. of Sup., 812 (i).
Peswick Wharf: in Com .of Sup., 2474 (ii).
Peterborough West, Expenditure *re* Public Works for twenty Years: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4636 (iii).
Petewawa Camp, Number of Permanent Force, Date of Opening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 5639 (iii).
Petewawa Dock: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 3307 (ii).
Pictou County Fishery Overseers, Prosecutions in Salmon illegal Fishing: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5632 (iii).
Pictou and Magdalen Island Mail Services, Contract, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser)

Pictou Public Buildings, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1291 (i).
Piers on Lake St. Peter, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6887 (iv).
Pilots, Pension to F. X. Lamarre: in Com. of Sup., 3437 (ii).
Pilotage Rates, Scale of Charges for B. C.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3476 (ii).
Pincher Creek Post Office, Complaints re Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).
Pink Rock Wharf, Shepody Bay: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).
Plank, Mr. M. W., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3252 (ii).
Plaster Mines Lighthouse, Dismissal of Hector McRae, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6784 (iv).
Pneumatic Tubes, Montreal, Quantity and Value of Purchase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1068 (i).
Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract Price, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 818 (i).
—— Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1557 (i).
Pointe du Chene Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).
Pointe Tupper Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).
Police Patrol Boats in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 6682 (iv).
Political Partizanship: *See* 'Govt. Employees.'
Political Weekly Letter, Franking and Distribution by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1922 (i).
Polling Booths in Ont., Payments for Rents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 3251 (ii).
Pope Post Office, Pet. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 1713 (i).
Pork, Bacon, &c., from U.S., Entries at Kingston, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1176 (i).
Portage la Prairie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3001, 3332 (ii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2091 (ii).
Port Arthur Harbour and Mission River Dredging, Contractors, Inspectors, &c. Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5775 (iii).
Port Bruce Harbour, Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 818 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 3331 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevators, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
Port Credit Customs Revenue, Superannuation of Collector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3049 (ii).
Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 3329 (ii).
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).
Port Hood Breakwater, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4892 (iii).
Port Hood Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).
Port Stanley Groynes: in Com. of Sup., 2977 (ii).
Port Stanley Pier, Delay in Paying Labourers Wages: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) 4047 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 342 (i).
Portuguese Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2479, 3234 (ii).
Postal Law Violations, Number of Prosecutions, Penalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1924 (i).
Post Office Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 19 and 136.'
POST OFFICE :
Black Lake Postmaster, Complaints, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4896 (iii).
Brophy's Post Office, Name of Postmaster, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 1186 (i).
Burks Falls and Trout Creek Mail Routes, Contractor, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 3196 (ii).
Campbellford and Brighton Mail Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 3479 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Owen) 3655 (ii).
Cariboo Mail Service, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 1731 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 3424 (ii).
Central Park, B.C., Mail Delivery, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 2590 (ii).
Country Postmasters' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).
Dorland and U. E. Loyalist Mail Route, Mail Carrier, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 334 (i).
East Elgin Postmasters Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 3429 (ii).
Envelopes, Complaints *re* Mutilation through Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 349 (i).
Etobicoke Postmaster, Apptmt. of Salary, &c. Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 671 (i).
Franking Privilege *re* Campaign Literature, Names of Ministers, &c.: Ques. (Mr Foster) 2585 (ii).
—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1653 (i).
Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Names, Mail Routes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2585 (ii).
Gaspé-Perce Mail Contract, Expiration of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2596 (ii).
Glace Bay Mails, Contract for collecting: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5775 (iii).
Glace Bay Post Office, Inspector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 5635 (iii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Gowganda Mail Facilities: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1395 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 1703 (i).

Graham Post Office, Pet. *re*: Remarks (Mr G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 1713 (i).

Greenfield, P.E.I., Post Office, Removal of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 5776 (iii).

Hand Hills, Alberta Post Office, Applications, Reps., &c., *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Magrath) 2162 (ii).

Hazel Ridge Post Office, Application *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Lachute Mills Post Office, Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Perley) 158 (i).

Letter Carriers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1653, 1697 (i).

—— Salaries at St. Thomas: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in Com. of Sup., 3428 (ii).

—— System in Cities, Regulations *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5158 (iii).

Lévis Postmastership, Apptmt. of Successor to Mr. A. Lafancois: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4636 (iii).

Londonderry Station to Great Village Mail Contract, Name, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 824 (i).

Lorne Valley, P.E.I., Tenders *re* Mail Contract: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 5776 (iii).

Mackey's Station Post Office, Complaints *re* Management: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 545 (i).

Macleod Post Office, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).

McKenzie, Mr. D., Resignation as Postmaster of Three Brooks, Apptmt. of a Successor: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 4640 (iii).

Mail Boxes purchased and entered into Canada free of Duty: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 517 (i).

Mail Carriers, Post Office Payments in Newmarket and Aurora to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 1560 (i).

Mail Contracts, Fair Wage Clause: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3430 (ii).

Mail Contracts, Renewals in April, 1909, without Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 477 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 685 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 4801 (iii).

Mail delivered in Towns, &c., Rural Free Mail Delivery, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 157 (i).

Mail Service from Hyde Park Post Office, &c., Middlesex County: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 3251 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Mail and Stage Routes, Total Number of Miles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 481, 813 (i).

Makaroff Postmaster's Salary: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).

Malagash, N.S., Mail Contract, Expiry of, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5639 (iii).

Manitoba Post Office, Transfers since Nov. 1908, Names of former Postmasters, Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1414 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche) 1922 (i).

Montreal Eastern Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1303 (i).

Mount Pleasant Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 3423 (ii).

New Westminster Post Office, Free Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i).

North Bay Post Office Inspector, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1558 (i).

N. S. Weekly Mail Service, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1731 (i).

Owen Sound Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

Pictou and Magdalen Island Mail Services, Contract, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3047 (ii).

Pincher Creek Post Office, Complaints *re* Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).

Political Weekly Letter, Franking and Distribution by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1922 (i).

Pope Post Office, Pet., *re*: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 1713 (i).

Postal Law Violations, Number of Prosecutions, Penalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1924 (i).

Postmaster General's Rep.: Presented (Mr. Lemieux) 12 (i).

Postmasters' Salaries in East Elgin: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 3429 (ii).

Post Office Apptmts., Incorrect Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1023 (i).

Post Office Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 725 (i).

Post Office Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 613, 720 (i).

Post Office Deposits and Interest Credits in Pass Books: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4896 (iii).

See 'Savings'

Post Office Inspectors, Travelling Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3431 (ii).

Post Office Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).

Post Office Miscellaneous Items: in Com. of Sup., 1716 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Post Office Orders and Postal Notes, Total Number issued, Payable in G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1242 (i).

Post Offices in Peel County, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3046 (ii).

Post Office Revenue at Kingston, Brantford, Sherbrooke and Quebec, Salaries of Postmasters, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5633 (iii).

Quebec Post Office, Elevators, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).

Queens and Sunbury Mail Service, Established in Oct., 1908: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2375 (ii).

Railway Mail Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 1699 (i), 3432 (ii).

——— Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 336 (i).

——— Increase of Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4223 (iii).

Railway Mail Clerks, Furois, Dorais and Wathen, Dates of Examination for Promotions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3253 (ii).

Railway Mail Clerks, Number killed or Injured in past two years: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3476 (ii).

Roblin and Forest Mills Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 333 (i).

Rural Mail : in Com. of Sup., 1714 (i), 3423 (ii).

Rural Mail Delivery : on M. for Sup. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).

——— East Northumberland, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 3480 (ii).

——— Establishment of in Grey County : Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 671 (i).

——— Location of Routes, Non-Delivery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 347 (i).

——— Number of Routes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6408 (iv).

——— Prince Edward County, Establishment of : Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1077 (i).

——— Purchase of Boxes, Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 179 (i).

——— System, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 148 (i).

——— Total Expenditure on Routes : Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 179 (i).

Rural Mail Boxes, Number delivered in Dufferin County: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 341 (i).

St. John Postmaster, Superannuation of, Apptmt. of Successor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 871 (i).

St. Justine Mail Delivery, Complaints *re* : Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3480 (ii).

Ste. Philomene Mail Contract, Annual Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2770 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

St. Polycarpe Post Office, Complaints *re* Officials, Change of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 4894 (iii).

Savings Banks Deposits, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1067 (i), 4897.

Sillsville and the Pines Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 333 (i).

Somerville, Thos., Payments to by P.O. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 1559 (i).

Souris Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. J. Dolmage, Investigation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1915 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) on M. for Sup., 6847 (iv).

Sydney Free Mail Delivery : Remarks (Mr. Maddin) in Com. of Sup., 1706 (i).

Tercentenary Postage Stamps, Total Amount *re* Sale : Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3654 (ii).

Thedford, Arkona and Fort Frank Rural Mail Delivery, Delays in Establishing : Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 476 (i).

Victoria Post Office. Pet. from Letter Carriers: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 1712 (i).

Wingham Post Office Clock, Completion of : Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4637 (iii).

Winnipeg P.O. and Ry. Station Mail Contract, Tenders, Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 869 (i).

Potatoes sold in Bags, Statute *re* Measurements: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).

Prairie Fires, Govt. Relief : Remarks (Mr. Knowles) 6411 (iv).

Prairie Provinces Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 163.'

Preston, W. T. R., Complaints from Japan *re* Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. German) 480 (i).

——— Emplymt. by Govt., Transfer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3391 (ii).

——— Protest from Japan *re* Statements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Reid) 186 (i).

——— Transfer to Holland: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5999, 6656 (iv).

Preventive Service, Customs : in Com. of Sup., 611 (i).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Rv. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'

Prince Albert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1555 (i).

P.E.I., Cape Breton and Newfoundland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).

P.E.I. Winter Communication with Mainland, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Warburton) 6448 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch: in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii).

See 'Railways.'

Prince Rupert, B.C. and Jedway, Queen Charlotte Island SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6652 (iv).
Prince Rupert Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 2081 (ii).
Printing and Stationery, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 804 (i).
Prisoners paroled or pardoned, Cost of Ret., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 673 (i).
Private Bills, Apptmt. of Com. to revise Rules: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5351 (iii).
——— Extension of Hour for considering: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5774 (iii).
——— Payment of Fees, 14th Rep. of Com. M. (Mr. Guthrie) 4986 (iii).
Private Bills, Refund of Fees: M. (Mr. Ethier) to conc., in 8th Rep. of Com., 5889, 5997 (iv).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to amend Rules of Hse *re*, 6120 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Bribing Deptl. Offiials, &c. (Mr. Campbell) 6777 (iv).
Privilege, Ques, of (Mr. Conmee) *re* 'Special Trains,' &c., 4290 (iii).
——— Order, Ques. of (Mr. Foster) 4291 (iii). *See* 'Question,' &c.
Proportional Representation in House of Commons: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 2598; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) 2624; Agreed to, 2625 (ii).
Prorogation: Mess. from His. Ex., 7086 (iv).
Protection of Coast Line and Seaports, &c.: Notice of Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 482 (i). *See* 'Naval.'
Provincial Rights: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Prudential Life Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Prudential Trust Co. Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Public Accounts Com., Calling of Meetings: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 663, 1188 (i).
——— M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Public Accounts, &c., to Com. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1479 (i)
Public Accounts Com., 12th and 14th Reps.: M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to conc., 6559 (iv).
Public Health Bureau, Establishment of by Govt.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1081 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 464 (i).
Public Works, Hours of Labour: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Public Works, Hours of Labour B. 35 (Mr. Verville): M. to dsch. from Order Paper, 4990 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS:
Amherst Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1282 (i).
Annapolis Ice Piers, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2338 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Anse a la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2512 (ii).
Anse à l'Ilot: in Com. of Sup., 2513 (ii).
Arisaig Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3233 (ii).
Assiniboine River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3332 (ii).
——— Cost per yard for Sept. and Oct.: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 1239 (i).
Avonport Piers Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2453 (ii).
Baddeck Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2453 (ii).
Bailey's Brook Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
Batiscan Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 3274 (ii).
Bay St. Lawrence Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2455 (ii).
Beaver Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1622 (i).
Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1356 (i).
Big Bras d'Or Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2455 (ii).
Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2966 (ii).
Blind River Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii).
Blue Rocks Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2455 (ii).
Boat Harbour, Pictou Co., N.S., Total Expenditure, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2318 (ii).
Boat Harbour, Skinner's Cove, Yearly Expenditure, Completion, &c.: (Mr. Maddin) 2817 (ii).
Bonaventure Public Works, Amount expended prior to 1900, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 173, 353 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Lennox) for Ret. 1320 (i).
Bonaventure River, Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2559, 3277 (ii).
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup. 2453 (ii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1283 (i).
Brule Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup. 2460 (ii).
Buctouche Channel: in Com. of Sup., 1623 (i).
Burlington Channel Piers Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2966 (ii).
Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).
Cape Bald Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Cape Tormentine Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2522 (ii).

Cariboo Breakwater or Causeway, Yearly Expenditure, &c.: (Mr. Crosby) 2152 (ii).

Charlottetown Post Office, Sidewalk Construction, Tenders, *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4228 (ii).

Chesley Post Office, Amount of Vote *re*: Ques. (Mr. Donnelly) 543 (i).

Cheverie Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2456 (ii).

Chicoutimi Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2523 (ii).

Chicoutimi Pier, Contract of T. Desbiens, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 2161 (ii).

Chicoutimi Wharf, Expropriation of Land, Prices paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4222 (iii).

Chilliwack Post Office Site, Plans, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1414 (i).

Chilliwack Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 2090 (ii).

Church Point Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).

Clarke City, Seven Islands Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2526, 2540, 2887 (ii).

Clark's Harbour Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 2462 (ii).

Cobourg Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2967 (ii).

Cobourg Harbour, Expenditure for 1908, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 3988 (ii).

Collingwood Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 3294 (ii).

——— Payments to Mr. Battle: in Com. of Sup., 3294 (ii).

Cookshire Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1293 (i).

Cornwall Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i).

Courtenay Bay Dredging Contracts: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Cow Bay, Port Morien Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2463 (ii).

Cow Bay Run and Osborne: in Com. of Sup., 2473 (ii).

Cribbin's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2473 (ii).

Cummings Cove, Deer Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1543 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2473 (ii).

Disraeli Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2350 (ii).

Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 3237 (ii).

Doucet's Landing, Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2543 (ii).

Douglastown Pier Addition: in Com. of Sup., 2516 (ii).

Dover Wharfs on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

Dredge, Govt.-owned, employed in N. S. under Contracts, Arangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2320 (ii).

Dredges owned by Govt., Number, Construction, Price, &c.: M. (Mr. German) for Ret.*, 2596 (ii).

Dredges purchased by Public Works Dept., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 145 (i).

Dredging, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).

——— Mar. Provs., Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6553 (iv).

——— Mar. Provs., Plants, Contracts, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3339 (ii).

Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River: in Com. of Sup., 6885 (iv).

Dredging Vessels, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3338 (ii).

East Huron Public Works Expenditure during 20 years: Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 3477 (ii).

Eastville Subway Crossing: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).

Eatonville Wharf, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4638 (iii).

Economy Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 2460 (ii).

Father Point Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2548 (ii).

Fraser River, Flooding at Delta, Rep. of Mr. Coste, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2587 (ii).

Garthby Wharf, Lake Aylmer: in Com. of Sup., 2549 (ii).

Gaspe Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2550 (ii).

Georgetown Public Building, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1292 (i).

Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).

——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1287 (i).

Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1361, 1366 (i).

Goderich Harbour, Repairs to Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2968 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Graham's Pond, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 2507 (ii).
Grand Bend Dock, Approaches, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).
Grand Etang, Channel Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
Gravenhurst Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).
Greenwood and Grand Forks Post Office Sites, Options *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 814 (i).
Gretna Quarantine Building, Total Cost, Price of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. H. Sharpe) 824 (i).
Guysborough Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1288 (i).
Guysborough County Public Works, Expenditure of Votes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 819 (i).
Halifax, Customs House, Total Cost, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 815 (i).
—— Dom. Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1288 (i).
—— Post Office, Contract *re* Reconstruction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 814 (i).
Harbours and Rivers and Bridges, Generally, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 2985 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i), 2118, 2474 (ii).
—— Ont., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2968 (ii).
—— P.E.I., General Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2507 (ii).
—— Quebec, General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3243 (ii).
Harbours and River Works, Piers, &c., Govt. Procedure *re* Construction by Day Labour: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2513 (ii).
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).
Heron Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).
Honora Dock, Manitoulin, Construction, Dimensions, &c., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 6408 (iv).
House of Commons, New Wing, Payments to Deptl. Staff: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2149 (ii).
Icelander River Dredging, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 347 (i).
Indian Point Dredging, Tenders *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2763 (ii).
—— Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1397 (i).
Inverness Harbour, C.B., Improvement, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4637 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Jesus River Dredging, Amount of Expropriation, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1069 (i).
Joggins Mines Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1293 (i).
Kingston Royal Military College Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1507 (i).
—— M. in Conc. to reduce Vote (Mr. Pugsley) 4049 (iii).
—— Cottages, Estimated Cost, Specifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2319 (ii).
—— College Stables, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1732 (i).
—— Military Buildings: M. for Original Tenders (Mr. Edwards) 1922 (i).
Kingston Veterinary Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 1534 (i).
—— Tenders for Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2149 (ii).
Kouchibougouac Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).
Lac du Bonnet Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 2116 (ii).
Lachute Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1301 (i).
Lake Dauphin, Mossy River Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 2997 (ii).
Lakefield Wharf, Amount of Expenditure, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1063 (i).
Lake Nipissing Floods, Claims of Settlers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 817 (i).
Lake Nipissing, Improvement of Narrows to Monetville: in Com. of Sup., 3308 (ii).
Lake St. Francis (Beauce) Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 2554 (ii).
Lake St. John Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2556 (ii).
Lameque Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).
Lansdowne Drill Shed, Tenders, Contract *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 5630 (iii).
Laprairie Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1386 (i).
Leonardsville, Deer Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).
Lethbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1551 (i).
Lévis Harbour, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2094 (ii).
Lismore Wharf, Construction, Unpaid Accounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1079 (i).
Little Current, Improvement of Northern Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2973, 3302 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Little Current Dredging, Depth, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 7072 (iv).

Little Narrows Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).

Little River, Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).

—— Amount expended, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 476 (i).

Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com of Sup., 1626 (i).

McGregor's Creek Bank Protection: in Com of Sup., 2974 (ii).

Maganatawan River Improvements, Amount expended, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 476 (i).

Maritime Dredging Co., Tenders *re* St. John Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6787 (iv).

Markham Post Office, Total Cost *re*: Ques (Mr. Wallace) 6406 (iv).

Markham Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1386 (i).

Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3313 (ii).

Michipicoten Wharf, Expenditures, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 338 (i).

Middle River Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).

Mill's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1626 (i).

Minasville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).

Mission River Piers, Advertisement for Tenders: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6919 (iv).

Mistook Wharf Repairs: in Com of Sup., 2557 (ii).

Moncton Wharf, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1627 (i).

Montreal River, Improvements at Latchford: in Com. of Sup., 2975 (ii).

Mossy River Dredging, Expenditure of Appropriation, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 816 (i).

Nanaimo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3224 (ii).

Napanee River Dredging, Surveys, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 333 (i).

Naufrage Pond: in Com. of Sup., 2508, 2512 (ii).

—— Protection Works: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) in Com. of Sup., 2461 (ii).

New Glasgow Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1290 (i).

New Liskeard Wharf, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 2553 (ii).

Nicolet Harbour, Repairs to Jetty: in Com. of Sup., 3246 (ii).

Nipigon River Dredging, Expenditure for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3653 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Nipigon River Dredging, Estimated Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5635 (iii).

North Head, Grand Manan Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).

Okanagan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6544 (iv).

Oromocto Wharf, Total Cost, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2319 (ii).

Oshawa Harbour, Negotiations *re* Acquisition by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1918 (i), 2372 (ii).

Otonabee River Dredging, Name of Contractor, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr Bradbury) 3044 (ii).

—— Amounts paid, Quantity done, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 4221 (iii).

Owen Sound Harbour Dredging and Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 3315 (ii)

Owen Sound Post Office, Original and Present Cost, Change of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 247 (i).

Panmure Island Wharf, Purchase of Right-of-way, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6403 (iv).

Peswick Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2474 (ii).

Peterborough West, Expenditure *re* Public Works for twenty years: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4636 (iii).

Petewawa Dock: Remarks (Mr. Gerald White) in Com. of Sup., 3307 (ii).

Pictou Public Buildings, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1291 (i).

Piers on Lake St. Peter, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6887 (iv).

Pink Rock Wharf, Shepody Bay: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).

Pointe du Chene Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract Price, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 818 (i).

—— Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1557 (i).

Point Tupper Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).

Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2091 (ii).

Port Arthur Harbour and Mission River Dredging, Contractors, Inspectors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5775 (iii).

Port Bruce Harbour, Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 818 (i).

Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).

Port Hood Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4892 (iii).

Port Stanley Groynes: in Com. of Sup., 2977 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Port Stanley Pier, Delay in Paying Labourers Wages: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) 4047 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 342 (i).

Portuguese Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2479, 3234 (ii).

Prince Albert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1555 (i).

Public Works Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 613 (i), 3665 (ii).

——— Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 3672 (ii).

——— Deptl. Salaries, O. C. *re* Increases: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1074 (i).

——— Supplies, Notice to Agents *re* Purchases: Letter laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 3650 (ii).

——— Works by Marine Dept., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 2765 (ii).

Public Works, Expenditure *re* Byng Inlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 1178 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, Promises during Elections: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1357 (i).

Public Works Health Act: in Com. of Sup., 810 (i).

Public Works in Middlesex, Expenditure for twenty years: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4228 (iii).

Public Works in South Wellington, Expenditure for last 20 years: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3655 (ii).

Quaco Harbour Pier: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).

Quebec Harbour, Levis: in Com. of Sup., 2094 (ii).

Queens and Sunbury Wharfs, Construction, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2320 (ii).

Quesnel Telegraph Station Supplies, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 1919 (i).

Richard's Landing, St. Joseph's Island Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).

Richelieu River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2559 (ii).

——— Improvements Office: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1185 (i).

Richibucto Cape, Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).

Richibucto Harbour, Claims of John Jardine: in Com. of Sup., 3237 (ii).

Richibucto Harbour Breakwater: Conc., 4049 (iii).

Rimouski Wharf Sheathing West Side: in Com. of Sup., 2557 (ii).

Riviere du Loup Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Rivière du Moulin Pier, Pets., Reps. *re* Construction: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 2161 (ii).

Rondeau Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2979 (ii).

Royal Military College Cottages, Estimated total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1732 (i). *See* 'Kingston.'

St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).

St. Alphonse Wharf, Removal of Rocks: in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).

St. Andrew's Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i).

Ste. Anne des Monts, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2906, 3287 (ii).

St. Charles River, Estuary Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).

St. Francis du Lac, Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3285 (ii).

St. Francis River: in Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).

St. Fulgence Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).

St. Jacques River, Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3287 (ii).

St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).

St. John Drill Hall, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1293 (i).

St. John Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i), 2109 (ii).

——— Dredging, Apptmt. of Supt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5632 (iii).

——— Dredging, Contracts, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1917 (i), 2158 (ii).

St. John River, Construction of Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 1633 (i), 3238 (ii).

——— Contribution of Local Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).

St. Johns, P.Q., Contract for Wharf Extension: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2770 (ii).

——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).

——— Richelieu River Improvements, Estimates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2817 (ii).

——— Wharf, Expenditure, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2768 (ii).

St. Joseph's Island Wharfs, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 337 (i).

St. Joseph Wharf, Expenditure in 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).

St. Lawrence River Channel at Kingston, Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 2979 (ii).

St. Maurice River: Grande Piles Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).

St. Michel, Yamaska, Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3247, 3262 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

St. Nicholas Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2908 (ii).

Saguenay River Booms, Construction of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4222 (ii).

Saguenay River, Dredging and Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2802, 2878 (ii).

Saguenay River Wharf: in Com. of Sup, 3284 (ii).

Sandy Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup, 3235 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2475 (ii).

Sandy Cove Breakwater Construction, Payments to Contractors: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1419 (i).

——— Amounts owing for Labour &c., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1728 (i)

Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).

——— Dredging Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 3316 (ii).

Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).

Sea Gull Wharf, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 338 (i).

Seal Cove, Grand Manan Island Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i).

Selkirk Post Office, Estimated Cost, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 347, 530 (i).

——— Completion of, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5643 (iii).

Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1291 (i).

Shell River Bridge, Original Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 529 (i).

Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).

——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3478 (ii).

Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i).

Silver Centre Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3317 (ii).

Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1392 (i).

Snag Boat at Selkirk, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 474 (i).

Sorel Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2909, 3289 (ii).

Sorel Ship Yard, Purchase of Property: in Com. of Sup., 6885 (iv).

Souris Dredging, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (iv).

Southampton Dock Extension: in Com. of 3317 (ii).

——— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

South Lake, Lakevale Channel, Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 2480, 3235 (ii).

Spanish River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3324 (ii).

Spry Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2474 (ii).

——— Expenditures *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4895 (iii).

Stony Lake Wharfs Number, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1064 (i).

Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3224 (ii).

Sturgeon Falls and Sudbury Public Buildings, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 817 (i).

Sturgeon's Pier, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 2510 (ii).

——— Tenders, Contracts, &c., for raising: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1241 (i).

Sydenham River, Clearing East Branch: in Com. of Sup. 3324 (ii).

Tangier Harbour Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2484 (ii).

Tatamagouche Bay Wharf, Expenditure for Oct. and Nov., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 185 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i).

Tatamagouche River Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) in Com. of Sup., 2365 (ii).

Tenby Bay Wharf, Warehouse Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 339 (i).

Three Rivers Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1318 (i).

Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Tignish Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup. 2510 (ii).

Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3317 (ii).

——— Delay *re* Payments to Men: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 544 (i).

——— Western Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).

Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).

Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2082 (ii).

Vernon, B.C., Public Building; in Com. of Sup., 2075 (ii).

Vernon River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 2511 (ii).

Victoria Harbour Improvements, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 2117 (ii).

Victoria Immigration Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2082 (ii).

Wallace Bridge Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2484 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Wallace Bridge Wharf, Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1916 (i).
Welchpool, Campobello Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1646 (i).
Welland County, Expenditures *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3990 (ii).
Westport Landing Pier: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).
—— Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 475 (i).
Westville Post Office, Contract Price, Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 2755 (ii).
Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1292 (i).
Wharfs in N. S., N. B. and B. C., Amount expended since 1906, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 348 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barnard) 1190 (i).
Wharfs in Queens and Sunbury, Tenders called for in Oct. 1908, Estimated Cost, &c.: (Mr. Crocket) 2374 (ii).
Wharfs at St. Zotique, Amounts of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 1400 (i).
See 'Public Works,' &c. ,
Whitby Harbour, Negotiations *re* Acquisition by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2372 (ii).
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1393 (i).
—— Advertisements for Tenders: Read in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).
Whitehead, Grand Manan Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1646 (i).
Windsor, N.S., Post Office, Tenders *re* Renovating, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 4288 (iii).
Winnipeg Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1549 (i).
Yamaska Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2484 (ii).
Pulp, Paper, &c., Negotiations with U. S., *re* Duty: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2384 (ii).
Pulp and Paper produced in Canada, Quantity exported to G. B. and U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Béland) 3048 (ii).
Quaco Harbour Pier: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).
Qu'Appelle Electoral District, Voters' Lists, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 1191 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Land Grant, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 468 (i).
Quarantine, General Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 3193 (ii).
—— Partridge Island Water Service: in Com. of Sup., 3206 (ii).
Quarantine, Steamers 'Challenger,' &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5883 (iii).
Quebec and Blanc Sablon SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6653 (iv).
Quebec Bridge Co., Payments to Stockholders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 163 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 353 (i).
Quebec Bridge Rebuilding, Estimated Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 165 (i).
—— Plans, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2050, 3421 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Report, French Translation: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1722 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Res. *re* Sub-Marine Viaduct, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2321 (ii).
Quebec Camps of Instruction, Date of, Regiments attending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5641 (iii).
Quebec Citadel, Refurnishing, &c., for Tercentenary: in Com. of Sup., 3211 (ii).
Quebec Detention Hospital in Savard Park: in Com. of Sup., 3221 (ii).
Quebec Harbour, Lévis: in Com. of Sup., 2094 (ii).
Quebec Harbours and Rivers, General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3243 (ii).
Quebec Judges, now receiving Pensions, Date of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 5634 (iii).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Quebec Post Office, Elevators, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).
Quebec Tercentenary, Amount subscribed, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1721 (i).
Quebracho Extract, Quantity imported, Pet. *re* Duty: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 1178 (i).
Queens and Sunbury Mail Service, Established in Oct., 1908: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2375 (ii).
Queens and Sunbury Wharfs, Construction, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2320 (ii).
Quesnelle and Fort George Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 6544 (iv).
Quesnel Telegraph Station Supplies, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 1919 (i).
Ques. of Privilege, Insulting Members: Par. in Toronto 'World' (Mr. M. Clarke) 3941 (ii).
See 'Privilege.'
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Ry. Act Amt.: *See* 'Bills 2, 3, 6, 21, 32, 39, 54, 65, 72, 99, 106, 111 and 172.'
Railway Aid in Alberta, Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 676 (i).

Ry. Charters and Mileage Construction: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Ry. Commission's Powers: *See* 'B. No. 39.'
Ry. Subsidies, 1908, Clerical Error: *See* 'B. No. 174.'
Ry. Trainmen on Locomotives: *See* 'B. No. 172.'
Railway Act (level crossings) Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. Bickerdike): Remarks *re* M. for 2°, 555
RAILWAYS:
Alberta and Saskatchewan, Number of Miles in Operation: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 3049 (ii).
——— Aid in Alberta, Representations *re* Ques. (Mr .McCarthy) 676 (i).
Algoma Steel Co., N.T.R. Contracts *re* Rails, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 336 (i).
Arbitrations and Awards: in Com. of Sup., 2054 (ii).
Aylen, Mr. J., Emplymt. by Transcontinental Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5096 (iii).
B.C. Railway Belt, Litigation between Dom. and B.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3043 (ii).
Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry., Names of Stockholders, Passenger Rates, Freight Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3473 (ii).
Buell, Mr., Legal Work before Ry. Commission *re* Express Companies: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3002 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3252 (ii).
Caledonia and Liverpool Ry. Lines, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1734 (i).
Canada Eastern Railway, Original Price, Expenditure *re* Repairs, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2149, 2579 (ii).
——— Cost of: Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 3363 (ii).
C.P.R. Additional Stock, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 416 (i).
——— O.Cs. *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 685 (i).
——— O.Cc., &c.: Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 780 (i).
——— O.Cs.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1321 (i).
——— Ref. to Courts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 882 (i).
C.P.R., Closing of Law Suit: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) on M. for Sup., 2920 (ii).
——— Gimli Branch Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 2965 (ii).
Canadian Railways, Improved Service, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 626 (i).
RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Capitalization of Stock, Regulations by Ry. Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1187 (i).
Cattle Guards at Ry. Crossings, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1409, 1724 (i).
Central Ry. of N. B., Rep. of Commission *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4125 (iii).
See 'N.B. Central,' &c.
Charters, Lapsed Powers, Date of Charters, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Magrath) 1190 (i).
Crossing, Accident near Kingston: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) 251 (i).
Crossings of Rys., Methods adopted by Ry. Board *re* Protection, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 827 (i).
Crossings, Number of Accidents, Time, Cause, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 158 (1).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 548, 1320 (i).
Crossings, Cor. with Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 291 (i).
——— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 1977 (i).
——— Preventions *re* Accidents: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1192 (i).
——— Width of Opening, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. McIntyre) 3568 (ii).
Dominion Atlantic Ry., Examination by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).
——— Interview with Manager: Remarks (Mr. Black) 3003 (ii).
Expropriation of Ry. Lands, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. McKenzie) 4802 (iii).
French Language used by Ry. Cos., Telephone Cos., &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Paquet) 1421 (i).
G. T. Ry., Indebtedness to Canada: M. for O.Cs. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3056 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 2759 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 3046 (ii).
G.T. Ry., Level Crossings, Cost of Protection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1913 (i).
G.T. Ry., Madoc-Eldorado Branch Ry., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 245 (i).
G. T. Ry., Major's Hill Park, Conveyance by Govt., O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 352 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13 (i).
G. T. Stock, Outstanding, Rate of Interest, Total Liabilities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3651 (ii).
Grant to McGill College: in Com. of Sup., 2071 (ii).
Halifax and Southwestern Ry. Subsidy, Negotiations *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Graham) 1561 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Harmony-Elmira Branch of P. E. I. Ry., Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1243 (i).

Highways, Removal of Planks, Instructions from Ry. Commissioners: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 1022 (i).

Hudson Bay Ry. Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 2960 (ii).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 685 (i).

Hudson Bay Ry., Total Expenditure, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 1055 (i).

Lake St. John Ry., Colonization Subsidy Grant, Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 678 (i).

Level Crossing Accident Ret., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 1116 (i).

Level Crossings, Orders of Ry. Com. of Privy Council: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 549 (i).

See 'Crossings.'

Lussier, J. A., Payments to by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3990 (ii).

Mail Cars, Recommendation of Ry. Commissioners *re* Changes: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 3652 (ii).

Mail Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 1699 (i), 3432 (ii).

Mail Clerks, Furois, Dorais and Wathen, Dates of Examination for Promotions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3253 (ii).

Mail Clerks, Increase of Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4223 (iii).

Mail Service, Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 336 (i).

Mileage of Ry. Construction from 1888 to 1908, Authorized by Charters: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1076 (i).

N. B. Central Ry. Commission, Rep., Printing: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4236 (iii).

——— Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4296 (iii).

N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Report, O.Cs., &c.: M. (Mr. Foster) to lay on Table, 5634 (iii).

N. B. Central Ry. Commissioners' Rep. and Hon. Mr. Pugsley; Amt. (Mr. Crothers) to Com. of Sup., 5645; Neg. (Y. 63; N. 90) 5830 (iii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 6058 (iv).

Payne, J. Lambert, Duties, Salary, Hours of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McKenzie) 1726 (i).

Pembroke Ry. Crossing, Cost of Protection by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2159 (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Charlottetown, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2959 (ii).

——— Elmira and Harmony Branch Ry., Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6787 (iv).

——— Harmony-Elmira Branch: in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii).

——— Montague Branch, Land Claims: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (ii).

——— Souris Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Land Grant, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. (McCraney 468 (i).

Railways and Canals Dept., Consulting Engineer: in Com. of Sup., 386 (i).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Emmerson) 1250 (i).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 1318 (i).

——— Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).

——— Miscellaneous Works: in Com. of Sup., 2054 (ii).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 461 (i).

——— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2055 (ii).

Railway Commissioners, Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 289 (i).

——— Board, Pet. *re* Vacancy: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 529 (i).

——— Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 2056, 2068 (ii).

——— Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).

——— Vacancy, Apptmt. of Practical Farmer from N.W.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 2625; Amt. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2659; Agreed to (Y. 94; N. 54) 2668 (ii).

Ry. Subsidy c. 40, Edward VII., Reps., &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 2161 (ii).

Railways, Telegraphs, &c., Com., 14th Rep. *re* Private Bills Payments, M. (Mr. Guthrie) to conc., 4986 (iii).

Saskatchewan, Number of Miles in Operation from 1896 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3475 (ii).

Telegraph and Telephone Tariffs, Regulations by Ry. Board: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2764 (ii).

Telephone Companies, O.C. *re* Control by Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1072 (i).

——— Provincial Control by Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1418 (i).

Telephone Lines crossing Rys., Applications, Refusals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 335 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 353 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Two-Cent Fares, Refund by G. T. Ry., Letter Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 2911 (ii).

Rama Indians Trust Fund, Amount held by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 543 (i).

Rama Township, Expenditures on Roads and Bridges: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 677 (i).

Rand, Dr. F. A., Payments *re* Indians: Stmnt (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1168 (i).

Red Cross Society: *See* 'B. No. 160.'

Red River Expedition, Land Grants to Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3990 (ii).

Red River Settlers, Deputation *re* Land Grants: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 6278 (iv).

Registered Letters: *See* 'B. No. 19.'

Registered Stock, Arrangements *re* Importation from U. S., Regulations *re* : Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2379 (ii).

Regulations and Treaty *re* Fisheries, Prof. Jordan's Communication, &c.: to Ont. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iv).

Representation in House of Commons: *See* 'Proportional.'

Restaurant Com., 2nd Rep.: M. (Mr. Pugsley) 290 (i).

——— Interim Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 402 (i).

See 'House of Commons.'

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1718 (i), 2218, 2493, 2674, 3110, 3202 (ii).

Returns, Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6412 (iv).

Revenue Details *re* Amount of $699,235.52 in December, 1908: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 158 (i).

Revenue for December, Details of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure': Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 149 (i).

Richard's Landing, St. Joseph's Island Pier : in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).

'Richelieu' Dredge, Removal of Captain, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1185 (i).

Richelieu River Improvements, Office: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1185 (i).

Richelieu River Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 2559 (ii).

Richibucto Cape Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1629 (i).

Richibucto Harbour, Breakwater: Conc., 4049 (iii).

——— Claims of John Jardine: in Com. of Sup., 3237 (ii).

Richmond Rifle Range, Protection *re* Target Shooting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1722 (i).

Rideau Canal Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (ii).

——— Jones' Falls Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 2030 (ii).

Rideau Hall, Fuel Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (i).

——— Grounds, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (i), 3232-3 (ii).

Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Compensation to Squatters, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 530 (i).

Ridout, John Grant, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 121.'

Rifles, Swiss and Foreign, Regulations *re* Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2381 (ii).

Rimouski Wharf, Sheathing West Side: in Com. of Sup., 2557 (ii).

Riviere du Loup, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).

——— Machine Shops, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2949 (ii).

Riviere du Moulin Pier, Pets., Reps. *re* Construction: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 2161

River St. John Wharfs, Contribution of Local Govt.: in Com. of Sup. 1638 (i).

See 'St. John,' &c.

Robertson, Thos., Suspension by Pilotage Board, B.C.: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) on M. for Sup., 6855 (iv).

Roblin Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2995 (ii).

Roblin and Forest Mills Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 333 (i).

Rondeau Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2979 (ii).

Roof Garden, New Wing, H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7074 (iv).

Ross Rifle, Authority *re* Adoption by Can. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1072 (i).

——— Bayonet Contracts, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 344 (i).

——— Bayonets at Factory, Installments of Machinery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 670 (i).

——— Bisley Competitions, Description of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 343 (i).

——— Claims for Damages *re* Accidents, &c.: Remarks *re* former Answer (Sir Frederick Borden) 548 (i).

Ross Rifle Factory, Number of Employees, Inspection *re* Standards: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1411 (i).

Ross Rifles, Mark I., and Mark II., used by Canada at Bisley, Description, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 684 (i).

——— Number accepted and rejected by Militia Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 245, 329 (i).

——— Reps. *re* Merits and Demerits, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 1189 (i).

——— Rep. of Small Arms Com., Date of last Contract: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 471 (i).

Ross Rifle, Weight, Length, Diameter, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4891 (iii).
Royal Canadian Accident Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Royal Canadian Dragoons, Contract re Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2767 (ii).
Royal Casualty and Surety Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Royal Guardians: *See* 'B. No. 95.'
Royal Military College: in Com. of Sup., 3423 (ii).
Royal Military College, Kingston, Additional Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1381 (i).
—— Commandant: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 6660 (iv).
—— Estimated Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1732 (i), 2319 (ii).
Royal Military College Stables, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1732, 1733 (i).
Royal Military College, Water Supply, Defects, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 682 (i).
Royal Mint, Coins manufactured. Sale and Purchase of Silver, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 244, 354 (i).
—— Guard House, Gates, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3205 (ii).
—— Refining Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 1271 (i).
—— Total Cost, Expenditure, Amount of Silver, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 352 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 146 (i).
R.N.W.M. Police Barracks Grounds, Transfer to Ry. Corporations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 819 (i).
See 'N.W.M.P.'
Royal Victoria Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Rural Free Mail Delivery: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).
—— Number of Routes, &c.: Ques (Mr. (Armstrong) 6408 (iv).
Rural Mail Boxes, Number delivered in Dufferin County: Ques. (Mr .Barr) 341 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery: in Com. of Sup., 1714 (i), 3423 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Alberta: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCarthy) 3056 (ii).
Rural Mails in East Northumberland, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 3480 (ii).
—— Establishment of in Grey County: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 671 (i).
—— Prince Edward County, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1077 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, Location of Routes, Non-delivery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 347 (i).
—— Purchase of Boxes, Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 179 (i).
—— System, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 148 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, Total Expenditure on Routes: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 677 (i).
Rutherford Bay Island, Dispute *re* Ownership, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 6408 (iv).
Rutherford, Dr. J. S., Resignation, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1720 (i).
St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).
St. Alphonse Wharf, Removal of Rocks: in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).
St. Andrew's Bridge Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3000 (ii).
—— Contract re Approaches: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 2159 (ii).
St. Andrew's Lock Construction, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 531 (i).
St. Andrew's Rapids Locks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2097 (ii).
St. Andrew's Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i).
Ste Anne de Bellevue Locks, Pets. *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3483 (ii).
Ste. Anne Des Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2906, 3287 (ii).
St. Anne's Lock, Renewing Bridges: in Com of Sup., 2029 (ii).
St. Boniface Immigration Hospital: in Com of Sup., 7035 (iv).
St. Charles River, Estuary Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).
St. Francis du Lac Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3285 (ii).
St. Francis River: in Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).
St. Fulgence Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).
St. Helen's Island Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 3243 (ii).
St. Jacques River, Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3287 (ii).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).
St. John Drill Hall, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1293 (i).
St. John Harbour and Courtney Bay, Surveys and Borings, Cor., Reps., Advertisements *re* Tenders, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Daniel) 826 (i).
St. John Dredging, Apptmt. of Supt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5632 (iii).
St. John Harbour, Dredging Contract, Payments to Mayes *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1181 (i).
—— Contracts, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1917 (i).
—— Contract for Wharf Extension: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2770 (ii).
——Date of beginning, Contracts, &c.: Ques (Mr. Foster) 2158 (ii).

St. John Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i), 2109 (ii).

——Surveys, Election Promises: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i). *See* 'Mayes,' &c.

St. John Hospital, Fitting of Martello Building: in Com. of Sup., 3210 (i).

St. John Lighthouse, Purchase of Land, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6915 (iv).

St. John and Minas Basin SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).

St. John Postmaster, Superannuation of, Apptmt. of Successor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 871 (i).

St. John River, Channel Survey, Rep., Letters, Instruction, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Crocket) 881 (i).

—— Construction of Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 3238 (ii).

—— Survey between Fredericton and Woodstock: in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i).

——Surveys: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Crocket) 3254 (ii), 5249 (iii).

—— Tributaries, Wharf construction in Tidal Waters: in Com. of Sup., 1653 (i).

St. Johns Military Buildings, Lease, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 672 (i).

—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).

St. Johns, Richelieu River Improvements, Estimates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2817 (ii).

St. Johns Wharf, Expenditure, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2768 (ii).

St. Joseph's Hospital, Victoria, B.C., Arrangements for Sick Mariners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3197 (ii).

St. Joseph's Island Wharfs, Expenditures *re* Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 337 (i).

St Joseph Wharf, Expenditure in 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2586 (ii).

St. Justine Mail Delivery, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3480 (ii).

St. Lawrence Canals: in Com. of Sup., 1572 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel, Expenditure *re* Dredging, Continuation of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 2150 (ii).

—— Channel at Kingston, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2979 (ii).

St. Lawrence Ship Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6877 (iv).

St. Mary's and Milk River Diversions by U.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6238 (iv). *See* 'Waterways.'

St. Mary's and Western Ontario Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'

St. Maurice and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No 176.'

St. Maurice River, Grande Piles Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).

St. Michel, Yamaska Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3247, 3262 (ii).

St. Nicholas Indian Island, Disposal of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1410 (i).

St. Nicholas Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2908 (ii).

St. Peters Indian Reserve, Instructions of Mr. Vaughan, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 354 (i).

—— Patents *re* Surrender: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 1191 (i).

—— Removal to Fisher's Lake: in Com. of Sup., 3462 (ii).

—— Surrender, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 1017, 1139 (i).

St. Peters Indian Treaty, Cor., Instructions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1421 (i).

Ste. Philomene Mail Contract, Annual Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2770 (ii).

St. Pierre River Drainage, Floods, &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) to adjn., 4229 (iii).

St. Polycarpe Post Office, Complaints *re* Officials, Change of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 4894 (iii).

Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2948 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Contract with J. G. Herous *re* Timber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6404 (iv).

—— Furniture Making: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 900 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 673 (i).

—— Insufficient Number of Guards, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1417 (i).

St. Williams Landing Pier: Remarks (Mr. McCall) in Com. of Sup., 3332 (ii).

Sackville Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2934 (ii).

Saguenay River Booms, Construction of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4222 (iii).

Saguenay River Dredging and Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2802, 2878 (ii).

Saguenay River Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).

Salaries of Civil Servants. *See* 'B. Nos. 137, 138 and 187.'

Salaries of Letter Carriers. *See* 'B. No. 136.'

Salisbury and Harvey Railroad Co. *See* 'B. No. 35.'

Salvation Army Council. *See* 'B No. 142.'

Sandy Cove Breakwater, Amounts owing for Labour, &c., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1728 (i).

Sandy Cove Breakwater, Payments to Contractors: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1419 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2475, 3235 (ii).
Sanitary Conditions on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5644 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Channels, Contracts *re* Buoys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3482 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1909 (i).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 1909 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Farm and Garden Imports, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 339 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).
——— Dredging Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 3316 (ii).
Savings Bank Deposits, Increase of Interest: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1396 (i).
Savings Deposits and Loans, 3 per cent, &c., Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 679 (i). *See* 'Loans.'
School Lands, Alberta, Total Area, Fund, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 7072 (iv).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3234 (ii).
Scotch Farmers, Report *re* Visit to Canada : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6060 (iv).
'Scotia' SS., Subsidy Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4895 (iii).
Sea Gull Wharf, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 338 (i).
Seal Cove, Grand Manan Island Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i).
Secretary of State, Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 185 (i).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 14 (i).
Sec. of State, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 458 (i).
Security Life Insurance Co., of Canada : *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Seed Grain, Distribution to Settlers: in Com. of Sup., 3464 (ii).
——— Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 144 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 352 (i).
Seed Grain, Relief, &c.: Indians: in Com. of Sup., 998 (i).
Seed Oats purchased for Alberta, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1420 (i).
Seed Wheat, Number of Bushels purchased, Price paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1734 (i).
Seed Wheat, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1419 (i).
Seizures by Inland Revenue, Number for 1904-5-6-7-8, Dates, Amounts, realized, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 685 (i).
Selkirk Post Office, Estimated Cost, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 347, 530 (i).
Senate, Abolition of : Prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 1421 (i).
Senatorships, Commercial Negotiations *re*: ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 52 (i).
Sergeant-at-Arms, Classification *re* C. S. Bill: *See* 'House of Commons, Staff,' &c.
Sessional Allowances, Deductions *re* Assent to Bills: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4119 (iii).
Sessional Messengers appointed or dismissed since 1880: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 521 (i).
Sessions of Parlt., Length of, Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 27 (i).
Shad Fisheries, N.S., Rep. of Prof. Prince: Inquiry for (Mr. Stanfield) 3254 (ii).
'Shanghaiing' in Vancouver, Investigation *re*, Rep. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 3481 (ii).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1291 (i).
Shell River Bridge, Original Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 529 (i).
Sherbrooke Armoury, Completion of, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5643 (iii).
——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3478 (ii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i), 3222 (ii).
Sherbrooke New Regiment, Construction, Appropriations *re* Band: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5643 (iii).
Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (i).
Shipping Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 131 and 179.'
Ships Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Ships' Water Lines: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Shipping Drawbacks, Amounts paid from 1898 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 167 (i).
Sillsville and The Pines Mail Route, Carrier, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 333 (i).
Silver Centre Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3317 (ii).
Silver Currency coined in Canada for 1905-6-7-8, Profits, U.S. Silver circulated in Can., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 868 (i).
Simcoe and Couchiching Lakes, Expenditure *re* Lowering Waters: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 543 (i).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1392 (i).
Sissiboo River Bridge, Construction, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) on M. for Sup., 6834 (iv).
Smith, John Denison, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 157.'

Smith, Thomas L., Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Snag Boat at Selkirk, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 474 (i).
Snider Rifles, Disposition of Old Ones: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2381 (ii).
Somerville, Thos., Payments to by P.O. Dept.: (Mr. Wallace) 1559 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2909, 3289 (ii).
Sorel Ship Yard, Purchase of Property: in Com. of Sup., 6885 (iv).
—— Repairs of Boats owned by Marine Officials: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4702 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Amount expended for Repairs, Suspension of Mr. A. Sauve: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 1404 (i).
—— Fire Proof Building: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).
—— Number of Employees, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 869 (i).
—— Slope Trimmings: in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).
Soulanges County Wharfs, Repairs, Valuations &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lortie) 3055 (ii).
Soulanges Island, Change of Name: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 2757 (ii).
Souris, Man., Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. J. Dolmage, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1915 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) on M. for Sup. 6847 (iv).
Souris Dredging, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (iv).
Souris Wharf Extension, P. E. I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).
S. A. Bounty Act, Regulations *re* : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) on M. for Sup., 2219 (ii).
South African Land Grants, Changes *re* Regulations as to Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 541 (i).
—— Conditions of Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1179 (i).
—— Number located, Apptmts. of Substitute, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6404 (iv).
—— Land Scrip, Sale of to Govt. Employees: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 143 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).
—— Land Grant to Teachers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3986 (ii).
—— Homesteads issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2818 (ii).
S. A. Patriotic Fund, Names of Beneficiaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 2157 (ii).
Southampton Dock, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).
—— Dock Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3317 (ii).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
South Lake, Lakevale opening Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2480 (ii).
—— Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
Spanish River Improvements: in Com. of Sup.. 3324 (ii).
Speaker, Election of, 2 (i).
Speaker, Dep., Apptmt. of: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 140 (i).
Specie Reserve, Date of Last Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 869 (i).
Speech from Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 9 (i).
Spry Bay Govt. Wharf, Expenditures *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4895 (iii).
Spry Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2474 (ii).
Squatters Claims on Dauphin Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6287 (iv).
—— Burning of Buildings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 3045 (ii).
Stamps, Special, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3432 (ii).
Standing Orders Com., 1st Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to conc., 2019 (ii).
'Stanley' and 'Minto' Strs., Names and Residences of Officers: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 674 (i).
—— Total Expenditure from 1894 to 1908: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Maddin) 1922 (i).
Statistical and Special Information Publications, Number issued by Depts., Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 157 (i).
Statutes, French Translation, Designation of Titles: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) on M. for Sup. 2020 (ii).
Statutes for 1908, Delay in Publishing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 183 (i).
Steamers on Lake Winnipeg for Indian Dept. Lease, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1403 (i).
Steamship Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 146.'
SS. Subventions, Contingent Fund: in Com. of Sup., 6655 (iv).
Steel Cars, Introduction of on I.C.R., &c.: (Mr. Sproule) 481 (i).
Steel Importations from 31st March, 1908, to Jan. 31, 1909: M. for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 355 (i).
Stellarton Station, I.C.R., Area of Concrete Walks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 5630 (iii).
Stone, Broken and Rough for Marine Dept., Tenders, Contracts, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2593 (ii).
Stony Lake Property, Damage *re* Floods: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 825 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sexsmith) 1190 (i)
Stony Lake Wharfs, Number, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1064 (i).
Stony Mountain, Penitentiary Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 918 (i).

Stork, W. W., Inspector of Animals, Details *re* Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 6092 (iv).

Strachan, A. A., Land Patent, Homestead Duties, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lake) 3992 (ii).

Strathcona, Lord, Gift to Dom. *re* Drilling of School Children: Letter read (Sir Frederick Borden) 3198; M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) of Thanks, 3200; Seconded (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3201 (ii).

Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup.. 3224 (ii).

Street Car Traffic on Sundays, Dom. Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 1414 (ii).

Sturgeon Breeding in Lac du Bonnet, Sale of Fish, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 531 (i).
See 'Lac du Bonnet.'

Sturgeon Falls and Sudbury Public Buildings, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo Gordon) 817 (i).

Sturgeon's Pier, Enlargement: in Com of Sup., 2510 (ii).

Sturgeon Pier, P.E.I., Tenders, Contracts, &c., for raising: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1241 (i).

Submarine Co.'s Patent: *See* 'B. No. 77.'

Sugar: *See* 'Ways and Means.'

Superior and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 78.'

Supplies for Marine and Public Works Depts., Purchase by Tender, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 141 (i).

Supply Bills: *See* 'Bills 117 and 195.'

Supply: M. for Com. (Mr. Paterson) 140 (i).

Supply, Conc. Reading of Items: Remarks (Mr. John Haggart) 4048 (iii).

——— One-fourth Estimates voted: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 3936 (ii)

SUPPLY:

Committee:

Adulteration of Food:
General vote, 455 (i).

Administration of Justice: *See* 'Justice.'

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 688 (i).
Census and Statistics, 696 (i).
Cold Storage for Fruit, 6983 (iv).
Dairying Industry, &c., 3187 (ii).
Electric Ry. to Ottawa Farm, 3192 (ii)
Exhibitions, 727 (i).
Experimental Farms, 5947 (iv).
Fumigation Stations, 809 (i).
Hog Commission, 6984 (iv).
Gold and Silver Marking Act, 809 (i)
International Institute, 5882 (ii).
Live Stock Industry. 5833 (iii).
Patent Record, 696 (i), 3186 (ii).
Seed Control Act, 5880 (ii).
Tobacco Industry, 5881 (iii).
Year Book, 701, 726 (i), 3186 (ii)

Charges of Management:
General Vote, 399 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Civil Government:
Agriculture, 643 (i), 6982 (iv).
Auditor General's Office, 383 (i), 3434 (ii).
Civil Service Commission, 386, 705 (i). 7065 (iv).
Customs, 590 (i).
External Affairs, 7064 (iv).
Finance, 384 (i), 3436 (ii)
Gen. Consulting Engineer, 386 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 398 (i), 3434 (ii)
High Commissioner's Office, 385 (i).
Indian Affairs, 971 (i).
Inland Revenue, 428, 444 (i)
Interior, 6247 (iv).
Justice, 440 (i).
Labour, 651 (i)
Marine and Fisheries, 365 (i), 3436, 3687 (ii).
Militia and Defence, 2244, 2306 (ii)
Mines, 3673 (ii).
Post Office, 613, 720 (i).
Printing Bureau, 804 (i).
Privy Council Office, 380 (i).
Public Works, 613 (i), 3665 (ii).
Railways and Canals, 461 (i)
Secretary of State, 458 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 385 (i)

Customs:
Miscellaneous, 609 (i).
Preventive Service, 611 (i)
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 581, 591 (i).

Dominion Lands:
Contingencies, &c., 6285 (iv).
Hydrographic Surveys, 6284 (iv).
Salaries, 6284 (iv).
Surveys, &c., 3463 (ii), 6273 (iv).
Timber Protection, 6283 (iv).

Excise:
Methylated Spirits, 448 (i)
Salaries, &c., 436 (i).
Stamps, 437, 447 (i).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 435, 447 (i)
Weights and Measures:
Electric Power Export, 455 (i).
General Vote, 447 (i).
Metric System, 454 (i).
Salaries *re* Light Inspection, 452 (i).

Fisheries:
Biological Stations, 3438 (ii), 6953 (iv).
Cold Storage for Bait, &c., 6959 (iv).
Dog Fish, 6950 (iv).
Educational Establishments, 6952 (iv).
Fish-breeding Establishments, 6943 (iv).
Fishery Commissions, 6957 (iv).
Fresh Fish, Conservation, &c., 6955 (iv).
International Fisheries Commission, 3439 (ii), 6960 (iv).
Oyster Culture, 6949 (iv).
Protection Service, 6947 (iv).
Provincial Rights, &c., 6958 (iv).
U. S. Vessels Licenses, 6958 (iv).
W. S. Young, 6932 (iv).

Geological Survey:
Assay Office, Vancouver, 7063 (iv).
Mines Branch, 7062 (iv).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Specimens 7063 (i)

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Govt. of Northwest Territories:
Generally, 1171 (i).
Govt. of Yukon Territory:
Maintenance of Roads, 6273 (iv).
Salaries, &c., 6272 (iv).
Immigration :
Agents' Salaries, &c., 6994 (iv).
Contingencies, &c., 7014 (iv).
Hospitals, 7034 (iv).
Indians :
British Columbia, 1139-1160 (i).
Generally, 1161-1167 (i).
Man. and N.W.T., &c., 1002, 1016 (i), 3462 (ii).
Maritime Provs., 976, 989 (i).
New Brunswick, 999 (i), 3462 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 998 (i), 3462 (ii).
Ont. and Que., 976, 989 (i), 3461 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 1000 (i).
Yukon, 1160 (i).
Legislation :
Debates, 3437 (ii).
General Vote, 6775 (iv).
Increases in Salaries, 3437 (ii).
Permanent Messenger, 3436 (ii).
Senate, 7065 (iv).
Voters' Lists, 3436 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Agencies, Rents, &c., 6889 (iv).
Aids to Navigation, 6904 (iv).
Ice-breaking, 6915 (iv).
Lime Kiln Crossing, 3437 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 6902 (iv).
Payment to Mrs. A. G. Clarke, 6981 (iv).
Pension to Pilot, 3437 (ii).
Purchase of Land at St. John, N.B., 6915 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 6889, 6981 (iv).
Vancouver Island, West Trail 6981 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions:
Chinese Immigration Act, 6655 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, 6656 (iv).
General Vote, 3437 (ii), 6650-6654 (iv).
Old Age Pensions Act, 6660 (iv).
Marine Hospitals:
Care of Sick Seamen, 3438 (ii), 6946 (iv).
Militia:
Annual Drill, 2311, 3422 (ii).
Contingencies, 2313 (ii).
Gratuities, 2313 (ii).
Military Properties, 2314 (ii).
Ordnance, &c., 2307 (ii).
Pay and Allowances, 2316, 3422 (ii), 6660 (iv).
Royal Military College, 3423 (ii).
Transport, 3423 (ii).
Warlike Stores, 2317 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Arrest of Chinese at Sydney, 3466 (ii).
Banff Park, 1171 (i).
Can. and West Indies, Trade Relations, 6556 (iv).
Conservation Commission, 7064 (iv).
Hague Tribunal, 7057 (iv).
Industrial Disputes Act, 655 (i).
Injuries to N.W.M.P., 3664 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Miscellaneous—*Con.*
Labour Dept., 652 (i), 3433 (ii).
Litigated Matters, 1172 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, 3449 (ii).
Opium Conference, 3433 (ii).
Park Reservations, 6391 (iv).
Patent Medicines, 458 (i).
Parliamentary Companion, 7064 (iv).
Printing Maps, 3466 (ii), 6289 (iv).
Seed Grain, 3464 (ii).
Seizure of Schooner 'Evolution,' 3450 (ii).
Mounted Police:
General Vote, 3656 (ii).
Ocean and River Service :
Ice-breaker, 3437 (ii), 6673 (iv).
Life Saving, 6675 (iv).
Maintenance and Repairs, 6669 (iv).
Naval Militia, 6683 (iv).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 6682 (iv).
Removal of Obstructions, 6679 (iv).
Tidal Service, 6679 (iv).
Wreck Investigations, 6679 (iv).
Wrecking Plant, 6680 (iv).
Penitentiaries:
B.C., 924 (i), 7035 (iv).
Dorchester, 916 (i).
General Vote, 884 (i).
Kingston, 886 (i).
Manitoba, 918 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul, 914 (i).
Pensions, 812, 883 (i).
Post Office:
Mail Service, 1714 (i), 3423 (ii).
Miscellaneous, 1715 (i), 3431 (ii).
Salaries and Allowances, &c., 1649, 1696 (i); 3204 (ii).
Public Works—Capital :
Buildings:
Astronomical Observatory, 617 (i).
New Buildings, 1250 (i).
Parlt. Buildings, Additions, &c., 1253 (i), 3204 (ii).
Royal Mint, 1271 (i), 3205 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 1275 (i).
Harbours and Rivers :
Lévis, Deep Water Wharf, 2094 (ii).
Port Arthur, &c., Improvements, 2091 (ii).
Quebec Harbour, 2095 (ii).
Red River Improvements, 2097 (ii)
St. John Harbour, 2109 (ii).
Tiffin Harbour, 2115 (ii).
Victoria Harbour, 2117 (ii).
Public Works—Income :
Buildings:
British Columbia, 2075—2090, 3224 (ii).
Generally, 1598 (i).
Manitoba, 1543—1550 (i), 3332 (ii).
New Brunswick, 1293 (i), 3206—3210, 3237 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 1282-1292 (i).
Ontario, 1356-1361, 1366-1393, 1493-1543 (i), 3223, 3233-35, 3292-3325 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 1292 (i).
Quebec, 1293-1318 (i), 3210-3222, 3243-3249, 3262-3291 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Rents, Repairs, &c., 1599-1620 (i), 2452, 3225-3233 (ii).
Saskatchewan, Alberta and Northwest Territories, 1551-1555 (i), 3224 (ii).
Yukon Territory, 1592, 1620 (i), 3224 (ii)
Dredging:
General Vote, 6534, 6553 (iv).
Mar. Provs., 3339 (ii).
Ont. and Que., 3347 (ii).
Repairs, 3338 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia, 6544 (iv).
Manitoba, 2985-3001 (ii).
Maritime Provinces, 2511 (ii).
New Brunswick, 1622-1646 (i).
Nova Scotia, 1621 (i), 2338-2371, 2453-2484 (ii), 6543 (iv).
Ontario, 2966-2980 (ii), 6543 (iv).
Prince Edward Island, 2507-2512 (ii).
Quebec, 2512-2529, 2540-2564, 2802-2814, 2878-2909 (ii).
Marine Dept.:
Dredging Plant, 6885 (iv).
Permanent Piers, Lake St. Peter, 6887 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 6877 (iv).
Sorel Property, 6885 (iv).
Miscellaneous:
Compensation to Wm. Julien, 3349 (ii).
Generally, 6543 (iv).
Slides and Booms:
General Vote, 6542 (iv).
Telegraph Lines:
B.C., 3348 (ii).
Yukon, 3348, 3349 (ii).
Transportation Facilities:
Montreal Harbour, 3361 (ii).
Quarantine:
Further Amount, 3193 (ii).
Steamers, 5883 (iii).
Tracadie, &c., 809 (i).
Railways and Canals:
Canals:
Beauharnois, 1910 (i).
Carillon and Grenville, 2029, 3420 (ii).
Chambly, 1571 (i).
Cornwall, 2029 (ii).
Galops, 2029 (ii).
Generally, 2071 (ii).
Lachine, 786, 1563 (i), 1910, 3420 (ii).
Quebec Canals, 1910 (i).
Rideau, 2030, 3420 (ii).
St. Anne's Lock, 2029 (ii).
St. Lawrence Canals, Office, 1572 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie, 1909 (i).
Soulanges, 1569 (i).
Trent, 1577, 1886 (i), 2030, 2074, 3177 (ii).
Welland, 1903 (i), 2030-2041 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
A. Brunet, Remuneration, 2042 (ii).
Arbitrations and Awards, 2054 (ii).
Costs of Litigation, 2055 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry. Inspection, 2048 (ii).
McGill College, Contribution, 2071 (ii).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Miscellaneous—*Con*
Miscellaneous Works, 2054 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Plans, 2050, 3421 (ii).
Railway Commission, 2044, 2056, 2068 (ii).
Surveys and Inspections, 2055 (ii).
Railways:
Intercolonial Railway, 2753, 2921-2949, 2951, 3415-3418 (ii), 6557, 6985 (iv).
National Transcontinental Railway, 6985 (iv).
Prince Edward Island Railway, 2952-2959, 3418 (ii).
Scientific Institutions:
General Vote, 6263 (iv).
Hydrographic Surveys, 6916 (iv).
New Steamer, 6917 (iv).
Meteorological Service, 6915, 6982 (iv).
Water Rights on International Rivers, 6268 (iv).
Unprovided Items:
General Vote, 3466 (ii).
Supply, Concurrence, 4048 (iii), 7074 (iv).
Surveys by Mr. Vaughan: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bradbury) 2128 (ii).
Sussex Street Govtl. Buildings, Architects Plans, Ownership of: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 4638 (iii).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Purchase by Govt., Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 477 (i).
—— Surrender of Land: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
Sydenham River, Clearing East Branch: in Com. of Sup., 3324 (ii).
Sydney Free Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) in Com. of Sup., 1706 (i).
Sydney Mines Diversion Line: in Com. of Sup., 2936 (ii).
Tadousac and Rivière du Loup, Winter Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 344 (i).
Tangier Harbour, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2484 (ii).
Tariff, The: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
Tariff Changes *re* Tin: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4126 (iii).
Tariff, Protection, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., on Live Stock Industry, 5833 (iii).
Tatamagouche Bay, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i).
Tatamagouche Bay Wharf, Expenditure for Oct. and Nov., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 185 (i).
Tatamagouche River Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) in Com. of Sup., 2365 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, &c., across Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Telegraph Lines, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3348 (ii).
Telegraph Operators' Hours: *See* 'B. No. 72.'

Telegraph and Telephone Tariffs, Regulations by Ry. Board: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2764 (ii).
Telephone Companies, O.C. *re* Control by Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1072 (i).
Telephone Lines crossing Rys., Applications, Refusals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 335 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 353 (i).
Telephones, Ottawa Buildings: in Com of Sup., 3229 (ii).
Telephones, &c., Provincial Control by Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1418 (i).
Telephone Rates in Canada, Legislation *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1761 (i), Amt. (Mr. Carvell) agreed to (Y. 101; N. 47) 1811 (i).
Telephone Stations between Montreal and Quebec *re* Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 2594 (ii).
Telephone and Telegraph Special Com. of 1905, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 153 (i).
Tenby Bay Wharf, Warehouse Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 339 (i).
Tercentenary Postage Stamps, Total Amount *re* Sale: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3654 (ii).
Thedford, Arkona and Fort Frank Rural Mail Delivery, Delays in Establishing: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 476 (i).
Thessalon and Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Thirty-Sixth Regiment, Payments for Storage of Arms: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 4894 (iii).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Thompson Municipality Land Patent, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6280 (iv).
Three Rivers Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1318 (i).
Thunder Bay, Ice Breaking Steamer: in Com. of Sup., 6915 (iv).
Tidal Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6679 (iv).
Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 2115 (ii).
Tignish Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2510 (ii).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'
Timber Berth No. 1122, Original Applications, Tenders, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Campbell) 353 (i).
—— Nos. 1216, &c., Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 2162 (ii).
Timber Inspectors' Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Timber Lands in Alberta, Revenue due, Payable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 3193 (ii).
Timber Limit Regulations, Suspension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 342 (i).
Timber Protection, Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 6296 (iv).
Tobacco, Canadian, Encouragement of: in Com. of Sup., 5881 (iii).
Tobacco Stamps: in Com. of Sup., 437, 447 (i).
Tomkins, Hannah Ella, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
Toronto Barracks, Delay *re* Erection on Humber River Site: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 183
Toronto Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i)
Toronto, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3317 (ii).
—— Western Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 2980 (ii).
Toronto Harbour Works, Delay *re* Payment to Men: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 544 (i).
Toronto Meteorological Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 1505 (i).
Toronto Military Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1505 (i).
See 'Garrison.'
Toronto, New Post Office, Delay in Constructing: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 336 (i).
Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Toronto Old Fort, Condition of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6415 (iv).
—— Pets. *re* Transfer, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4122 (iii).
—— Reclamation of Land from Park Blackwell Co., Restoration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3984 (ii).
Towers in Dufferin County, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 341 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto: in Com. of Sup., 809 (i).
Trade and Commerce: in Com. of Sup., 6655 (iv).
Trade and Commerce, Part I: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 176 (i).
—— Dept., Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3091, 3236 (ii).
Trade Commissioners and Commercial Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 6656 (iv).
Trade Commissioner at Shanghai, Vacancy, Apptmt., &c: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2320 (ii).
Trade Relations with Germany, Improvement *re*, Total Exports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 482 (i).
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Official Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 2494 (ii).
—— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 289 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 6000 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 6412 (iv).
See 'G.T.P.'
Transportation Problem: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 2888 (ii).
Treaties between U.S. and G.B., of April 11, 1908, O.C. Regulations, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1081 (i).
See 'Waterways,' 'Germany,' &c.

Trent Canal: in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 1577 (i), 2074 (ii).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2080 (ii).
Trent Canal, Damages in Peterborough County Inquiry for Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5777 (iii).
——— Fish Slides: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 2672 (ii).
——— Land Damages, Amounts paid *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 4641 (iii).
——— Land Values, &c., Expropriations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3177 (ii).
Trent Canal, Newmarket: Amt. (Mr. J. A. Currie) Neg. (Y. 52; N. 80) 4049 (iii).
Trent Valley Waterways, Extension to Georgian Bay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Currie) 473 (i).
See 'Holland River,' &c.
Triennial Clothing, Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i).
Truro Armoury, Apptmt. of Caretaker, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 186 (i).
Truro I. C. R., Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2754 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'
Tuberculosis, International Congress, Delegates to: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1186 (i).
Tuck, ex-Chief Justice, Rep. *re* Offer of a Knighthood: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 154 (i).
Turtle Mountain Squatters, Removal, Compensation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1417 (i).
Unclaimed Balances in Banks: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
University Drill Corps, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 683 (i).
Unprovided Items: in Com. of Sup., 3466 (ii).
Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3235 (ii).
Usury Act, 1908, Prosecutions, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 481 (i).
Uxbridge Post Office, Options *re* Sites, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 181, 1731 (i), 6091 (iv).
Vancouver Bank: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Vancouver Election Officials, Delay in Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 1418 (i).
Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2082 (ii).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Vautelet, H. A., Emplymt. as Architect, Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1412 (i).
Ventilation and Fire Escapes of New H. of C. Wing: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6781 (iv).
Vernon River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 2511 (ii).
Vernon, B.C., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2075 (ii).
Veterans of 1866, Land Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 668 (i).
Victoria and Barkley Sound Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Victoria Harbour Improvements, Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 2117 (ii).
Victoria Immigration Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2082 (ii).
Victoria Post Office, Pet. from Letter Carriers: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 1712 (i).
Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).
Villa Lots in Section 14, Twp. 21, Applications *re* Transfer, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. McCarthy) 685 (i).
Voters' Lists, Electoral District of Thunder Bay, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 340 (i).
——— Parry Sound, Cost of Revision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 669 (i).
Voters' Lists, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3436 (ii).
Wake, John, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
Wallace Bridge Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2484 (ii).
——— Contracts *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1916 (i).
Wallberg, Mr., Claims *re* Moneys due him: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3989 (ii).
——— Contract of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3475 (ii).
Ward, Fleetwood Howard, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Warlike Stores: in Com. of Sup., 2317 (ii).
Warships discarded by G. B., Offer to Fisheries Protection Service: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2379 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 105.'
Water Carriage of Goods between Can. and G.B., Regulations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2764 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods, Discussion *re* Bill: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 6846 (iv).
Water Lines of Ships: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Water Powers: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Water Power, Leases on Canadian Canals: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2037 (ii).
Waterways Treaty, Acceptance of U.S. Senate Amts.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4471 (iii).
——— Amendment of U.S. Senate, Ratification by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4288 (iii).
Waterways Treaty with U.S.: Changes in Draft Treaty *re* Intersection of Islands: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) on M. for Sup., 1490 (i).
——— Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1562 (i).

Waterways Treaty, Conditional Ratification: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 2335 (ii).
—— Date of Signing and Receipt: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1074 (i).
—— Delay in placing before Can. Parlt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 174 (i).
—— Despatch from Sec. of State for Colonies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 633 (i).
—— Discussion by Mr. Gibbons: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1563 (i).
—— Further Information: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 292 (i).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7, 158, 292, 402 (i).
—— International and N.B. Fisheries, Par. in St. John 'Globe.': Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 1243 (i).
—— O.Cs. Cor. Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1081 (i).
—— Presentation of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2494 (ii).
—— Publication by Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1187 (i).
—— Ratification by U.S. Senate: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Boyce) 1353 (i).
—— U. S. Rider *re* St. Mary's River and Milk River: M. (Mr. Magrath) to Com. of Sup., 6583 (iv).
Waterways and Boundaries Treaty, and Welland Canal Enlargement: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6292 (iv).
Watson, R. J., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 2158 (ii).
Ways and Means: M. for Com. (Mr. Paterson) 140 (i).
—— The Budget (Mr. Fielding) 4546 (iii). *See* 'Budget.'
Ways and Means, Sugar: in Com. on Tariff, 5099 (iii).
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. Nos. 83 and 101.'
Weights and Measures, Discussion of Estimates: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 3683 (ii).
—— Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 447 (i).
Welchpool, Campobello Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1646 (i).
Welland Canal, Electric Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
—— Employees, Number for Sept. and Oct.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 470 (i).
—— Feeder Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).
—— Number of Employees, Total Salaries, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 815 (i).
—— Port Maitland Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2030 (ii).
—— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2034 (ii).
Welland Canal, Steel Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 2036 (ii).
—— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 1909 (i).
—— Total Cost, Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCall) 2154 (ii).
—— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
Welland County, Expenditures re Public Works: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3990 (ii).
Wells, Judge, Apptmt. in Westmoreland County, Absence with and without Leave, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McAllister) 4897 (iii).
Western Canadian Life Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
West Coast Trail on Vancouver Island: in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iv).
Westport Landing Pier: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).
Westport Wharf, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 475 (i).
Westville Post Office, Area of Concrete Walks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6085 (iv).
—— Contract Price, Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 2755 (ii).
Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1292 (i).
Weymouth Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2360 (ii).
Weymouth P.O., Change of Name, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 3055 (ii).
Wharfs and Piers Act: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Wharfs between Longue Pointe and Pointe-aux-Trembles, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1068 (i).
Wharfs in Inland Rivers: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 3331 (ii).
Wharfs in N.S., N.B. and B.C., Amount expended since 1906: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 348 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barnard) 1190 (i).
Wharfs in Queens and Sunbury, Tenders called for in Oct., 1908, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2374 (ii).
Wharfs at St. Zotique, Amounts of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 1400 (i).
Wheat: *See* 'Seed.'
Whitby Harbour, Negotiations *re* Acquisition by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2372 (ii).
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1393 (i).
—— Advertisements for Tenders: Read in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).
Whitefish Spawn for Lake Winnipegosis, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1403 (i).
Whitefish, Sturgeon, Winter and Summer caught, Quantity, Value exported, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 826 (i).
Whitehead, Grand Manan Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1646 (i).

Williams Head Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 2090 (ii).
Williams, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R. at Moncton. Superannuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 330 (i).
Windsor Branch, I.C.R. Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 3421 (ii).
Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Windsor, N.S., Post Office, Tenders *re* Renovating, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 4288 (iii).
Wingfield Basin Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) in Com. of Sup., 3347 (ii).
Wingham Post Office Clock, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4637 (iii).
Winnipeg, Bank of: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Winnipeg Beach Pier, Removal of Obstruction in Manitou Rapids, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 335 (i).
Winnipeg Beach Protection: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 2986 (ii).
Winnipeg 'Free Press,' Total Amount paid by Govt., 1906-9: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 354 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 1978 (i).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No.. 29.'
Winnipeg P.O. and Ry. Station Mail Contract, Tenders, Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 869 (i).
Winnipeg Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1549 (i).
Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1402 (i).
Wire Fencing, Advertisements for Tenders, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 354 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 245 (i).
Wire Fencing, I.C.R.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1321 (i).
Wireless Telegraphy on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Wolfe Island Canal, Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 3302 (ii).
——— Construction, Contribution *re* Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3043 (ii).
Wood Alcohol, Quantity purchased, Price, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Miller) 1396 (i).
Wood and Wood Pulp, Negotiations *re* Tariff Increase: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1241 (i).
Woodstock Armoury, Bowling Alley Operations: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5157 (iii).
Woollen Industry and Tariff Changes: M. (Mr. Lennox) 4126 (iii).
Woollen Mills, Number, Quantity of Canadian Wool used, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 150 (i).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada for 1907, Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 149 (i).
Wrecks, Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 6679 (iv).
Wrecking Plant Subsidy, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).
Yamaska Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
Yarmouth Harbour Buoys, Displacement of: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) on M. to adjn., 1114 (i).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2484 (ii).
Year-Book: in Com. of Sup., 701 (i), 3186 (ii).
Young, W. S., Payment *re* Collection of Whitefish Eggs: in Com. of Sup., 6982 (iv).
Yukon Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Yukon Buildings, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup, 1620 (i).
Yukon, Commissioner's Residence, Dawson: in Com. of Sup., 1592 (i), 3224 (ii).
——— Buildings, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1620 (i).
——— Commissioner's Residence: in Com. of Sup., 1592 (i), 3224 (ii).
——— Northwest Mounted Police: in Com. of Sup., 3659 (ii).
Yukon Govt., Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iv).
Yukon Ordinances: Prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 7075 (iv).
——— Beer Tax (prop. res.) 5892 (iv).
——— Roads, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).
——— Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 3348 (ii).
'Zaidee' and 'Gladiator,' Govt. Strs., Privileges *re* Towing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 5631 (iii).
Zinc Mines, Discovery in Albermarle Twp., Govt. Bounty to: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 1077 (i).